



CITY OF SALEM PLANNING BOARD

City of Salem Planning Board Meeting Minutes April 2, 2020

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, April 2, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. via Remote Access. The public can listen and or view this meeting while in progress via the remote participation platform Zoom, through any one of the following ways:

- Go to the website link www.zoom.us/j/592188032 or
- Go to the website link www.zoom.us/join and enter meeting ID # 592-188-032 or
- Dial toll-free phone number 877-853-5257. When prompted enter meeting ID # 592-188-032. Those only dialing in will not have access to the direct video feed of the meeting, but can follow along with the project materials available for download at www.salem.com/planning-board/agenda/planning-board-agenda-april-2-2020.

Chair Ben Anderson calls the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

I. ROLL CALL

Those present were: Chair Ben Anderson, DJ Napolitano, Matt Smith (arriving late), Kirt Rieder, Vice Chair Matt Venio, Helen Sides, Noah Koretz, Carole Hamilton, Bill Grisette (9)

Absent:

Also in attendance: Mason Wells, Staff Planner, George Driver, Staff

Recorder: Stacy Kilb

Chair Anderson notes that information for a number of projects was just received this afternoon, despite the fact that it is required to be submitted one week prior. If the Board was being strict it would require these Applicants to continue, but he knows there are issues given the situation. Following this meeting, the Board will NOT waive that requirement.

II. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. **Location:** 79 Columbus Avenue (Map 44, Lot 57)
Applicant: Eric Cormier
Description: A public hearing for all persons interested in the application of ERIC CORMIER for the property located at 79 Columbus Avenue (Map 44, Lot 57) for a Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit in accordance with the Salem Zoning Ordinance Section 8.1. Specifically, the applicant proposes to reconstruct a home and garage on 79

Columbus Avenue. Other improvements include a new driveway. No change to the existing foundation and footprint is proposed.

The Applicant has requested a continuance.

A motion to continue to the April 16, 2020 meeting, is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Helen Sides, and the motion carries in a roll call vote with all in favor.

Roll call:

Carole Hamilton	Yes
Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Griset	Yes
Noah Koretz	Yes
Matt Smith	Not Yet Arrived/Online
Matt Veno	Yes

- B. Location:** 54 and 56 Swampscott Road (Map 07, Lots 65 and 64)
Applicant: Michael Buonfiglio
Description: A public hearing for all persons interested in the application of MICHAEL BUONFIGLIO for the property located at 54 and 56 Swampscott Road (Map 07, Lots 65 and 64) for a special use permit per Section 3.1.3 and Section 9.4 of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to allow a change in use from an auto repair shop to a contractor's yard and landscaping business in the Business Park Development District. Specifically, the applicant proposes to repair the shop for use as office and storage, with the addition of a second floor to the existing building.

A motion to continue to the April 16, 2020 meeting, is made by Matt Veno, seconded by DJ, and carries.

Roll call:

Carole Hamilton	Yes
Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Griset	Yes
Noah Koretz	Yes
Matt Smith	Not Yet Arrived/Online
Matt Veno	Yes

- C. Location:** 379, 383, and 387 Highland Avenue; 4, 10, 12, 14, and 16 Barnes Road; 9, 12, 14-16, and 18 Cedar Road (Map 7, Lots 18-21, 49-54, 59, & 60; Map 3, Lot 66 & 67)

Applicant: Overlook Acres LLC

Description: A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of OVERLOOK ACRES, LLC for the property located at 379, 383, and 387 Highland Avenue, 4, 10, 12, 14, and 16 Barnes Road and 9, 12, 14-16, and 18 Cedar Road (Map 7, Lots 18-21, 49-54, 59, & 60; Map 3, Lot 66 & 67) for a Site Plan Review and Planned Unit Development Special Permit in accordance with the Salem Zoning Ordinance Section 9.5 and Section 7.3. Specifically, the applicant proposes a development on the approximately 15.5 acre site along Highland Avenue at Barnes Road and Cedar Road consisting of a mix of uses, including commercial, residential, and public spaces. There is one commercial building with an approximate footprint of 8,450 square feet, four residential buildings with approximately 324 units, and a residential club house. There are also approximately 500 parking spaces proposed on site.

