

**City of Salem Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 16, 2016**

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, June 16, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall Annex, 120 Washington Street, Room 313, Salem, Massachusetts.

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

I. ROLL CALL

Those present were: Chair Ben Anderson, Helen Sides, Kirt Rieder, Noah Koretz, Dale Yale, Carole Hamilton

Tardy: Vice Chair Matt Venio, and Tony Mataragas

Absent: Bill Grisct

Also present: Amanda Chiancola, Staff Planner, and Colleen Anderson, Substitute Planning Board Recording Clerk.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. June 2, 2016

Carole Hamilton made a motion to approve the June 2, 2016 meeting minutes, was seconded by Noah Koretz, and the motion passed unanimously (7-0).

III. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Location: 1, 3, & 5 HARMONY GROVE ROAD; 60 & 64 GROVE STREET

Applicant: MRM MANAGEMENT, LLC

Description: Insignificant change request to the previously approved Site Plan Review and Planned Unit Development, specifically to allow the demolition of the existing structure at 60 Grove Street (former Salem Oil & Grease) with that space remaining designated for future commercial use on the site.

Attorney Joseph Correnti, 63 Federal Street, Salem, represents the applicant. Other presenters include:

- Robert Griffin; Site Engineer & Project Engineer; Griffin Engineering Group, LLC, 100 Cummings Center #224g, Beverly, MA 01915

Documents and Exhibitions:

- Written report from Griffin Engineering Group regarding the present state of the building

Atty Correnti states that the site is currently under demolition and ongoing remediation for several years, since Site Plan Review was approved. A DEP appeal, Ch. 91 license, MEPA, etc. has occurred in that time and the site is currently being prepared for construction. One of the Planning Board conditions was to rehabilitate the 60 Grove Street building, with a proposed commercial use. The use will remain commercial although Griffin Engineering Group has determined that the rehab of this building is not feasible.

Mr. Griffin states that the building was constructed in 1900 and used as office/industrial space but has gone unused for at least 10 years. The roof and floors have large holes, the structure has shifted away from the canal, the foundation had cracked and has defects, there is no internal bracing, mold and moss

are growing throughout the building, which has led to its present unsafe condition. For extreme expenditure the building could be rehabbed although there is practical way of saving the structure.

Chair Anderson inquiries about the square footage of the building. Mr. Griffin replies approximately 15,000 gross SF.

Chair Anderson inquires if a commercial building is proposed in the future would that need to come back before the Board. Mr. Griffin replied yes.

Ms. Sides, the only present Board member involved with the previous decision, states that there was much discussion regarding the PUD and the amount of office space, that many felt was being squeezed into the project. She finds this to be a significant change. The removal of the building takes away almost all of the commercial space and she questioned who will construct a new building to fulfill the condition. Leaving an empty space is unacceptable as the buildings future use was an important part of the development.

Atty Correnti states that they accepted to condition to rehab the building and that was always the intent, however; this particular building is too extreme to rehab. The commercial use of 60 Grove Street will remain, as that was always the intent of the board and of the developer. In the future a building will need to be erected and an amendment to the plan will come back before the Board. Ms. Sides asks who will construct the new building; Atty Correnti replies that this project will be sold to a development partner; the new developer will build it out. The development partner is not going to let a half-acre site right on the street sit vacant; it will be developed as a commercial building.

Ms. Sides states that it was clear years ago that rehabbing the building would be tough and expensive but that was the agreement and it effected the approval. Ms. Sides is not in favor of the property being sold with the only obligation being to tear down the building and not build anything, which makes it a different project.

Mr. Rieder is familiar with the site, and notes the site looks challenged and assumes it probably looked challenged in 2012. He is perplexed that the applicant does not have anything to show the board members who might not be familiar with the site, as showing the board something would have helped their argument. Mr. Rieder asks the applicant to clarify if they are asking to clear the site in advance of selling the site to another developer. Mr. Griffin replies that one of the issues they are faced with is that the Fire Department, Building Department, Police Department want this building torn down. It is a nuisance that is falling down on its own and has been red-tagged. Mr. Rieder states that he is concerned that the building will be torn down and the site will be turned into a parking lot, which would be a bad move. Mr. Rieder asks what abilities the board has to ensure the lot does not become a parking lot for the next x number of years. Chair Anderson replies that there is a path to that but that is not before them this evening. This evening the board is being asked to vote on whether removal of the building is an insignificant change.

Vice Chair Venio arrives.

