

**City of Salem Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, Sept. 15, 2016**

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, September 15, 2016 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, Noah Koretz, Matt Veno, Helen Sides, Kirt Rieder, Dale Yale, Tony Mataragas and Bill Grisct

*Absent:* None (Bill Grisct arrives at 7:11PM after Old/New business, which is taken first and Tony Mataragas arriving late)

*Also in attendance:* Erin Schaeffer, Staff Planner, and Stacy Kilb, recorder

**II. REGULAR AGENDA**

**A. Location: 14 Bertuccio Ave. (Map 24, Lot 105)**

**Applicant: Nathan Jacobson**

**Description:** A continuance of a public hearing for a Definitive Subdivision Plan in accordance with the Salem Subdivision Regulations to allow the construction of a roadway to serve seven (7) residential lots, and a Stormwater Management Permit in accordance Sec. 37 of the Salem Code of Ordinances to allow for activity that results in a land disturbance greater than one acre.

Mr. Eric Jacobson presents. He has not heard from the Civil Engineer and believes this is all that remains. He has taken into consideration what the Board said at the last meeting, and will again decline the review of the Geotechnical survey that the Board offered. He feels the three experts he has had present are adequate.

Erin clarifies to the Board that Civil Engineer review has been put on hold as the response of not moving forward with geotechnical review as requested so Civil engineer has stopped work, so is not complete for that reason.

Chair Ben Anderson does not agree with the applicant, and states that the peer review is important to understand the issues related with the site. The actions the applicant can take tonight are to request a continuance, request that the Board vote on the project or to close the public hearing.

Chair Ben Anderson states for the record that a letter from Carol Michaud has been received. He notes that further public comment should be limited to issues not yet covered.

Bill Grisct wonders what the precedent is for an applicant declining the peer review. The Chair states that the applicant has the right waive it, but it is up to the Board to determine if they have enough information to make a decision. This has not happened in the Chair's term but he cannot speak for before that.

Matt Veno asks Erin Schaeffer asks about the decision not to proceed with the Civil Engineering review, as the geotechnical review was declined by applicant. Ms. Schaeffer outlines the protocols and progress, now halted.

Tony Mataragas arrives at 7:17PM.

The Chair opens to the public but requests that they limit comments to new input.

Clifford Goodman of 22 Bertuccio Ave says that, if by some injustice, the project is approved; he wants to bring up the option of a contingency bond to cover the cliff falling, etc. in order to address concerns.

City Councilor Steve Lovely of 14 Storey St. has been speaking with neighbors, and notes their concerns. He is concerned that the Board is asking for but not receiving additional information from the applicant.

Chair Ben Anderson comments that he has pause with the project due to the following sections of the subdivision regulations that he reads into the record:

*If during the public hearing process the Salem Planning Board has not received sufficient information to determine if the definitive subdivision plans comply with the subdivision regulations, it has the authority to refuse to grant approval, provided the board has a reasonable basis to believe that additional information is necessary to make a determination that the definitive subdivision plan complies with the subdivision regulations.*

As far as waivers are concerned, the Chair personally feels that the applicant has responded to concerns, but he has difficulty tying the project to the public benefit. In general the applicant has been responsive.

Chair Anderson reads the purpose section of the subdivision regulations:

*They [the subdivision regulations] have been enacted for the purpose of protecting the safety, convenience and welfare of the inhabitants of the cities and towns in which it is, or may hereafter, be put in effect by regulating the laying out and construction of ways in subdivisions providing access to several lots therein, but which have not become public ways, and ensuing sanitary conditions in subdivisions and in proper cases parks and open areas.*

Chair Anderson also reads:

*"If the Board modifies or disapproves a plan it shall state, in its vote, the reason for such action."*

There is no need to indicate reasons for approval, however if there are concerns, specific reasons for Board member objections shall be provided, should a vote not approving the project occur this evening.

Chair Anderson notes that according to the subdivision regulations, The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is to be considered part of the rules and regulations.

*"In reviewing the statement [the Environmental Impact Statement], the City boards will consider the degree to which water is recycled back into the ground, the maintenance and improvement of the flow and quality of surface waters; the preservation or promotion of wildlife refuges, historic sits,*

Chair Anderson notes that this is the part he is concerned with:

*"unique geologic features, botanical and archaeological features, existing or potential trails and accesses to open space areas; and the health and safety of the inhabitants of the area."*

This statement gives him pause, because this site does have unique geological features. He as he previously stated he feels that the EIS is incomplete. As such he needs additional information, not receiving the information is important enough to sway his decision.

Procedures are discussed again.

The applicant feels that the concern is that there might be an issue that has not been addressed, not that there is a known issue. He notes that the Board of Health did not hire its own peer reviewer and the Chair responds that the Board of Health's input can be taken as a recommendation but will not sway this Board's decision.