Present for the Applicant are:

Scott Grover, Attorney

Michael D'Angelo, Landscape Architect

Dan Ricciarelli, Architect

Paul Herrick, Pavel Espinal, and Peter Lutts, Development Team

Rich Kirby

Robert Michaud, Transportation Analyst

Scott Cameron, Engineer, The Morin Cameron Group

Scott Cameron presents:

Feedback from the Board is being addressed. Significant changes have been made to the site, to that end. A summary of responses to Board questions has been provided

- Context map
 - Relationship to Barnes Rd. neighborhood; site viewed as transitional between residential and commercial areas
- Zoning Overlay
- Site Plan:
 - Site of concern was the interface with Highland Ave. and Barnes Rd.
 - Much frontage on Barnes Rd; originally planned a 2-way driveway off Barnes Rd. Now exit only with a curve to prevent people from cutting through the neighborhood. Will force drivers to use the main entrance off Highland Ave. Will be signage identifying that
 - 28' wide entryway on Barnes Rd.
 - Front Building #5 redesigned; originally mixed commercial and residential, now one-story commercial only w/aesthetic streetscape; sidewalk, will be closer to street with parking in rear. Will have outdoor use area
 - Walkways and bikeways at 5% slope; attention given to this to make it more walkable

- A more robust and linear park connecting the commercial area to a parkway and ending at a playground has been added. Other parks in City were studied. Playground area is 3500 square feet, rest of Park is 28,000 square feet. Street trees will be added
- Parking right in the entrance was eliminated, now feels like a road coming into a neighborhood, the road bends before entry to the residential area to screen it.
 - A small amount of parking on both sides was eliminated.
- Units reduced from 324 to 298
- Terraced landscaping to soften design
- Building 4 turnaround moved to end; building pulled from wetland to maintain 25' buffer; more trees on other side being conserved
- Distinct breaks in building have been added to break up massing; Architecture is work in progress; will still go before DRB
- Building 3 – concern was impact to wetland; building has been pulled away, close to lot line, made more pedestrian oriented w/parking under building and across street. Still close to wetland but not in it. Grades made to fit better
- Building 1 concerns included the large fill slope close to the wetlands, impacts to isolated wetland; Elevation has been raised to reduce cut along lot line from 20' to 10'; parking added under building 1. Wetland only has a wall along one side; wetland will now be replicated and restored in place. Open amenity space has also been opened in front of building 1 next to wetland
- 2 cul-de-sacs meet radius requirements of subdivision regulations; fire truck can navigate site without having to do 3 point turns. Grade by Building 1 turnaround has been reduced
- Surface parking was moved beneath building 2 as well. 170 parking spaces moved under buildings mean 1.3 acres of pavement are no longer needed; pervious area has increased to 67% of the property
- Cross section elevations; terraced retaining walls, streetscape (various sections shown)
- Linear park detail and renderings & perspectives are shown

Chair Anderson comments that progress has been made.

Carole Hamilton asks about the buildings that have underground parking, and if trash collection could be in those parking areas. Their current location is too far, particularly from Buildings 4a and 4b. How many stories are proposed in Buildings 1, 2, 3 and 4? They chose to centralize trash with the understanding that residents would drop off their own waste; this is proprietary to developers. Residents may also add service to be picked up at their door. Otherwise they can load trash into cars and bring it to the dumpster; it is also away from the wetland and in an open, visible area to provide for public safety. Buildings 1 and 4 are four stories; 2 and 3 are three-story buildings (it is unclear if this includes the parking underneath the buildings that have it).

Kirt Rieder asks about the entry corridor setback; the Board can request a setback but Mr. Rieder feels there may not be a precedent for any other building that is as close. Length of cul-de-sacs? The Code for subdivisions is 500'; they are not held to subdivision regulations but are adopting those design standards for roads. The distance from the intersection of 2B to the cul-de-sac is 800', not to subdivision regulations but it is best practice. Keeping it under 1500' will avoid water pressure issues. The distance from the intersection between buildings 3 and 1 is 340'. Kirt Rieder notes that the fire marshal will ultimately approve, or not. Cross sections of landscape architecture were

helpful but he wonders about actual heights vs. number of stories. Please clarify in the future. Open space is far more robust, but he wants to hear from abutters regarding their preference as to maintaining a dense buffer of vegetation vs. putting in a new buffer that will take 15 or more years to mature. He agrees w/the Chair re effort that has gone in, but he is trying to form an opinion about density and number of units, especially regarding the project's proximity to wetland resources. If the buffer is 100' it is not unusual to expect a 50' setback.

Helen Sides agrees with Kirt Rieder on the Barnes Rd. park and is concerned about what the residents would like. The existing buffer may be more valuable than developed open space.

Noah Koretz agrees with Helen Sides and Kirt Rieder. Matt Smith (who arrived for this item) likes the path in the park, and feels that the small commercial center and sidewalks into the neighborhood are positive developments. The entry has also been made more street-like.