Chair Anderson asks Ms. Sides if the previously approved rehabilitation of this building was supposed to be concurrent with the construction of the remaining housing project. Ms. Sides replies yes, the percentage of commercial use on the site was always a concern, this lot could now be vacant for years, and it seems hopeful that it could become commercial. Mr. Rieder asks if saying yes will allow the residential construction with no commercial because it is not clear if the original decision stipulated that the two must be built concurrently. Chair Anderson noted that the approvals limit it to commercial and

approving the insignificant change does not give a time limit on the commercial development. Other avenues are available if the Board doesn't approve the insignificant change. Atty Correnti notes that the calculation for qualification of the PUD & BPD, residential vs. commercial, is based on land area. The building itself is not included in that calculation and the land area will remain commercial. There is nothing unique in the decision about that building other than it saying the building will be rehabbed. Another building can be constructed to fulfill all the PUD requirements. Chair Anderson states that the development of commercial spaces needs to be proven.

Atty Correnti states that this project must also be approved by the Historic Commission, and he can get more specifics on future plans from the owners and this discussion can be continued. Mr. Koretz proposes that visuals also be brought to the next meeting.

Mr. Koretz states for the record that Mass Development has a Brown Fields Loan in this project, he filed a 23(b)(3) disclosure with the Mayor's office, stating that he can objectively and fairly deliberate on this matter.

Ms. Hamilton fails to see why a vote on whether or not this is an insignificant change is being voted on, regardless of whether a proposed/potential building is shown to them. The Board should be able to make this determination on whether this request is insignificant or not, which will give the applicant direction. Vice Chair Veno states that he would like the applicant to return with a refined presentation to give the Board a clearer sense of the future of this site since different people are now on the Board from when this project was last presented. Mr. Koretz agrees with Vice Chair Veno.

Vice Chair Veno made a motion to continue to the July 7, 2016 meeting, was seconded by Dale Yale, and the motion fails (4 in favor 3 in opposition)

Tony Mataragas arrives.

Carole Hamilton makes a motion to approve an insignificant change for 1,3, & 5 Harmony Grove Road, was seconded by Helen Sides, and the motion fails (3 in favor 4 in opposition).

B. Location: 70-92 ½ BOSTON STREET (Map 15, Lot 299 & Map 16, Lot 139)

Applicant: 139 GROVE STREET REALTY TRUST

Description: A continuance of a Site Plan Review, Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit, 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 the redevelopment of the former Flynn site consisting of removal of three structures on the property, the construction of 50 residential dwelling units within two separate buildings and a commercial retail space with parking provided on the site.

Attorney Joseph Correnti, 63 Federal Street, Salem, represents the applicant. Other presenters include:

- Chris Sparages, P.E.; Project & Civil Engineer; Williams & Sparages, 189 North Main Street, Suite 101, Middleton, MA 01949
- Kenneth Staffier; Peer Reviewer, VHB, 101 Walnut Street, Watertown, MA 02481

- Alan Cloutier; Peer Reviewer, Stantec, 5 Burlington Woods Drive Suite 210 Burlington MA 01803-4542

Documents and Exhibitions:

- Goodhue Street & #70-92 ½ Boston Street, Salem, MA – Peer Review Response
- DEP memo regarding precipitation analysis methods

Atty Correnti states that the project has been before the DRB and will return for a second DRB meeting later in the month and introduces the Civil Engineer, Mr. Sparages.

Mr. Sparages states that this is the third Planning Board appearance; the plans and drainage report were sent out for a peer review that Mr. Kenneth Staffier, P.E. of VHB commented on through a letter dated June 1, 2016 and will present his findings. They have been working on addressing those findings but do not have revised plans to submit at this time, but have submitted a letter to the Board explaining how those findings are being addressed. They are also coordinating with the City Fire Marshall regarding fire apparatus access on the site and finalizing hydrant locations, and the City Engineer regarding the ongoing demolition and cutting and capping existing utilities. A revised set of site plan will be submitted to the Planning office and Mr. Staffier.

Mr. Staffier of VHB, conducted the site and civil review for the project, and outlines his comments and concerns:

- Storm water & utilities and if they meet the City regulations – additional information is required to make that determination
- Site hydrology analysis
 - Rainfall analysis – TP 40 has been superseded by Noah Atlas 14. DEP uses TP 40 as their standard, but new data should be analyzed using the latest in hydrological analysis modeling, NOAA Atlas 14, to determine the pipe sizing and network system.
 - Soil types – Type B was chosen and studied but soil report indicates that Type A should be used
- Various technical items needing clarification
- Test pits need verification to confirm consistency during construction
- TMDL for the north coastal watershed
- Proximity of infiltration systems to the retaining walls on site, there is a minimum setback to maintain the strength and stability of the retaining walls
- Coordination of cutting and capping of utilities with the City requirements
- Verifying hydrant locations and connection location with fire department
- General Site Plan & Engineering Review
 - Accessibility especially from Boston Street
 - Beaver Street driveway entrance is in close proximity to intersection creating potential vehicular conflicts
 - Width of Beaver Street driveway doesn't meet minimum requirements for a 2 lane road
 - Access to garage, two 90 degree turns, is tight for 2 way traffic and requires an analysis of turning movements
 - Fire apparatus access plan and Fire Dept. approval
 - Snow storage, currently along retaining walls and in the dog park, should be relocated away from the retaining walls

