

City of Salem Planning Board
Approved Meeting Minutes
Thursday, February 15, 2018

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, January 18, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall Annex, 120 Washington Street, Room 313, Salem, Massachusetts.

Chair Ben Anderson opens the meeting at 7:00 pm.

I. ROLL CALL

Those present were: Chair Ben Anderson, Carole Hamilton, Kirt Rieder, Helen Sides, Dale Yale, Noah Koretz (arriving late), Bill Griset (7)

Absent: Matt Venno, DJ Napolitano (2)

Also in attendance: Amanda Chiancola, Staff Planner; Matt Smith, Director of Traffic and Parking Department; Tom Daniel, Director of Planning, and Stacy Kilb, Recorder

I. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Guest Speaker Matt Smith, Director of the Traffic and Parking Department, will attend to provide a discussion on the intersection of land use and parking, highlighting existing parking and traffic trends with overview of best practices.

Mr. Smith hands out some documents reviewing his work. Main presentation points:

- Land use patterns and transportation decisions:
 - Land use patterns determine transportation decisions, but it is also the other way around at the same time, so the processes must be viewed comprehensively. In this way priorities can be established
 - Salem's priorities include complete streets as its dense urban community supports pedestrians, bike and transit traffic. Adding such amenities helps create and support that community as well and Salem has been investing in them (bike paths, complete streets, and additional methods of accessing public transit through non-auto-dependent accessibility)
 - The suburban, car-centric neighborhood pattern will continue if infrastructure investments are not made
 - Transportation and parking requirements should be considered when making land use decisions
 - Farther from downtown there are more choices for getting around, including cars, so to address congestion it is important to expand these choices and encourage transit other than by car from a number of perspectives
- Parking
 - Parking is critical and a balance must be struck to ensure the proper amount. Too little and people will not come to Salem; if there is too much, there is a perception issue around the empty parking lots. Parking demand should be accommodated while encouraging alternate ways of getting around
 - Transportation Demand Management (TDM) encourages locals to walk, bike, etc. and generally use cars less. Some examples of this are Zipcars in public lots, Zagster bikes, providing showers at workplaces for those who bike in, and Transportation Management Association (TMA) incentives for those who utilize alternate methods of getting around, such as the MBTA, biking, rideshare, etc.
 - Private developments can incorporate some of these elements by offering charging stations for electric vehicles, bicycle parking, and Zipcars
- Other issues surrounding parking in Salem:
 - Five years ago it was thought that the peripheral parking areas were underutilized, as there were always spaces, so they are cheaper, however, now more data has been obtained. While there are seasonal variations, parking is heavily utilized year round

- On street spaces downtown are always in demand, however garages are full during the day but have lots of availability overnight. This presents an opportunity for shared parking, and possibly reducing the parking requirements for development
- This is about solving parking problems a downtown area has. People say, “There’s no parking.” There is but it may not be near where they are going. Salem needs to be strategic about where development happens, and where bike lanes and roadway improvements are made

II. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Location: 18 Thorndike Street

Applicant: PASQUANNA DEVELOPERS, INC.

Description: Request from the applicant to be released from the covenant for the Form C Subdivision and their \$50,000 cash bond.

Presenting for the Applicant is Mr. Patrick Deluis, who has submitted the as-built plan, the request for release and return of the cash bond. The project has been complete for over a year, and remediation was done before work was begun. Various other aspects of the project are described. Chair Ben Anderson asks if the Clerk of the Works is satisfied with the completion. The project was inspected on Jan. 31, and the Clerk had two notes: a gas valve not shown on plans, and since then the applicant provided an as-built showing that. One final issue with a Verizon conduit incomplete, but the ground must thaw to finish. The Clerk of the Works funding can cover that cost, so Amanda Chiancola recommends releasing the bond but holding Clerk of the Works funding until that is complete.

A motion to release the covenant and cash bond is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and carries with all in favor (7-0).