Matt Veno acknowledges the adjustments made according to Board feedback; massing of the buildings was a concern and he thanks the Applicant for taking it into consideration. Underground parking has opened up many possibilities that the Applicant has taken advantage of by extending amenities.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment and the procedure for commenting on Zoom is outlined. Mason Wells will read comments by email aloud, however in future yjru will be entered into the record as an email as per usual, not read. The Chair notes that the Board may not have time to go through the entire list, so while comments submitted in writing may not be read aloud, they will read aloud names of those who submitted comments. Each project presentation is being limited to 45 minutes pre meeting, so there are 10 minutes left in this session

#9382 – David Labby, 18 Barnes Rd. comments that he does not mind a playground per se, but it is a bit close to residents. He is also concerned about the lack of a privacy buffer. He asks about the back of the playground and if there is a cutout for a walkway for residents. Building 2 is 7' taller than the closest house (his).

#2741 – No comment

#0266 – No Comment

#2618 - No comment

#6909 – No connection/no comment

#9686 – No comment

5050 – Leanne Dealey of Highland Ave. # 5050 – Leanne Dealey of Highland Ave. is concerned about light and noise pollution from building 5; she is across the street. What will the hours of the stores be? Signage ?

#Lori Stewart - No comment

Dennis Colbert had submitted written comment and asks if the developer will answer questions in this public forum or another way. The Chair will forward comments/questions to the Developer and they will answer in the public forum.

#Alvi Ibanez - submitted comments via form

#3722 –

#Beverly H. castles3@comcast.net, Agrees that current mature growth would be a preferable screen. She appreciates change to access but is concerned at enforcing the one-way nature of entry.

Scott Grover wonders if the project can now be referred to the DRB.

A motion to refer the matter to the Design Review Board is made by Matt Veno, Seconded by Carole Hamilton, and passes 9-0 in a roll call vote:

Carole Hamilton	Yes
Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Grisct	Yes
Noah Koretz	Yes
Matt Smith	Yes
Matt Veno	Yes

A motion to continue to the May 7, 2020 meeting, is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by DJ Napolitano, and carries in a roll call vote:

Carole Hamilton	Yes
Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Grisct	Yes
Noah Koretz	Yes
Matt Smith	Yes
Matt Veno	Yes

- D. Location:** 16, 18, and 20R Franklin Street (Map 26, Lots 400, 401, and 402)
Applicant: Juniper Point Investment Co LLC
Description: A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of JUNIPER POINT INVESTMENT CO LLC for the properties located at 16, 18, and 20R Franklin Street (Map 26, Lots 400, 401, and 402) for an amendment to a Site Plan Review, Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit, and Special Permits associated with the North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 9.5 Site Plan Review; Section 8.1 Flood Hazard Overlay District; Section 8.4 North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District; and a Stormwater Management Permit in accordance with Salem Code of Ordinances Chapter 37. Specifically, the applicant proposes to amend an existing Planning Board decision dated September 20, 2018. The original decision allows replacing the junkyard with a residential development consisting of

forty-two (42) units in five (5) buildings and includes a strip of land running from Franklin Street to the river that is approximately 25,000 square feet and is part of an ownership dispute. The new application includes only a portion of the disputed land, referred to as Parcel B, and downsizes the project accordingly. The amendment proposes to replace the existing junkyard with a residential development consisting of thirty-seven (37) units in four (4) buildings with parking under each building, in addition to some surface parking. The project also includes landscaping throughout, and public access along the riverfront with walking paths. Also included are slightly repositioned building locations. In order to accommodate the new building layout, the applicant proposes the relocation of the site entrance approximately 55-feet to the south; revised parking and walkway layouts; changes to grading, drainage, sewer, water, gas, electric, lighting, and landscaping; and a new proposed three-foot tall retaining wall along the disputed strip of land. NOTE: Alternatively, should Parcel B not be integrated into the project, then the Applicant requests the Decision be amended to reflect a further reduced plan, to 31 units, with no change to the building footprints, or site plan, as submitted herewith.

Present for the Applicant are:

Attorney Joseph Correnti
Attorney Kristin Kolick
Bob Griffin, Engineer
Marc Tranos
Ryan McShera, Architect

Attorney Joseph Correnti introduces the project and outlines the changes. The land in dispute continues to be a title issue that will take time to resolve, but they would like to move forward. They wish to show the Board this project in two parts; one including a piece of the land in dispute, and an alternative including none of the land in dispute. These will be distinguished as Parcel A and Parcel B.