Mr. Sparages responses to VHB comments and concerns:

- Rainfall data – DEP provided a memo stating that TP 40 analysis should still be used for hydrological analysis unless the applicant chooses otherwise was submitted to the Board. If regulations don't require it they would rather not re-analysis the data.
 - Chair Anderson stated that Ms. Chiancola will verify this with the City Engineer
- Existing conditions soils – Some test pit data has been provided but a large amount of soil data wasn't submitted and needs to be provided.
 - B soils were chosen but A soils were suggested, which will make it more difficult to mitigate the proposed condition if there is less runoff leaving the site and additional impervious conditions are being created. Additional soils data will be tested and provided to Mr. Staffier.

Chair Anderson asks when additional data will be provided to Mr. Staffier. Mr. Sparages replies one week prior to the next meeting.

Atty Correnti states that the project underwent a Site Plan Review 2 years ago for a medical office building, and at that time the City was working on a comprehensive North River Canal Corridor Traffic analysis, which resulted in the current intersection in front of 28 Goodhue Street. The applicant has used the City's data for this site had hired the same company to analyze this site.

Mr. Alan Cloutier of Stantec, worked on the previous study, and stated that this study has been revised based on current neighborhood and traffic numbers. The onsite driveway and neighborhood were reviewed to study the traffic impact. The area is mostly residential with some commercial usage and residential numbers generate less traffic.

- Peak morning hours: 40 trips = 12 entering and 28 exiting (less than 1 car per min.)
- Afternoon: 79 trips = 46 entering and 33 exiting (more than 1 car per min.)

Traffic coming and going from the site is less than what was determined 2 years ago because this is a slightly different project. Level surface analysis of intersections that border the site were reviewed both with and without the project, and it was determined that there would only be a slightly higher impact to the traffic – a few extra seconds spent at intersections. The impact wasn't significant enough to add anything on site to help with traffic flow, however; some improvements can be done in the area if the City chose to pursue them.

Internal, parking, and site driveway review generated more comments from their office.

Parking: Average for residential units = 64-84 spaces to be utilized. The site can provide 102 spaces.

The following list of comments and improvements was recommended:

- Driveway location on Boston Street. It is currently 170 feet from the Bridge Street intersection and 100 feet away from the Dunkin Donuts driveway. The recommendation is to move the driveway an additional 25 feet away from the Dunkin Donuts driveway because Dunkin Donuts proximity to the street poses a conflict in terms of the minimum site distance requirement.
- The Architectural drawings differ from the Civil in terms of the Beaver Street Driveway. The architectural drawings show two separate driveways and the civil shows a shared drive. The shared curb cut should be separated or widened because the opening is shown as approximately 15 feet wide.
- The proposed garage spaces are shown at 7 ½ feet wide which is too narrow
- Some of the turns going in and out of the garages are very sharp for passenger vehicles, fire apparatuses, etc.
- Can the dumpster be accessed by a trash truck?
- Where will moving vehicles park - Goodhue Street?

- The sidewalk and driveway need more detail so the sidewalk crosses the driveway so cars have to drive over a raised sidewalk.
- There is no pedestrian access from Boston Street, except for the townhouses.
- Will the sidewalk along Boston Street be new?
- The new sign should be further away from the road as to not interfere with sightlines.
- Insure that bicycle racks are on site.

Atty Correnti states that he will review all items and will address them with the peer reviewer.

Chair Anderson states that the project would be better if the items were addressed, especially as they relate to:

- Safety and sightlines from the driveway.
- Comfortable entrance and exit from the parking garage for residents
- Parking space usage – the City's requirement is 9 feet x 18 feet.

Vice Chair Veno stated the Boston Street egress is of particular concern and he encourages the recommendation of the peer review even if it is a modest number of feet is added, would be a significant improvement, and should be added despite the impact it may have on the site parking.

Chair Anderson opens public comment.

No public comment.

Helen Sides made a motion to continue to the July 7, 2016 meeting, was seconded by Dale Yale, and the motion passed unanimously (8-0)

- C. Location: 14 and 16 ALMEDA STREET (Map 14 Lot 116 and Map 14 Lot 117)**
Applicant: TOWN AND COUNTRY HOMES, INC.
Description: REVISION: The applicant requested a continuance to June 2, 2016 of the public hearing for a Definitive Subdivision Plan to construct a roadway to serve two existing undeveloped lots.

Robert Griffin of Griffin Engineering Group represents the applicant, Mr. Balou.