Mr. Jacobson feels that his engineers were highly qualified and that the Board should have enough information to make a decision. He feels the project will be beautiful, with the "Rolls Royce" of sidewalks, and that it is a safe and reasonable development. He does not believe the Board could be persuaded by hiring yet another engineer to review.

A discussion of the main objective and logistics of peer review, both in general and as related to this project, follows.

Mr. Jacobson feels that the process has not been fair to his project. Chair Anderson states that all comments have been repeated multiple times, and Kirt Rieder notes again that this is a thorough process, and that the Board learns by listening over multiple meetings, so topics are not closed just because they are not discussed at the first meeting; members need time to process information then come back to discuss it further.

*A motion to close the public hearing is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Bill Grisct, and passes with all in favor, 9-0.*

Chair Anderson gives the applicant an opportunity to continue, which he declines. The Chair seeks a motion for approval, however Matt Veno makes a motion to DISAPPROVE the project. Chair Anderson notes that a motion must be in the affirmative, then can be denied by a vote of "no," and also notes that just because a Board member makes or seconds the motion, it does not mean that they actually approve of the project.

Matt Veno withdraws the motion to disapprove the project.

*A motion to approve a Definitive Subdivision Plan in accordance with the Salem Subdivision Regulations to allow the construction of a roadway to serve seven (7) residential lots, and a Stormwater Management Permit in accordance Sec. 37 of the Salem Code of Ordinances to allow for activity that results in a land disturbance greater than one acre, is made by Matt Veno and seconded by Carole Hamilton.*

Matt Veno comments that he is disappointed by the way this whole process has moved forward, reiterating as he has stated in past meetings that project approval has nothing to do with the Board members' personal opinions of whether the project is good or bad, but rather, whether it complies with the relevant ordinances. He feels that information was lacking but that, despite his personal feelings about the project, he could be persuaded if adequate analysis were provided.

*Opposed to the project are: Carole Hamilton, Noah Koretz, Matt Veno, Helen Sides, Dale Yale, and Bill Grisct (7) with none (0) in favor.*

Tony Mataragas and Kirt Rieder were absent at relevant meetings so were ineligible to vote.

**B. Location:** 14 Bertuccio Ave (Map 24, Lot 105)

**Applicant:** Nathan Jacobson

**Description:** Board discussion and vote on an application for endorsement of a plan believed not to require approval under the Subdivision Control Law (ANR).

Form A requires a signature. Mr. Jacobson outlines the division of the first lot at this address. There is sufficient frontage on Francis Ave. and Bertuccio Ave. The Chair has no questions.

A motion for endorsement of the Plan is made by Matt Veno, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and passes with all (9) in favor and none (0) opposed.

**C. Location:** 81 Highland Ave; 108 Jefferson Ave; Old Rd; 1 Dove Ave; 79 Highland Ave; 55 Highland Ave; and 57 Highland Ave (Map 24, Lots 1, 2, 88, 19, 216, 218 220; and Map 14, Lot 129)

**Applicant:** North Shore Medical Center, Inc.

**Description:** A continuance of 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.

**\*THE APPLICANT HAS REQUESTED A CONTINUATION TO THE NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING ON THURSDAY OCTOBER 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Joseph Correnti of 63 Federal St. represents the project. They are nearing the end of the process, working on final details. They are requesting a continuance to allow time for the City to work on final conditions and details of the project.

A motion to continue to the October 20, 2016 meeting is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Bill Grisct, with all (9) in favor and none (0) opposed.

**D. Location:** 70-92 ½ Boston St. (Map 15, Lot 299 & Map 16, Lot 139)

**Applicant:** 139 Grove Street Realty Trust

**Description:** A continuance of a public hearing for 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 Flynnntan 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.

Presenting for the applicant are Joseph Correnti of 63 Federal St. He states that the project is ready for Board review and describes progress thus far.

Chris Sparages, Project Engineer, begins the PowerPoint presentation.

A PowerPoint presentation outlines the following points:

- Layout plan: additional green spaces, parking, sidewalk, Fire Dept. connections/access, Conservation Commission negative determination obtained
- Tanya Carrier from the architectural firm reviews comments from the Design Review Board (DRB) and subsequent changes to the building, including:

- Retail space relocated to Goodhue St., projected out from main bldg. and lowered finished floor to sidewalk level
- Added trash room on end of parking garage
- Relocated garage entrance to side of building
- Views from Goodhue St. presented.
- Material on bays is a lighter board and batten rather than brick; color also changed
- Central area redesigned to be more cohesive but still have a distinctive canopy
- Upper floor site plan:
  - Moved community room
  - Views from Boston St.
    - Townhouse roofs lowered, now also a different style (hip roof) for scale/proportion to other building
    - Changed bay materials on Boston St. side of apt. complex
    - Proportion of chimneys changed – enlarged
    - View of Boston St. entrance circle
    - Revised Elevations of apt complex – window types and sizes are now varied
    - Townhouse exterior changes

Noah Koretz asks if there was a letter of recommendation from the DRB; Erin Schaeffer has it and give is to him.