Attorney Correnti:

- Project Site
 - Parcels A and B do not exist, but define an area that the City believes it has a claim to. It believes it has a strong claim to Parcel A (the one toward the front, abutting Franklin St.) belonging to Furlong Park. The back half of the land in dispute, referred to as Parcel B, may not be the same type of claim. To be clear, the current owner and proposed developer are not relinquishing any claim to Parcels A and B. However, in order to move forward, they are showing a revised Plan and willingness to discuss with the City to show how this might work
 - Fence line, Parcels A and B are shown
- Proposed layout approved by Planning Board in 2018
- Proposed layout 2020 with Parcel B. No construction proposed on Parcel B (15,000 sf)
- Proposed layout 2020 proposed without Parcel B. No land under contention. Clear title held by Ferris trust. Reduced to 31 units; variance from ZBA approved density/land area per

dwelling unit of 2,350 sf of land per dwelling unit. When 15,000 sf of parcel B are included, there can be 37 units. $A + B = 42$ units. Take away $A + B = 31$ units. They want to respect the variance that has been granted

- Buildings will remain the same and difference in units is via floor planning within the buildings. the 31 unit project would have more three bedroom apartments; if 37 units, the project would have more two bedroom apartments

Bob Griffin, Engineering, presents 2018 and 2020 versions of the following Plans, for comparison:

- Building overlay plan: Building footprint comparison
- Pavement overlay plan; reduced by 10,500 sf reduction in impervious surfaces; 2400 sf associated w/removal of building on Parcel A, 6000 sf and 3,000 square foot walkway removal from previous plan
- Grading & Drainage plans
- Figure 1: Limits of site above flood waters; will still be an “island of upland” in a storm
- Fire Truck Arriving Path, Fire Truck Leaving Path. Fire Chief has reviewed and approved path analyses and fire hydrant locations
- Sewer & Water plans
- Proposed Gas & Electric
- Photometric Plan
- Landscaping Plan; some substitutions were made due to availability. Some mature trees will be saved if Parcel B is included
- Project Summary; parking spaces remain the same

Matt Smith notes that he favors the number of three bedroom units in the project as designed without Parcel B. This is a much-needed unit type.

Helen Sides clarifies, asking if both are presented because it is possible they may get Parcel B, or if they don't get either Parcel, who clears the property and takes care of that area? In that case would the City expand Furlong Park? Attorney Correnti notes they are asking for a decision in the alternative. If no disputed land is included it remains in dispute, who will maintain and clear the parcel(s) in question, is “the owner.” It is not a simple answer, and no work will be proposed by the developer if the land is not included in the project. Including Parcel B makes a lot of sense but requires City action, City Council action, and possibly other actions. This is why they want alternatives. Juniper Point is trying hard to get a finance-able project. Land with title claims on it is not able to be financed. If Parcel B cannot be efficiently resolved, they will want to proceed without it. Would Ferris be responsible for clearing that land? Helen Sides does not want to see junk still there; the Developer does not want to see that either. If Juniper Point purchases a property, the current owners must vacate; the prior owners must clear it out and it must just be land. Automotive refuse and storage would be gone. If Parcel B is not included in the project beyond that, then the developer will not touch it because it will be in dispute. They will not spend money on landscaping, etc. as they will not be able to get financing to do that.

Matt Veno comments that he got a text from a member of the public that has logged on and keeps getting kicked off. Access issues are noted, as is the fact that anyone may call in via phone.

Kirt Rider comments:

- Notes that the worst case scenario, if the Developer does not get either Parcel, is that Ferris removes the vehicles, but the City does not have the funds to clean up A and B, and the area will be left with dirt roads and spare car parts. This is the least desirable outcome, however it is beyond the Applicant's control

- Asks how the proposed massing stays out of the 100 year riparian zone, but is still in the 100 year coastal bank? Bob Griffin comments that the requirement according to Chapter 91 is that buildings must be 100' away from the mean high water line. Buildings may be 100' from the top of coastal bank, landward of mean high water line. The Applicant is not allowed to put buildings beyond the offset of the mean high water line.
- Comments that originally, there were 4 street trees on Franklin St., but now only one is shown. Two are new, but they don't have as much room to work with if Parcel A is not included. The building did not shift toward Franklin St. but there are fewer trees due to the shortened frontage on the street
- Would like more information and would like to know how to return those trees, elsewhere. To the left of the entry drive perhaps? He understands why they want to raise the site but now there is only one publicly accessible route from Franklin St./Ct. directly to the water. The Applicant could add one or two trees in grates in the 6' sidewalk.
- Notes the pedestrian ramp next to the building on Franklin St. It is a 5' wide walkway, and he is disappointed in this, as it will lead to "pulling people up a ramp." He understands that geometry makes it difficult
- Approves of resubmission of the retaining walls including guard rails, but this must be 42" high, more than what is shown. This will be fixed
- Asks if there is any compulsion not to have a building come to the property line? Parcel B is tight, constrained because the Applicant needs to leave room for vehicle maneuvering. Is there no stipulated setback for a PUD? The NRCC (North River Canal Corridor) does not have side yard setbacks

Carole Hamilton notes that there was hazard mitigation on this property; how is this affected by the loss of Parcels A and B? There is still an LSP involved, and the Applicant will still have to clean up the site but cannot clean Parcel A if they cannot get on it; they will follow the 21E process as much as possible. Was mitigation proposed on A and B originally? The original plan was to remove what could be removed and then have an AUL (Activity and Use Limitation) on the rest of the site, with all habitable spaces above, so no pathway for buried contamination to be exposed. This will continue to be the case.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment. Mason Wells repeats call-in information for those having technological difficulties.