Mr. Griffin states that the proposed is an 80 foot extension of Alameda Street, off Highland Avenue. Alameda Street is currently 650 feet long with 6 or 7 existing homes, and two additional homes are proposed on the new extension. The Planning Board approved a 250 foot extension in 2004, and the additional 80 feet will be built in a similar manner but would be slightly wider with a hammer head at the end.

Land characteristics in the area:

- Smooth terrain with some drop off past the existing road
- Some ledge which will require removal
- Concrete retaining wall along the right side at the end of the existing road
- A pool and guardrail on the left side of the end of the road that is half on the owners' property, which will need to be removed.

The two lots involved were created in 1919 that do not conform to the R1 requirements, but because they are over 5,000 SF and have over 50 feet of frontage, they are both legal lots. The City Attorney made an opinion in October of 2015 that the 2 lots were merged for zoning purposes, but George Belleau's attorney determined that that was not the case. The City Attorney made a second opinion in January of 2016 that the lots were not merged. This led to the delay with their September application.

The second delay was with the differences in opinions on how best to supply water to these houses. Some wanted a water main extended from Highland Avenue. The last three houses on Alameda Street have wells and the houses closer to Highland Avenue are possibly served by copper lines from Highland Avenue, although; there is a lack of records to confirm that. Mr. Belleau offered to put in a dry section of water line for the City to utilize, but after some discussion with the City, Mr. Belleau has offered \$20,000 to the City for utility improvements on Alameda Street, as well as a well on each new lot as a water supply.

The 18 foot street will be widened to 21 feet with a 20 foot by 35 foot hammerhead turnaround. A low 50 foot retaining wall will be added to eliminate the need for any regrading as well as a tree box filter to treat storm water. Both houses will be served by a public sewer system that will connect at the end of Alameda Street. Some waivers have been requested for sub-division regulations for

- 1 – Length of a dead-end street: Adding 80 feet onto an existing 650 foot street = 730 feet
- 2 – Center line of sub division requires a 230 foot radius and Alameda Street has 130 feet. The 1919 layout of Alameda Street is being used.
- 3 – Roadway construction requirements similar to the 2005 plan
 - No sidewalk
 - No granite curbing
 - 20 foot wide right-of-way

Mr. Belleau adds that the \$20,000 will be used for the water system at the City's discretion and not necessarily on Alameda Street.

Ms. Hamilton asks how much further does the 1919 layout extend. Mr. Griffin replied that he did not know but the road continues past the lake and Alameda Street West has some developments on it although there are some existing barriers keeping the two roads from being connected, such as an electrical sub-station.

Ms. Yale asks if this project needs to be filed with the Conservation Commission. Mr. Griffin replied yes, and added that the lots are within 100 feet of the wetlands.

Mr. Rieder asks that Mr. Griffin speak to the wetlands to the lower left of the 2 lots. Mr. Griffin replied there is a wetland at the bottom of the hill and the grade drops off rather steeply, but their lot lines are above that drop off, but it is in proximity to the two lots.

Chair Anderson outlines his concerns:

- Right-of-way improvements policy of the City's sub-division regulation. In the requested waiver this looks to be a sub-division of 2 lots with a possible expansion, not a sub-division of 2 lots with no expansion. What prevents future developers from continuing the addition of lots, especially when curb requirements are being waived.
 - Mr. Griffin replied that there is no way to further divide the lots. The only extension is the road. There is adequate room for curbing and sidewalk if the Board requires the land to be reserved.

- Hammerhead at the dead end extension as it relates to the water service and fire department comments.
 - Mr. Griffin replies that they asked that turning area be created which is what the hammerhead provides, if an apparatus can reach within 50 feet of the house sprinklers are not required to which this project complies, the water service connection has been addressed and agreed upon by the City. Because of turning radiuses and possible private property damage, the driveways will be constructed with the same requirements as the street.
- The waiver to allow the centerline to be less than the required 230 feet is based on the right-of-way, but the condition exists.

Chair Anderson asks if the construction of the homes was known at this time, architectural style, materials proposed, etc. Mr. Griffin replies that nothing has been submitted on the houses but they will conform to the City zoning requirements and will be 2 story colonial style houses consistent with the neighborhood.

Mr. Koretz asks why a hammerhead is proposed instead of a circle. Mr. Griffin replies that a circle would need more area than is available, and a hammerhead is listed in the sub-division regulations, and will improve the existing 18 foot wide dead-end.

Chair Anderson opens public comment.

Stephen Lovely, Ward 3 Councilor. There is a need for homes in the City and he is in favor of this project.