B. Location: 132-134 Canal Street, 142 R. Canal Street, and 144 Canal Street (Map 33, Lots 5, 6, and 8)

Applicant: CANAL STREET WAREHOUSE LLC, CANAL STREET REALTY DEVELOPMENT LLC and CANAL FURNITURE LLC

Description: A public hearing for all persons interested in the application of Canal Street Warehouse LLC, Canal Street Realty Development LLC, and Canal Furniture LLC for the properties located at 132-134 Canal Street, 142 R. Canal Street, and 144 Canal Street (Map 33, Lots 5, 6, and 8) in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 7.3 for a Planned Unit Development, Section 9.5 for a Site Plan Review, Section 8.1 for a Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit, and Section 6.7 for a Drive-Through Special Permit, and a Stormwater Management Permit in accordance with Salem Code of Ordinances Chapter 37. Specifically, the applicant proposes the redevelopment the site by razing the buildings at 132-134 and 144 Canal Street and constructing three (3) new buildings with associated driveways, parking spaces, landscaping, utilities, and drainage systems for stormwater runoff. Construction of a new three-story, mixed-use building with approximately 7,000 square feet of retail on the first floor and 20 residential units on the upper floors is proposed at the north side of the site. Construction of a three-story building with 30 residential units and parking below; and a 2,500 square foot retail building with a drive-through is proposed at the south side of the site. The existing buildings located at 138-142 Canal Street will remain with some site improvements.

Attorney Scott Grover represents Symes Associates. Landers Symes and Steve Feinstein are present, but at the last meeting the Board expressed concerns about the site plan and layout of buildings, so this evening’s focus is

responding to those concerns rather than addressing drainage, lighting and traffic small details. The two owners have explored alternatives to make the site more pedestrian friendly and came up with a viable plan that still accomplishes the owner's objective of creating a viable retail area. Also, a continuous landscape area abutting the rail trail has been planned and will be presented. Peer review and other details can be presented at the next meeting.

Landers Symes, Symes Associates and manager of the LLCs that comprise the properties (real estate developer) presents proposed changes to the layout of the site.

- Introduces the company and properties they own/have built. They do not “flip” developments
- Describes history/process followed for this site
- Changes to Plan since 2/1/18:
 - South site now has a continuous landscape area along rail trail; there was a loss of 7 parking spaces. 176 parking spaces remain on that side of the development (the Olive Oil lot is at a different elevation so cannot be connected)
 - Changes to the north end of the site were explored, and Mr. Symes spoke to many retail brokers regarding how to make a location attractive to potential tenants. They noted that:
 - Parking is required in the front of the building
 - If a pedestrian entry is sited along the street edge, with a drive-up entry from the rear, a smaller retailer cannot accommodate those two entryways as they must then hire another associate to prevent shoplifting, and they lose the storage space that is normally located at the rear of the establishment
 - Notes that current zoning requires a 30' setback so the building cannot be located adjacent to the front of the lot
 - The retail and residential parking areas overlap here, with the rear ones anticipated to be used by residents; it will be closer to the multi-use path
 - Reiterates that the elevation is 2.5' above the street level
 - Mr. Symes strongly feels that the original plan is the best for his company and future retail tenants
 - One other alternative explored was to pull the building forward 18', eliminating all parking immediately in front of the building, but they cannot recover any of the parking that was eliminated at the back. This would have to be retail only with no residential
- Reviews what they have provided to the City: gave up rail spur, provided access in two places to the multi-use path, provided a bike rack and bike share, an easement for bike path drainage, and have provided lots of landscaping all while negotiating with existing tenants to ensure that the project works for them financially
- Seeking guidance before engineers and architects begin design

Helen Sides asks about drive through type underneath residential on north side of site. It is anticipated that it will be a restaurant, but could possibly be a bank. She wonders who would want to live above such an establishment, but Mr. Symes indicates that the space is intended to be divided into “cubes” so will accommodate up to five tenants, not one large restaurant.