#618 – Tyler Terry, 22 School St., asks about the trees. USFS data sheet notes red maples are not salt tolerant but are proposed in the flood zone. The red maple comment has come up before, however the Applicant notes that all trees along the baseball field are red maples and are doing well and those proposed will be in a similar habitat. Please confirm that building D conforms with the Transitional Overlay District. All proposed work is well outside of that area. The TOD does not extend from residential conservation zone of land in dispute.

#909 –

#893 – Anne Sterlin, 29 Orchard St., notes that the Project looks great, and that many in the community were excited to hear about the amended plans. She asks about Parcels A & B, if the Developer would be willing to clear off both, and cap A as a parking lot for the City to use as a parking lot for Little League parents. Matt Veno comments that if it is not their property, the Applicant can't get on it to do anything, and if the City disputes it, then the City should clean it up. Questions from the public will be answered by the Developer at the next meeting.

Andrew Lippman, 28 Chestnut St., wonders if the 5' entry for public to the waterfront could be widened to waterfront, especially if it could be accessible by bikers, etc. in the future.

Jackie Sealund, 1 Walter St., comments that the City is already overpopulated, and is even more dangerous with COVID 19. She notes that there are 458 empty apartments in the City and fears that the five buildings going up between Walgreens and Furlong Park will sit empty.

Jane Arlander, 93 Federal St, asks if there will be public access from Furlong Park to their waterway park. It will be open and publicly accessible only if Parcel B is included in the Development.

Attorney Correnti comments that there is no design change; this got full vetting with the DRB; in the Planning Board's Decision in 2018, there is a condition requiring them to submit final construction drawings to the DRB for review and approval, to compare with the approved plans. There is virtually no noticeable change; buildings have been reoriented, but when construction drawings are done it will go before the DRB for final review and approval; any substantive changes would be noted and the PB notified.

Noah Koretz wonders what open questions are left to address. There are no further comments from the City; they have not been finalized but there will probably not be additional ones. A Civil Engineering peer review must be finalized.

DJ Napolitano asks if at the next meeting the Board will issue a Draft Decision, does it make sense to get through the rest of the comments or can we speak at the next meeting? There will be additional time at the next meeting; members of the public can still use the usual process of emailing City staff their comments at mwells@salem.com.

A motion to continue to the April 16, 2020 meeting, is made by DJ Napolitano, seconded by Noah Koretz, and carries in a roll call vote with all in favor.

Carole Hamilton	Yes
Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Griset	Yes
Noah Koretz	Yes
Matt Smith	Yes
Matt Veno	Yes

- E. Location:** 23 Summer Street (Map 26, Lot 463)
Applicant: 23 Summer Street LLC
Description: A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of 23 SUMMER STREET LLC for the property located at 23 Summer Street (Map 26, Lot 463) for a Site Plan Review in accordance with Salem Zoning Ordinance Section 9.5. Specifically, the applicant proposes the renovation and expansion of the existing multi-family residential property at 23 Summer Street in the Central Development district. The applicant proposes the demolition of the rear portion of the existing building and replacing it with an addition to create a total of 10 residential units. The project includes changes to the existing parking lot, new indoor garage parking spaces, utilities, and landscaping.

Present for the Applicant are:
Bob Griffini, Civil Engineer
Tom Mayo, Architect

Bob Griffin, Civil Engineering

- Existing conditions (no change)
- Site Layout (no change)
 - Fence will be extended along property line to building. Pieces are available; it will be repaired and repainted
 - Efficacy of snow melt system: manufacturer reply indicates can handle up to 3” per hour of snowfall. In the event of system malfunction, will have landscaper attend property and truck snow away
- Utilities and grading; Gas meters moved back from Summer St. Appears that electric meters will be able to be placed in garage

Tom Mayo, Architecture and Landscaping

- Elevation changes: went back to elevations approved by DRB and SRA; these are shown
 - South elevation: Existing building/fence, exposure of concrete foundation of new building shown
 - East Elevation: arbor vitae hedge runs along property, hiding small amount of foundation showing
 - Summer St. Elevation: door added in lieu of a window, as requested by the DRB. Light fixtures are shown
 - North Elevation: HVAC equipment on deck. Railings 4’ high, will block view of units. Grade along this side is shown
 - First floor plan: garage, trash/recycling, bike storage, stairway, windows (90 minute fire rated)
- Landscape plan
- Exterior lighting
- Deck section showing A/C condensers
- 3rd Floor Deck/HVAC Plan
- HVAC components/fact sheet, 32” tall (below railing height)

Chair Anderson understands the logic but regrets that deck real estate must be taken up by HVAC units. He asks about the fence. It does not continue along Summer St. The existing Summer St. view is shown. Part of the hedge is being removed; the Chair feels if the corner will be open it would be good if the fence could continue to the edge of the driveway. The Applicant would be open to this.