Ms. Chiancola states that revised plans were submitted to the City Engineer but they have not received comments in response but they should receive them by the July 7, 2016 meeting. Mr. Belleau states that plans dated, June 2nd, were given to the City Engineer prior to him writing the letter. Only one revision was made after the June 2nd plans were submitted and that was a comment from Ms. Chiancola regarding moving a pipe off of City property and into the right-of-way that the City Engineer hasn't had a change to address. Chair Anderson replied that a draft decision will be made on July 7th by the Board.

Noah Koretz made a motion to continue to the July 7, 2016 meeting, was seconded by Carole Hamilton, and the motion passed unanimously (8-0)

D. Location: 81 HIGHLAND AVENUE; 108 JEFFERSON AVENUE; OLD ROAD; 1 DOVE AVENUE; 79 HIGHLAND AVENUE; 55 HIGHLAND AVENUE; AND 57 HIGHLAND AVENUE (Map 24, Lots 1, 2, 88, 19, 216, 218 220; and Map 14, Lot 129)

Applicant: NORTH SHORE MEDICAL CENTER, INC.

Description: A public hearing for a Site Plan Review, in accordance with the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 9.5 Site Plan Review; and a Stormwater Management Permit in accordance with Salem Code of Ordinances Chapter 37. Specifically, the applicant proposes to construct a new Emergency Department/Inpatient Beds building, a new front Lobby expansion, renovation resulting in an addition of 119,735 square feet and repurposing of 119,734 square feet of interior space, internal driveway and parking modifications, landscape and hardscape improvements and utility infrastructure modifications to their existing campus.

Attorney Joseph Correnti, 63 Federal Street, Salem, represents the applicant. Other presenters include:

- Vinod Kalikiri, P.E.; Traffic Consultant; VHB, 101 Walnut Street, Watertown, MA 02481
- Kenneth Petraglia, P.E.; City of Salem Independent Traffic Peer Reviewer; V.P. of Beta Group; 315 Norwood Park South, 2nd Floor, Norwood, MA 02062

Atty Correnti states that at previous meetings the campus presentation was presented by the Civil Engineer, Architect, and Landscape Engineer. The traffic and parking on campus will be presented tonight by Mr. Vinod Kalikiri.

Transportation & Parking Study

Mr. Kalikiri, Senior Project Manager, licensed professional engineer and professional traffic engineer, and traffic engineer of record for this project and has been working with NSMC since that began their master plan project. The traffic study is from April 16th. Mr. Kalikiri states that three main topics will be discussed.

- Overview of the Traffic Study and off-site impacts
 - Overflow
 - Roadways
 - Sidewalks
 - Traffic signals
 - Intersections and their proximity to the campus
- On-campus access and circulation
 - Access in and out today and any future changes associated with the campus expansion
- Parking
 - Existing and how it is used
 - Utilizing future parking associated with the campus expansion

Off-site traffic impacts: The April 2016 comprehensive study includes both the vacant Spaulding building and new spaces, and there are several opportunities for enhancements. The ongoing study by Mass DOT – Highland Avenue / Rt. 107 Corridor Study starts in Lynn and extends to Boston Street in Salem, and this study includes the scope and limits of the Mass DOT findings including:

- Critical locations within the corridor
- Campus entry and exit points (the focus of the study)

The study is broken down into three components:

- Scoping – look at record information, meet with City staff, transportation characteristics, and understanding what occurs in this area
- Data collection and analysis – Safety and transportation (vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles, transit, etc.) analyzing it to determine what is occurring today
- Analyze future conditions within the project and determine off-site impacts and how to resolve any issues on-site

The limits of the jurisdiction is Greenway Road to the South West of the hospital; everything South of it is under Mass DOT jurisdiction and everything North is City of Salem jurisdiction. They have met with the Planning Department as well as Planning and Community Development, to ensure that the study is consistent with the City's expectations and the future DOT study. The Planning Dept. wanted to ensure that the multiple peaks of traffic flow and volume; 1) morning commutes & school start, 2) school release which coincides with hospital shift changes, and 3) evening commutes were addressed and how they

impact the neighboring intersections, were included in this study. Several traffic guards are at multiple intersections that help manage traffic and add to the safety during peak school hours. This data was collected in May of 2014 reflect when Spaulding was still in operation at NSMC campus.

Data collected includes; traffic, speed, truck traffic, heavy vehicles, crash data, roadways and traffic signals and their settings, and Highland Avenue planning level data going as far back as 2009, to use in and compare with the more recent Mass DOT Highland Avenue data. The City's Peer Reviewer submitted a letter stating that this data used in this analysis is sufficient.