Noah Koretz:

- Notes that the subject property is located in an entrance corridor, thus is subject to the Commercial Design Guidelines. He quotes [Design Guidelines](#), which recommends: parking areas to the side or behind buildings, screened, planting strip requirements. Not recommended are: new parking in front of stores, multiple curb cuts for drive throughs. Setting retail along streets is encouraged.
 - Standalone retail buildings dominate the landscape, there is importance in placing the primary building close to the street
- He is skeptical of retailers who say parking must be in front of a building
- Does not approve of the drive through, citing queues of vehicles blocking the brand new sidewalk at nearby Bagel World. This will become a more pedestrian area, so prioritization of site planning for drive through

does not interest him, so maintains the position that his vote is contingent upon adequate treatment the two new buildings having a proper relationship to Canal St. via siting, street wall, and landscaping. Also this is a PUD, so the Board has authority to ask for these things

Mr. Symes agrees but notes that downtown Salem is different in character, and that there can be no street wall at this location unless zoning is changed. Revere Tan was on the street, but the Applicant was asked to delete it. Noah Koretz insists that the existing buildings set a precedent, but because of the flood zone, if proposed today they could not be built the way they are.

Ben Anderson:

- Is sympathetic to Noah Koretz's point of view and would in general encourage this, but differs re residential
- In order for residential and the development to be successful, they should interact together. Retail underneath should be complimentary to residents
- South building placement is adequate, but other uses on the site should service those residences
- Would like it to be more pedestrian friendly, as right now it is not as it is partitioned into four separate parcels. Pedestrian traffic will increase with people walking through this site to/from the train
- His main concern is how to circulate pedestrians within the site, both parallel and perpendicular to Canal St.

Mr. Symes notes that there are only two access points where the path meets site grade. Right now parking lots are connected, except for the northern site; at this site pedestrians go from store to store and they want to separate these areas with landscaping so cars do not go from store to store.

Kirt Rieder:

- Agrees with the Chair re pedestrian circulation
- Notes that this is a PUD, so the Applicant's obligation is to look for flexibility while its the Board's obligation is to grant them the ability to allow tradeoffs while making larger change to urban fabric
- Would like to see additional landscaping; tree bands are below the 5' that is ideal. Approves of the contiguous landscape band, but feels more trees could still be added.
- Cites the Senior Center project, which was held to a much higher standard

Chair Anderson thinks this is a good project and opportunity for the City, but would like to see an interconnected, pedestrian friendly site. Noah Koretz feels the residential units will go quickly, but it may be more challenging to find the right retail tenants. Helen Sides asks if the north building could be only residential with parking underneath, but the Applicant says that it is not financially feasible, as retail rents are much higher than residential. Kirt Rieder asks if the Canal St. frontage has different economics than Ocean Ave.; it does.

Chair Anderson opens to the public.

Polly Wilbert, 7 Cedar St.

- Incoming residents bring experience from Boston and their interface with that City; new developments should acknowledge that. Walkability to/from the train is key. This will also increase property value and allow developer to charge higher rents
- People from Marblehead will also use the bike path here, so this will be a draw that can be sold to retailers

Councilor Josh Turiel, Ward 5

- Sees multiple projects on one site, both a challenge and an opportunity
- Canal St. is transforming and will have a new neighborhood; amenities are expected but timing and details are unknown (as with south Salem train station)

- Outlines businesses that bracket this site; these cannot be changed. Two middle buildings must be worked around, and are a constraining influence on the rest of the site; this must be acknowledged
- Thus while it would be ideal to move the north building to the street, with the rest of the site the way it is, he does not see how it would fit
- Appreciates the modified landscape plan, and wants to see incremental improvements project by project lead to overall larger improvements on Canal St.

Emily Udy, 8 Buffum St.

- Thanks Board for consideration of their obligation, and also thanks the Applicant for the same. It is important to improve with every step
- Asks about shared parking; the north building is separate, standalone with its own parking because it is at a different grade, but the rest of the site is combined/shared parking

Noah Koretz reiterates that his comments are rooted in Commercial Design Guidelines for the City, an official document, not just his opinion. Accepting status quo will not lead to change.

Chair Anderson says that the Applicant must interpret what Board has said, but his personal suggestions are:

- Reexamine connecting sites as he mentioned; if this is difficult, make municipal connections more robust
- Make the trip down sidewalks more pleasant with more plantings, etc. Direct people there if the buildings within the site cannot be connected, though he feels there are ways to make that happen.