The Applicant notes that the existing building lacks central A/C so there may be window units. Condensers will be in back and on the egress deck so this is an improvement.

Helen Sides wonders about the status with the Zoning Board and zero lot line. This is a B5 zone, and setback for existing buildings is zero on front, side and rear so it is in compliance. They will not be required to go before the ZBA as there is no minimum lot size per dwelling unit.

DJ Napolitano received an email from Carol Carr re Historic Salem; Tim Jenkins does not approve of these Plans. The correspondence will be shared; it references multiple meetings with Jessica Hebert and Emily Udy. Massing is based on a sketch that Larry Spang presented to them from the original Plan. Please share with Mason Wells to be included in the record. This has been shared around the time of the previous meeting.

Helen Sides wonders if this went before HSI or the Salem Historical Commission; the project was approved by both. The Developer recognizes the architectural importance of the building, and has worked with Jessica Herbert and HSI as well as a firm re interior renovation. He regularly gets input from Ms. Hebert on historic projects.

Kirt Rieder thanks Bob Griffin for the snow melt information, including the video of how it works, and notes that he has read the documentation. He opines that the massing is huge for this site; too big and too many cars; if the Board approves or denies based on Site Plan Review, he is not comfortable with the vehicle circulation pattern.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment.

#909 Janice LeBel, 1 Chestnut St. l: Appreciates follow up on HVAC and utility visibility. Concerns:

- A/C units will be visible from a higher elevation by neighbors
- Doubling of density of the building
- Additional HVAC is not a good remedy to external A/C units
- Noise
- Garage exterior lighting; why not choose a fixture that complements that on front entry
- Parking configuration is not workable. Increased density will exacerbate traffic issues at this intersection.

Mr. Griffin notes that traffic leaving the driveway will have to turn right, and there is good visibility to enter the traffic stream. They will be continuing to use the existing parking spaces, which have been fine, and they are not making it worse. Garage spaces meet size and spacing requirements set forth in Zoning. Parking is actually improved by removal of the shed addition. There are 23.2' between parking spaces in the garage; this is more than adequate. Three outside spaces meet the minimum size requirement. Also there is some additional pavement next to one spot. Previously there was a display case at the window well when it was a dress shop; they used it as parking in the 1970's with much bigger cars.

Tom Mayo notes that the only A/C unit visible from across the street, even looking down, would be on the 3rd floor so one would have to be at 4th or 5th floor level to look down on it. He notes that the lighting fixture proposed for over the garage doors and the new entrance are down lights, so as not to have glaring lights that shine out. Existing lights on the main entrance are glaring with no downlight shield. New ones are night sky compliant and in keeping with the existing building.

Andrew Lippman, 28 Chestnut St., feels that the project seems bloated for the site as it exists. While it is admirable that parking has been workable, those turning radii would not be ideal today if designing now. It has the appearance of shoehorning as many units as possible into the smallest possible property with unworkable parking.

Carole Carr, 7 Summer St., is opposed to this project.

- Planning Board requested the developer show this design a couple of blocks around the site with more context, yet there is no 3D model of this
- Tourism is a major industry, historic district was established by residents with lots of work by those who were here before, and the developer is taking advantage. The project is inappropriate for the historic district
- Overdevelopment in this City is a problem
- Concerned about density and traffic, garage doors facing Chestnut St.
- Concerned about condensers on decks
- Concerned about turning radius from garage. She rented before, lot spaces were taken by renters, visitors would park on Chestnut St.

Emily Udy, 8 Buffum St. on behalf of Historic Salem, notes that she did work with Mike in early 2019, when representatives of HSI and the Historical Commission made suggestions about the exterior treatment of the addition, these were incorporated into design. They did not take any position on any other issues such as density and the site plan.

Jane Arlander, 93 Federal St., opposed, feels the simplicity of the original building is degraded by the massing. Garage doors reduce curb appeal. Almost no landscaping is proposed; yet this is almost like an entrance corridor into Salem. The awkwardness of vehicle circulation results from the massing.

Matt Veno notes that this is one of the most traveled strips of road in all of Salem, so to pack more cars into this location gives him pause. He still needs to be convinced that this design and auto density at this location will work. Helen Sides agrees, noting that the Board asked to see floor plans as 10 units seems like a lot on this site. Tom Mayo shows the first floor, floor plan. They also note that many of the existing units remain but have added space. The two on the 3rd floor are micro units which will have added space. Existing internal staircases remain intact. They note previous concern about “chopping it up,” but this is not the case. The new building is where additional units are added. The existing is a 6 unit building, but the previous owner combined two units, so this is not doubling the density but adding 4 units. The license is for 3 short term rentals; that is the intent for micro units. Two will be on the 3rd floor with one on the 1st floor.