The schematic site plan indicates that all three existing curb cuts/access points on Highland Avenue and Jefferson Avenue are being maintained and no new curb cuts are proposed or anticipated, although a new internal driveway will connect the Highland Avenue side of the campus with the Jefferson Avenue side, to assist with traffic flow and circulation. Yellow indicates: the new building, white: parking, and grey: existing buildings on the campus. The new building will house a new Emergency Department, two floors of in-patient beds, a new lobby area - Davenport, the first floor of the Spaulding building will be integrated with the Emergency Department, the second to the fifth floors of the Spaulding building will support a new Psychiatric Department partially relocated from Union Hospital in Lynn and partially an existing department on the NSMC campus and already within the Spaulding Building.

The Traffic Study incorporates trip generation and traffic flow using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) guidelines, which analyzed both the morning and evening peak hours. The current 2 way traffic flow is approximately 1,900 vehicles per hour on Highland Avenue and 1,200 vehicles per hour on Jefferson Avenues. The future projections estimated an additional 120 trips at both peak hours, split over the three entrances, which appears to be a 60 /40 split between the two sides, and also incorporates how traffic moves around the campus and the flow of the two existing employee parking lots off campus on Jefferson Avenue.

Union Hospital Non-Ambulance Traffic: 16,000 visit per year. Approximately 5,000 of those cases would be directed to NSMC, based on the level of care needed, but could be treated at Urgent Care Centers. Vice Chair Veno asked how much control there is over how many non-emergency ambulance trips will be transferred to NSMC. Ms. Mary Joe Gagnon, of NSMC replied that the NSMC is working with Lynn on a Determination of Need (DON), to figure out the urgent care program for Lynn but that could take a year or more to finalize. Half of the volume is level 4 & 5, meaning non-urgent care, but they will accept all ambulance traffic. Vice Chair Veno stated that these are data assumptions and stated that the numbers seem optimistic. Mr. Kalikiri noted that industry data based on similar uses was being used to estimate the numbers. Salem receives on average 44 ambulance visits per day and Union Hospital 22. Not all of those ambulances will be directed to NSMC, only approximate 13 (roughly 1 every couple of hours) and only Levels 1+2 and 3. Ms. Gagnon added that not all of those ambulances will require sirens.

Mr. Koretz asked which direction the ambulances will travel to get to the new Emergency Department and where will ambulances not going to NSMC go? Ms. Gagnon stated that the other ambulances will go to either Lahey in Peabody or Melrose/Wakefield.

Mr. Kalikiri stated that all vehicles would need to drive through a series of parking lots from Highland Avenue, to get to the new internal driveway and new ambulance loading bay on the Jefferson Avenue side of the campus. Emergency Room visitors or those dropping off a non-ambulance patient can drop off the patient, park in one of the lots and walk back to the Emergency Department. Ambulances would enter from whichever access point is easiest for them to travel. Ms. Sides noted that the intersection at

Jefferson, Jackson, and Hathorne Streets is getting progressively worse and adding more ambulance traffic could be problematic and also requires some study.

Mr. Kalikiri stated that pedestrian access has been a significant focus of the project. The red dashes lines on the site plan represent the existing sidewalk to and from the Highland and Jefferson Avenue entrance. The yellow areas are the new pedestrian sidewalks to Highland Avenue, along the new internal driveway, to Jefferson Avenue, and to various entrances of the buildings on campus to help improve pedestrian walkability.

Mr. Kalikiri stated that there are numerous lots both on and off the NSMC campus. The common complaint is that there is not enough parking along the Highland Avenue lots, depending on the time of day; morning and evening commute times, shift changes, and during the peak times of hospital use – 10AM and 2:30PM. The two off-campus lots on Jefferson Avenue are overflow lots, primarily used by employees. There is no active enforcement of these designated parking areas. Parking data collected show that at 10AM there are between 400 – 600 spaces available, and at 2:30PM there are between 370 – 660 spaces available, although they are not all in areas where they are needed, and patients or visitor are leaf searching for parking during those times.

The goal of the parking management plan is to improve the connectivity, circulation, parking availability, and pedestrian access. Operational changes planed are:

- Unify medical and administrative parking areas
- Relocate administrative parking on Highland Avenue to the Jefferson Avenue side of the campus.
- Lessen the staff increase since some of them are already on the campus and will be consolidated into the Spaulding Building
- Reduce parking in front of the ED and Children's Medical Center
- Place visitor and patient parking in the Highland Avenue parking lots
- Keep the valet parking at the Main Entrance
- Consider valet parking at the ED entrance

Mr. Kalikiri stated that there some questions regarding walking distances between the parking lots and the current Emergency Department and how that might change when it moves to the Jefferson Avenue side of the campus.

Existing:

- MSCH & ED parking to ED entrance: approximately 110 feet
- Lot A to ED entrance: approximately 340 feet (when cutting through the multiple isles of traffic and that distances will increase if pedestrians follow the sidewalk routes)

Proposed:

- Handicapped to ED entrance: 150 feet
- ED parking to ED entrance: 190 feet
- Additional ED parking to ED entrance: 200 feet

The sidewalks adjacent to the building to the ED entrance will be covered, there will be crosswalks, and accessible ramps proposed. The pedestrian environment will be improved through the distances traveled and walking surfaces provided.