Kirt Rieder asks about the setup on the drive through at the corner of Canal St. and Ocean Ave, citing a specific example in the Commercial Development Guidelines. The Applicant feels that this drive through is critical to the financial viability of the project. Kirt Rieder notes that the building could alternately be positioned at the zero lot line on one primary and one secondary street, as in the Development Guidelines. The engineering perspective always utilizes the path of least resistance but may not take into account how an area should work as a whole.

Mr. Symes concludes, noting that a requirement to pull the north building to the front of the lot would constitute a withdrawal of his plan. The possibility of providing parking on the sides instead has been examined, but he feels that with the site as it is now, it is not pedestrian friendly and having a layout perpendicular to the main street will put off potential retail tenants. However, Noah Koretz notes that people will see the building better if they are coming from the south toward the north. As proposed, that building would also require a large sign on the street, which is not desirable. Kirt Rieder asks if it is possible to build up from Revere Tan, using that as street front, but probably not due to grading issues.

A motion to continue to the March 1, 2018 meeting is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Helen Sides, and passes 5-1 with Noah Koretz, Helen Sides, Kirt Rieder, and Ben Anderson in favor; Carole Hamilton is opposed and Bill Griset abstaining.

- C. Location:** 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 for 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 replace the existing junk yard with a residential development consisting of forty-three (43) units in five (5) buildings

with parking under each building, in addition to an independent garage and some surface parking resulting in 69 parking spaces. The project also includes landscaping throughout, and public access along the riverfront with walking paths.

Attorney Joseph Correnti of 63 Federal St. represents the Applicant. Engineering and peer review were discussed at the last meeting, but mostly the Applicant has been trying to address Board and public comments re site layout, so a revised concept is being presented. Bob Griffin, Site Engineer, will present specific revisions. Site Architect Ryan McSherer will also outline changes in that area.

Attorney Correnti presents:

- Current Site
- Project Site
- Flood Map
- Existing Conditions
- Proposed Layout – Sept 2017
- Chart outlining Board and Public comments and responses

Bob Griffin, Site Engineer:

- Proposed Layout:
 - Buildings along Franklin St. now have townhouse design; these are lower with taller buildings in the rear of the site
 - 48 units now proposed vs. 42 or 43 previously
 - Franklin St. view corridor has been opened
 - New building code requires elevation 11 of habitable spaces; this is addressed, and grade changes described; buildings are out of flood zone
 - Pedestrian connectivity: sidewalk along baseball field, will still need a fence but will allow visibility
 - Riverwalk is described, landscaping issues still TBD but waterfront features are similar
 - Parking ratio is around 1.5 spaces per unit; figures from Beverly are presented. Tenants within walking distance from the train had less than one car per unit in those figures. School impact assessment was also done; there was 1 student per 30 units, indicating that units such as these do not attract families with children
 - Comparison Sept. 2017 to Feb. 15 2018 layout
 - Single curb cut now proposed
 - Tenants will be encouraged to come out on Franklin St. and go to Foster St., and not use Franklin Court
 - Issues related to transit-oriented development that will be explored: provide bike storage, area for bike repair, Zagster location, tie into carpool and T ridership programs to keep low parking amenable
 - Electric vehicle charging stations will be explored
- Peer Review re water and sewer, etc. still need to be addressed
- Fire Truck Path
- Project Summary
- NRCC Project density: this is the least dense project of those permitted, with more open space

Ryan McSherer, Red Barn Architecture

- Site Plan
 - View corridor to the water; activation of pedestrian access
 - Integration of buildings along Franklin St. into context of neighborhood re size and scale, offering lots of outdoor decks to reduce building massing to accommodate view sensitivity on the site

- View from Franklin St.
- View from river (landscape details not yet included). DRB input is being sought so materials are not yet finalized either
- View from centerfield (park next door)
- Proposed Layout: Access to water highlighted, pedestrian opportunities, some common spaces added; Landscape design TBD

Attorney Correnti adds that buildings will include community rooms, which will be available to the public, and will also have a fitness center in one or more buildings. More outdoor space has also been incorporated.

Chair Anderson commends the design team and the Applicant; this is a major step forward and it is obvious that a lot of thought went into this. Renderings are much more dynamic and exiting, for a much more successful project.