Noah Koretz feels the first floor plan overlay is confusing. He would like to see a floor-by-floor plan of the building and egress configurations.

Chair Anderson notes that the Board finds it helpful, for larger sites, to be shown the fire truck turning radius. In this case it would be helpful to show something similar for cars. The Applicant notes improvement to parking on the South side of the garage with removal of the shed. the Chair and Board members would still like a visual.

There are no final comments from Engineering or other departments. Feedback has been obtained but there are no major concerns. We are coming up on 35 days to give Board comments, since distribution, so the project will be finalized at the next meeting.

A motion to continue to the May 7, 2020 meeting, is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Matt Veno, and carries in a roll call vote with all in favor.

Carole Hamilton	Yes
Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Griset	Yes
Noah Koretz	Yes
Matt Smith	Yes
Matt Venio	Yes

F. Location: 602 Loring Avenue (Map 20, Lot 11)

Applicant: Vavel LLC

Description: A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of VAVEL, LLC for the property located at 602 Loring Avenue (Map 20, Lot 11) for a Site Plan Review in accordance with Salem Zoning Ordinance Section 9.5. Specifically, the applicant proposes the demolition of the existing two-story commercial building on the site and the construction of a three-story building containing 20 residential units. The project includes 34 off street parking spaces, 22 of which will be garage level spaces within the building and 12 of which will be surface parking spaces. Also proposed are landscaping, a ground level patio, a sidewalk from the building entrance to the existing Loring Avenue sidewalk, bicycle racks, utilities, grading, and drainage systems for stormwater runoff. The existing curb cut will be reconfigured into a 24' driveway.

Attorney Scott Grover represents the project. He thanks the City for making this meeting possible.

Also present:

Tom and George Wabno, Owners

Scott Cameron, Civil Engineer, The Morin-Cameron Group

Peter Pittman, Architect, Pittman & Wardley Architectss

James Emannuel, Landscape Architect, james k. emmanuel associates

Heather Monticup, Traffic Engineer. Greenman-Pederson Inc.

Scott Grover presents the project background.

- Site overview, R3 zone, front part of site is in City's layout for Loring Ave. They propose to continue to use but improve. Negotiated easement with City Solicitor for City to use
- Will raze existing and construct a new building, in excess of 1.5 parking spaces required by zoning. Similar Plan was first approved by ZBA in 2017 but was appealed by abutter to South, and was in land court for 2 years. That apartment project changed ownership and the new owner dismissed the appeal, provided building the proposed building height be reduced from five to three stories and the building be set back a bit. This Plan was submitted to ZBA and approved in December, with no appeal filed
- Property is in ECOD (Entrance Corridor Overlay District), requiring DRB input; Applicant is requesting referral to DRB

Scott Cameron:

- Existing conditions: Improvements to intersection will be made, especially to curb cut. Grades are outlined
- Site Plan: Unique building shape is called out. Curb cut will be normalized and a place for pedestrians included. Entrance, solid waste disposal, parking layout are outlined
- Garage layout: Includes mechanical space, bicycle storage
- Grading: Elevation of building is lowered from existing. Bedrock along street will be excavated for sight line improvement
- Stormwater management: Project will not encumber municipal storm drains
- Utilities: Cut across front, will use for future connections, add new fire service

Heather Monticup, Traffic Engineer

- Sight distance Plan: driver's eye to driver's eye roadway and driveway
 - One collision; day care previously on site generated more trips than residential. Increase of 5 peak hour trips on Saturdays, will not have any impact on traffic operations on Loring Ave.

James Emanuel, Landscape Design

- City granting easement, existing condition contributes to sight distance issues, City will maintain area along Loring Ave.
- Removal of trees, working with tree warden, trees to replace are outlined
- Photometric plan: all lights are dark sky compliant
- Lighting specs are shown

Peter Pittman, Project Architect, Pittman & Wardley Associates

- Elevation shown: cladding and trim are described
- West Elevation: mechanical systems on roof will be screened
- Ledge lot line view
- Key architectural features
- Dynamic exterior renderings
- Floor plan: Each unit is 1200-1400 square feet, two bedroom, two bath units
- Mechanical enclosures

Chair Anderson asks about the eastern property line; a row of large trees and buffer exist; will they be removed or are they off the property? Some are off the property but the area is a ledge cut, so what has grown back in is Norway Maple, sumac and other fast growing trees. Thus, if the Applicant tries to keep them they will not have a long life cycle. They will communicate with the abutter due to proximity of the site to surroundings.