The parking lots will be grouped in terms of use:

- Patients & visitors

- General staff
- Mixed use: Patients, visitors & medical staff

Before Spaulding closed there were 1,953 parking spaces across the campus and after the completion of this project there will be 2,025 parking spaces. The site plan indicates an 88 space loss which was determined based on the footprint of the project. When comparing the campus as a whole to when Spaulding was in operation, there is a net gain of 72 parking spaces. The campus is comparable to industry standards for parking for a campus of this size. The parking data will be provided to the peer reviewer.

Chair Anderson outlines his concerns:

- Will be a connection to Wilson Street, as it was referenced several times in some of the documentation. Mr. Kalikiri replied no, it was an incorrect reference. Mr. Shelly Bisegna, of NSMC, added that there is a road, Old Road, to their rear parking lot but there is a gate that they have committed to the City will remain closed at all times because residents were concerns that it would be used as a cut-through. It is only opened for City and fire department purposes.
- Ambulances coming from Union Hospital in Lynn were answered
- Concerning the connector road: It seems very close to the newly renovated Bertram Field. How will that disturbance to Bertram Field be handed, and requests a site cross section at that point in relation to the building, sidewalk, roadway, retaining wall, and the field. Mr. Kalikiri replied that there is land swap planned with the City and a cross section can be provided.

Atty Correnti stated that there is no agreement with the City but that part of Bertram Field is dedicated park land and that needs to be reviewed by the City Council and voted on by a home ruled decision. The matter would then be reviewed by the Parks & Recreation Commission, and they would need to recommend a land swap. The home ruled decision would then be voted on by the State legislature, which would occur in months from now. This would be a condition of the Planning Board and the proposed plan includes the swapping of that land. If it is approved, the hospital would gain approximately 11-1,200 square feet of land and the City would gain just under 6,000.

- Is the off-site parking is leased or owned? Mr. Bisegna replied that the 108 Jefferson Avenue lot is owned by the NSMC. The 65 Jefferson Avenue lot is owned by a neighboring business, EMR Drywall, and houses 197 spaces. As of August 1st an additional small lot will be leased that will house 37 spaces.
- In terms of employees walking from those off-site lots, the sidewalks, especially in front of 108 Jefferson should be repaved to meet all code requirements for safe pedestrian access
- Crosswalks should be added across Jefferson Avenue on both side of the Dove Avenue entrance. Mr. Pertanian noted that there are employee shuttle with a covered pick-up area from the off-site lots.
- ED, pedestrian, and ambulance access. Pedestrian access should be closer to the ER entrance to provide safer access and a 300 foot seems too far. Mr. Bisegna replied that they would like to get the pedestrians closer but wetlands to the South are limiting their options. The proximity of hospital departments pushed the ED to this area of the site. Grading challenges exist along the internal driveway, and the longer ambulance route from Highland Ave creates gentler turns for ambulance passengers.
- The main entrance driveway is confusing and a straight shot to the main entrance from Highland Avenue would eliminate the confusion and create a clearer path for vehicles. It is dangerous to have pedestrians crossing through multiple parking lots and across driveways with no clear

definition of where they should be going. Mr. Kalikiri replied that there are site line implications involved with moving the lower Highland Avenue curb cut.

- Higher number of accidents at signaled intersections than normal and how that can be mitigated. Mr. Kalikiri replied angled accidents occur because there is a lack of adequate clearance times between the yellow and red lights. Beta Group implied that there could be a trade off by taking time off the green light and adding it to the red to allow additional time for cars to clear the intersection. This corridor is part of the more comprehensive DOD Corridor Study that will point out these types of adjustments and tweaks can be made in the meantime.
- Will the Parking management plan be made available to the Planning Board? Ms. Gagnon replied that numerous parking changes will be made during the 3 years of construction. The NSMC would need to make a management decision to implement final parking changes, but they can be clarified for the Planning Board.

Mr. Rieder stated that not redeveloping the various Highland Avenue parking lots is a missed opportunity to simplify the pedestrian route, transforming the space, and create a new campus image. Wayfinding should be clear and easy to determine. (Mr. Rieder made reference to the Cleveland Clinic.) Ms. Gagnon replied that a new landscaping plan is underway from the Highland Avenue side of the campus. Chair Anderson added that parking zones for each building would be great to see, not a mass of parking lots with no clear direction. Mr. Koretz added that the visual sequence of arrival needs to be thought out.