Comments:

- Walkway from Franklin St. to path at end seems bare with a lot of pavement. Please make it “warmer,” with additional landscaping and a bench or two
- He appreciates the scale at Franklin St. May need more definition at entry points but the DRB will weigh in
- Notes that Buildings A and C not connected by sidewalk

Bill Griset also commends the Applicant for the comments and responses section, a useful, simple graphic.

Helen Sides asks about elevation. The Flood zone is 10, while Franklin St. is 8, and most of site is in 11 so will need to be lifted to 2-3’ above the existing, but it varies. She also agrees this is a tremendous improvement with more communication between the buildings on the site.

Noah Koretz:

- Approves of the changes and echoes comments about views from train station and how seeing this will make him feel. This will be contextual, the type of buildings that Salem deserves, and the architecture speaks to the neighborhood and addresses neighbor’s concerns. He appreciates the view corridor as well
- Asks about Building C connectivity and the width for fire truck access, noting that the pedestrian layout does not correspond to desire lines
- Wonders if a Dutch woonerf would be possible or desirable in this project. (Recording Clerk’s note: See https://nacto.org/docs/usdg/woonerf_concept_collarte.pdf for an exploration of the possibility/plausibility of this concept in Somerville.) This would be an undefined street with no separate sidewalk; a shared street space that does not make it clear that cars are the priority
- Appreciates layout with lower units in front and the terraced look in the back for those in the park and in the units
- Feels that the number of parking spaces provided, at 1.54 per unit, is ideal, noting that this could be an opportunity to test “park sharing” options, given that the train station is only a 15 min. walk away, and its garage empty after 7PM

Chair Anderson feels that the terraces are a visual amenity to those passing by, going to the train station, as well as an amenity to residents.

Bob Griffin describes grades; the elevation of the ball field is 9 and the Burnham side 8, so the Applicant can bring the middle of their site up to 11 without a steep slope.

Kirt Rieder:

- Is concerned that by presenting tonight without full architectural and landscape details, the Applicant may be lengthening the process. Attorney Correnti understands, acknowledging that their process was unusual, but states that the Applicant wanted Board input on this project early on in development
- Asks for details on pavement materials and crosswalks, encouraging the Applicant to consider a non-structured pavement environment that all vehicles plus pedestrians can move across. He also cautions them against over striping the development with crosswalks, which would make it clear that cars are a priority. He supports the notion of making it unclear what road is for; he suggests bisect the pavement with pedestrian areas
- Perspectives from 40' up give an overall view, but more detail is needed as this will impact perception from a pedestrian point of view
- Landscape design has not yet started, but he requests that the applicant work on the street edge
- He expresses the hope that though not a park, the Applicant will maximize the tree canopy and minimize the amount of lawn that needs to be mowed; this would also improve sale ability. The Applicant notes that dune grasses were previously proposed and are still planned
- He notes that this will be the first positive change along this streetscape
- Noah Koretz adds that pedestrians will move through the area as they see fit, and that if the rear is naturally landscaped, the shared spaces in front are attractive, and there is little traffic on the site itself, that those spaces will function as open space for the units

Chair Anderson opens to public comment.

Emily Udi, 8 Buffum St.

- As a neighbor she is impressed with the site plan change, feeling that it sets positive precedent on several levels. Provides a sense of place, people will be proud to live there
- Concern: this is interesting and wonders if buildability will be an issue

Victoria Riccadello, 5 Foster St.

- Approves of townhouses on Franklin St. but insists there should be more townhouses and that these would bring in more tax dollars
- Concerned about the height of the other buildings, especially considering that one of the Board members objected to the Bell Apartments across the river that are only four stories, and concerned about the view from the train station and main entrance to Salem

Ann Sterling, 29 Orchard St.