Kirt Rieder wonders if this was discussed with the tree warden. This was beyond that discussion, which only encompassed what was in the right of way. Chair Anderson asks how many affordable units are proposed. Two, as per the 10% policy.

Helen Sides would like more information about the elimination of ledge along the front and the connection to the east. Google Street View is shown. Chair Anderson suggests a horizontal and

longitudinal (through the parking lot) site section to show existing and proposed, and the relationship to the adjacent properties. Ledge cuts are further described and discussed.

Noah Koretz applauds the creative use of such a challenging site, noting that the size is in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood. He approves of the number of two-bedroom units, but is concerned about the lack of space for any outdoor areas for recreation, especially if families with children move in. There is no safe way to get to any parks on foot. He asks that the Developer consider adding in even some small spaces, car free.

Kirt Rieder thanks Mr. Cameron for his thorough and detailed presentation. He notes that the Applicant will have to submit 1' contours, though he also appreciates that the ones shown are solid, not dashed. The Applicant met with both the Tree Commission and Tree Warden, and Bob [Robert LeBlanc, Tree Warden] has discussed removals along Loring Ave. Kirt Rieder is at peace with that. He notes that it is a challenging site, that the building geometry is squirrely, and with the "swoopiness of the access path," it is less than 5% so it works, but should be more angular to provide cohesiveness between site architecture and circulation. There is no pedestrian space, while a lot is given to the patio. The Applicant needs to flesh out the identity of the project. He asks about the rectangles on the lower parking level elevation; these are louvers for garage ventilation. There is a walkway with a lot of stairs/no guard rail; the handrail is in the middle of the walkway. The base of the building is cast in place concrete. Re landscape planting, he asks that the Applicant please favor larger shade, deciduous trees closer to Loring Ave.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment, but sees none. Helen Sides wonders if the DRB will try to address the same issues as this Board, and she is not sure if the Project is ready for Design Review. Timing is discussed. The DRB is not meeting remotely, so projects under its purview are delayed. It is extremely unlikely that the DRB could weigh in before the next Planning Board meeting. The Applicant asks if they should get into a queue for the most immediate upcoming DRB meeting, so as not get bumped to July, as they will not take application without a referral from the Planning Board. Site issues should be resolved prior to the next DRB meeting. They could even be at the Planning Board meeting on May 21, before going before DRB.

DJ Napolitano motions to refer the matter to the DRB, is seconded by Noah Koretz, and the motion passes 8-0.

Carole Hamilton	Yes
Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Griset	Yes
Noah Koretz	Yes
Matt Smith	Yes
Matt Veno	No longer in meeting

A motion to continue to the May 7, 2020 meeting, and refer the project is made by DJ Napolitano, seconded by Helen Sides, and carries 8-0.

Carole Hamilton	Yes
Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	Yes

Helen Sides	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Grisct	Yes
Noah Koretz	Yes
Matt Smith	Yes
Matt Veno	No longer in meeting

DJ Napolitano asks about doing long meetings remotely, concerned about how to limit the number of items on the agenda at one time. Pushing continuances out further is discussed, as it has been in the past. Noah Koretz also notes that Planning Board members are coming into these meetings after 9 hours of zoom meetings for their day jobs, and/or chasing kids around. The Board has tried to get some items continued to later dates, but must rely on Mason Wells to do the upfront work, and to help determine what is realistic.

Kirt Rieder comments that late submissions would have been grounds to postpone certain items and that on-time submission of materials must be enforced (they are due one week before a meeting). Carole Hmlton notes that the Board must be able to take comments, but also weed out people who are not interested in commenting [rather than go through the entire list of attendees on zoom to verify they have comments -or not]. Accessibility issues are discussed. Should attendees have to sign up to provide a comment? Should it be similar to a City Council meeting? The procedure will be updated for the next meeting. Noah Koretz assumes we have this clump of projects to work through, but there may not be many new projects given the current state of the market. Future continuances may be more spread out.

Noah Koretz comments that the piece of trail behind the power station is pleasant.

III. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

NONE

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A.** Regular Planning Board meeting minutes for January 23, 2020.
- B.** Regular Planning Board meeting minutes for February 20, 2020.

Postponed until the next meeting.

V. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by DJ, and the motion carries.

Carole Hamilton	Yes
Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Grisct	Yes

Noah Koretz	Yes
Matt Smith	Yes
Matt Veno	No longer in meeting

The meeting ends at 11:00PM.

For actions where the decisions have not been fully written into these minutes, copies of the decisions have been posted separately by address or project at: <https://www.salem.com/planning-board/webforms/planning-board-2020-decisions>

Respectfully submitted,
Stacy Kilb, Recording Clerk

Approved by the Planning Board on 5/21/2020