Peer Review

Mr. Petraglia stated that much of the information presented has not provided and is not reflected in the Peer Review. Based on the April 2016 Report Mr. Petraglia outlines his comments, concerns and recommendations:

- The study area was appropriate and traffic times were collected well
- Crash history: combination or angled crashes and rear collisions creates a confusion because North and South bound traffic are timed separately but also overlap. A recommendation to alter the traffic signal timing or adding more a delay can improve the crash history
- Corridor improvements recommendations along Highland & Jefferson Avenues; provide pedestrian bicycle lanes, striping on shoulders, wheelchair ramps are non-existent or not ADA complaint, replace missing curb cuts, provide ADA compliant crosswalks, & repair sidewalks along the property lines
- Public transportation information is accurate
- Future traffic information is accurate
- Trip generation: Recommends conducting counts in and out of the entrances during AM and PM peaks to develop actual rates and not ITE rates which come from across the country.
- Trip distribution and assignments: Conducted from circle and corridor analysis but there is no recognition that Jefferson Avenue will have less traffic and less delay, when it could become the more popular entrance.
- Capacity and queuing analysis: There is a possibility that delays could back into other intersections
- A parking discussion was not in the report, how many will be parking, where, and is there enough parking
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM Measures): Will traffic stress be relieved? Will carpooling become an incenting program and rewarded with better parking spots? Will shift

changes occur off peak periods? They will reduce traffic woes without doing anything structural to the road.

- Site Plan: ED parking is on average 200 feet away from the ED entrance
- Is in favor of the color coding parking proposal suggested by a Planning Board member
- Mr. Petraglia noted that there is more excess width on Jefferson Avenue that could provide bicycle lanes.

Mr. Kalikiri stated that he will have responses to these concerns at the next meeting.

Chair Anderson opens public comment.

Senator Joan Lovely, 14 Story Street, speaking as a concerned neighbor rather than as her elected role, lives 3 blocks away from the hospital on the Jefferson Avenue side. Ms. Lovely is concerned with the impact on the residential neighborhood and traffic flow into Salem and around the hospital once the Lynn campus closes, and will continue to attend these minutes as the project unfolds. Jefferson Avenue is 2 lanes but Highland Avenue is 4, so she is interested in how the traffic flow will impact both sides of the campus. Ms. Lovely is in favor of the comment regarding the project having a better face on both sides.

Judith Ware, 24 Wilson Street. Concerned with traffic cutting through the densely populated neighborhood, which is an existing problem, especially with speeding drivers that do not obey stop signs. Wilson Street is hard to turn off of and many take the side streets. Is hopeful that signage will direct people up Highland or straight down Jefferson, when Union Hospital closes.

Chair Anderson asks who gives ambulances direction when they are en-route to hospitals. Ms. Gagnon replied that drivers make the decision regarding routes but the NSMC has a traffic liaison that will deal with traffic patterns.

Ward 3 Councilor Steve Lovely, 14 Story Street. Speaking as a neighbor and as an elected official. Echoes Mrs. Ware's concerns. As a City Councilor in 1983 one of his actions was to close off Old Road, it has been closed since then. Bob Norton is committed to keeping it closed but Mr. Lovely is concerned with the long term goals of this project. Mr. Lovely is also concerned with drivers cutting through the neighborhood. The hospital should bear some responsibility to partner up with us and contribute to improvements of the entrances and sidewalks that will be affected by what he feels will be a great deal of an increase in traffic, especially on Jefferson Avenue. The sidewalks which are in disrepair and should be improved so that they are safe for pedestrians.

Councilor Lovely asked if the 107 Traffic Group has been consulted, asked if the 2014 report was being used, and encouraged someone from the project team attend the next 107 Traffic Group Meeting. Mr. Kalikiri replied that they do have access to their data and the 2014 report was used because that was when Spaulding was still occupying the building.

Councilor Lovely stated that the study has no money to contribute so the Board and State Council should ensure that all hospital entrance improvements are implemented. Councilor Lovely noted that he grew up in the area and knowing access to the hospital believes the impact on Jefferson Avenue is being undersold, especially with talk of South Salem Train Station off of Colonial Road that will increase pedestrian traffic. The flashing pedestrian light along Jefferson Avenue will need to change. A project of this magnitude needs a lot of contribution from the hospital.

Kirt Rieder made a motion to continue to the July 7, 2016 meeting, was seconded by Helen Sides, and the motion passed unanimously (8-0).

IV. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

A. Discussion of an expanded role for the DRB

Tabled until the next meeting.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Carole Hamilton made a motion to adjourn, was seconded by Tony Mataragas, and the motion carried with all in favor, 8-0.

The meeting ended at 10:25PM.

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:

<http://www.salem.com/planning-board/webforms/planning-board-2016-decisions>

Respectfully submitted,

Colleen Anderson, Substitute Recording Clerk

Approved by the Planning Board on 07/07/2016

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