- Concerned about height of buildings closer to the water. TOD (Transit Oriented Development) limits height
- Bob Griffin outlines; the restriction on TOD is within the 100' buffer, but no buildings are inside that line. TOD applies to the building itself, not the entire project

Ray Cruddas, Salem Little League president

- Concerned about drainage with proposed raising of the site
- Mentions that line drives will create a problem when residences are there. Suggests that the Applicant may want to look at a 10'-12' fence for safety
- Bob Griffin replies that they are not required to provide compensatory storage here because water flows out to the North river then Ocean, so water will not be pushed onto adjacent sites
- Agrees that netting could be provided, and that it does not need to be up year round

Councilor Beth Gerard, Ward 6, 49 Larchmont Rd

- Is very pleased by this design; architecture is unique and speaks to neighborhood
- Asks for clarification on entrance/parking; Bob Griffin replies that there is a 24' wide aisle to get into the site, with parking spaces that are 9' x 19'

Chair Anderson notes that there will be more opportunity for comments at the next meeting, or they can be submitted in writing, but the Board must move on to other agenda items.

A motion to continue to the March 1, 2018 meeting is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Noah Koretz, and passes with all in favor 7-0.

D. Location: 65 Washington Street Salem, MA (Map 35, Lot 600)

Applicant: 65 WASHINGTON STREET, LLC

Description: A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of 65 Washington Street, LLC for the property located at 65 Washington Street Salem, MA (Map 35, Lot 600) for a Planned Unit Development Special Permit, and a Site Plan Review in accordance with the Salem Zoning Ordinance sections 7.3 Planned Unit Development and 9.5 Site Plan Review. Specifically, the applicant proposes to raze the former Salem District Court building, and construct on the existing foundation a new mixed-use building consisting of sixty-one (61) residential units, two levels of enclosed parking, and commercial/restaurant space on the ground floor. General infrastructure updates to drainage, sewer and landscaping are also proposed.

Attorney Joseph Correnti opens, stating that parking and other outstanding issues will be addressed by Jeff Hirsch, Project Manager, and Steve Tise, Architect.

Jeff Hirsch, Urban Spaces, presents, noting that Merrill Diamond is present at this meeting, along with Greg Winter.

- View along Washington St.
- Garage door opening (several slides w/data and photos): 18' 0" is proposed. The Peer Reviewer thought this was too small for two passing vehicles; their previous urban development projects in other cities had garage door openings ranging from 16' t 18' 4". The Overhead Door company was consulted and stated via a letter that 18' is very common for what they install
- Parking Level 1: Steve Tise outlines the setup. Overall parking count is as proposed, but changes to layout have been made. There will be 61 regular spaces, 6 or 7 tandems, and the rest are stackers for a total of 88 spaces
- Absence of handicap van space: none was on the interior of the garage, as the Applicant thought that requirement was going to be eliminated but it was not. Layout is revised including vertical and horizontal space for a van in addition to required number of regular handicap spaces inside garage
- Color coded layout is outlined; some spaces are adaptable and could have a lift added; two 220 volt EV car charging spaces have been added on the 1st floor, and 3 are proposed on the parking garage level.
- Mr. Tise notes this is a private garage, and is laid out that way; many cars will not move so many comments that may apply to a public garage where one time use people are unfamiliar, would not apply in this case; the layout works with standards they normally use
- Optional stacker parking for individual unit owners: Harding Steel was a preferred unit. Examples are shown. They must be made convenient by having enough vertical space; in this case there will be full height headroom underneath. Units proposed cost \$5000 each
- Site Lighting Plan, First Floor: Will be awnings over retail space that conceal illumination on Church St, and Federal St. will also have bollard lighting

- Site Lighting Plan, Illumination Diagram: There will be backlit public artwork on Federal St. side; the sidewalk and street will not be illuminated by those lights and there will be no up lighting from the ground. Bollards are proposed along the walkway

Kirt Rieder thanks the Applicant for providing precedent on the garage entry, and he appreciates the difference between private garage vs public one. He wonders what the visual/audio sidewalk signal will be as this will impact residents, neighbors and abutters. The Applicant will entertain any suggestions.

Scott Thornton, Vanasse Assoc., presents Traffic Engineering

- Full size vehicle entering and exiting garage:
- Remove 3 spaces on Federal St. to improve sight lines; Matt Smith, Salem Traffic guy, will have discussions with him and Traffic Commission about this issue
- Proposed Washington St. Modifications:
- Loading zone/parking space designation, 6AM-6PM (unclear on times)
- Travel lane width amended
- Crosswalk reconfigured/relocated

Kirt Rieder asks about removal of parking on Federal St. but defers to the peer reviewer. Mr. Thornton says that all changes have been submitted, but no response received yet.

William Keefner, Allen & Majors, presents Civil Engineering

- Peer Review comments have been addressed
- Outstanding issue: existing municipal sewer and drain did not have good video, it was requested that the Applicant TV it. 1000 feet must be done and work started today and will be done tomorrow or Monday. They will then assess the condition and discuss with the City Engineer and Peer reviewer re repairs
- Sewer capacity check Church St. to Federal and Bridge St., will be completed next week to provide additional information

Chair Anderson agrees that street level renderings were helpful.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment but there are no comments.

Attorney Correnti provides closing comments, noting that Board presentations are complete and consultants came to provide updates; the Applicant expects final peer review comments at the next meeting. They will work with Amanda Chiancola to address anything else relevant to this Board. As an SRA and DRB project, they will continue to meet with those Boards. They must also appear before the City Council for the agreement, etc. Thus, while the rest of the process is in progress, they are hoping for a Planning Board decision at the next meeting.

Kirt Rieder has questions about the landscaping, especially trees noting the discrepancy between the renderings and the plans has not been clarified. Jeff Hirsch states that there is still no solid plan yet; a comprehensive plan is coming within the next day or two, to be submitted to Board members. Kirt Rieder suggests having the City Tree warden or Applicant arborist look at one sickly tree on Church St.

A motion to continue to the March 1, 2018 meeting is made by Dale Yale, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes 7-0.

- E. Location: 24 Fort Ave**
Applicant: FOOTPRINT POWER SALEM HARBOR DEVELOPMENT, LLC
Description: Received and File a Notice of Project Change regarding completion of the gabion wall.

The Board has several questions regarding this submission. It is unclear whether the notice of project change is regarding only a change in the timing of completion of the gabion wall, or if the extent of the wall itself will be changed. It is noted that landscaping goes along with the wall, and it is not known whether both apply to this one area or to the entire project. There could be no public access for another year but the Notice does not indicate one way or the other.

Amanda Chiancola will follow up with the Applicant. The Chair is concerned about future project changes, and notes that approval was predicated upon public access.

The Board would be comfortable moving forward with the wall not complete upon opening the facility, but any other changes to the extent, quality or deletions of it would be a major change. The Applicant will appear before the Siting Board on March 30.

Chair Anderson comments that Footprint should tie in the initial plan that shows full extent of the Gabion wall, pathways, etc. and show it as it will appear on the completion date. The Board requires that the entire assembly of public access, landscaping, and the Gabion wall is to be completed on a specified date.

Dale Yale asks about City oversight of the project. There are monthly meetings with the City fire and police Departments, etc. and with the Footprint Team as needed. It is easier to share this exchange with them. Amanda Chiancola will report on any clarification at the next meeting. Bill Griset feels the scale of the project is much larger as built compared to the renderings. Other Board members are not surprised by the scale and note that the completion of the Gabion wall and landscaping will change it. Project design and scale are discussed.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Special Joint Planning Board and City Council Meeting held on January 17, 2018

A motion to approve the minutes of the Special Joint Planning Board and City Council Meeting held on January 17, 2018 is made by Carole Hamilton, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes 5-0 with Noah Koretz and Bill Griset abstaining.

B. Regular Planning Board Meeting held on January 18, 2018

A motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting held on January 18, 2018 is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and passes 5-0 with Bill Griset and Noah Koretz abstaining.

C. Regular Planning Board Meeting held on February 1, 2018

A motion to approve the Regular Planning Board Meeting held on February 1, 2018, with a minor correction, is made by Bill Griset, seconded by Noah Koretz, and passes 5-0 with Chair Ben Anderson and Carole Hamilton abstaining.

III. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Dale Yale, and passes with all in favor, 7-0.

The meeting ends at 10:20PM.

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-2018-decisions>

Respectfully submitted,
Stacy Kilb, Recording Clerk

Approved by the Planning Board on 3/01/2018

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A § 18-25 and City Ordinance § 2-2028 through § 2-2033.