Katya Pasadlo, Blair Hines landscape architect, outlines changes to landscaping, including

- Outside retail store
- Revision to parking lot plantings
- Modifications in response to garage entrance changes
- Pedestrian sidewalk and landscape changes to Goodhue St. doors
- Staircase down to circle has been removed
- Unit paving in contrast to concrete paving of public sidewalk
- Blue Spruce substituted for white pine on western side of lot
- Wood guard rail ended at end of parking next to retaining walls
- One street tree removed, as she did not know sidewalk would be improved. The Chair asks about changes and Ms. Pasadlo outlines.
- Transformer relocated to Goodhue St.

Matt Venio asks about stair access from Boston St. to the circle and wonders why it was removed, as he thought it was a nice feature. Mr. Correnti states that it was designed upon a suggestion earlier on, but the City's peer reviewer pointed out that if they do that it must be made accessible, which is correct, but it would have had to be a large switchback ramp that would not have worked aesthetically or practically. Matt Venio also follows up, asking if you worked here but wanted to go to tattoo parlor, for example, next to the townhomes, you would have to walk all the way down to the curb cut. Unfortunately, that is correct.

Kirt Rieder asks about the 3<sup>rd</sup> street tree that is no more; could it be relocated to the area of lawn behind the sidewalk adjacent to the birch? Ms. Pasadlo says it could be.

The Conservation Commission gave permission to build the project; demolition has occurred on the remaining buildings.

Chair Anderson compliments the applicant and design team on their work. He cannot vote this evening but states that it has been a pleasure to see this, a collaborative project that will benefit the City.

Tony Mataragas comments that Boston St. has traditionally been a dull street, and this project will bring some light and attractiveness to it.

Matt Veno thanks the applicant for responding to the Board's comments regarding the use of the retail space and reiterates his feelings that it is consistent with the "urban village" envisioned in the NRCC mixed use Master Plan.

The Chair opens to the public but there are no comments.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and passes 9-0.

Noah Koretz asks about continuing the sidewalk on Goodhue St. down to the motorcycle shop; this is shown on the current plan but is not reflected in writing in the decision. Mr. Sparages reiterates that the applicant is committed to extending it and it is in the current plan, thus it does not need to be referenced in the decision itself.

The Board has no comments on the decision.

A motion to approve the 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 for the redevelopment and expansion of the existing two-story concrete industrial building at 9 South Mason Street, expansion of the three-story residential building at 3A Buffum Street Extension; and construction of two new townhouse style buildings along with parking and landscaping throughout the site. The project when completed will total 29 residential units in four buildings with all associated parking on site is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Tony Mataragas, and passes in a roll call vote with Carole Hamilton, Noah Koretz, Matt Veno, Helen Sides, Kirt Rieder, Dale Yale, and Bill Grisct (7) in favor and none (0) opposed.

Chair Ben Anderson and Tony Mataragas are not voting as they have missed meetings at which this project was presented.

- E. Location:** 9 South Mason Street, 3A Buffum Street Extension; and 23 Mason Street (also including 23 ½ Mason Street and 23R Mason Street) (Map 26, Lots 73, 74, 79)
- Applicant:** Juniper Point 9 South Mason Street LLC
- Description:** A continuance of a public hearing 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. Specifically, the applicant proposes the redevelopment and expansion of the existing two-story concrete industrial building at 9 South Mason Street, expansion of the three-story residential building at 3A Buffum Street Extension; and construction of two new townhouse style buildings along with parking and landscaping throughout the site. The project when completed will total 29 residential units in four buildings with all associated parking on site.

Here for the applicant is Joseph Correnti of 63 Federal St. He states that this is the second meeting for this project; and overview was previously provided and Bob Griffin of Griffin Engineering reviewed the site specific features. This is a previously industrial site in multiple zones and multiple uses. This is NRCC so they will be going before the DRB. We continue to see multi-million dollar investments coming into the area.

Giles Ham will provide traffic analysis this evening. The City is in the process of hiring a peer review consultant so more will be provided later as well. Ryan McShera, project Architect, will also present.

Giles Ham provides traffic assessment, and will work with the peer review consultant. All relevant analysis has been done. Buffum St. extension is a relatively narrow road with parking on both sides but is not very busy.

Outlined elements:

- 2016 Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes
- Trip Generation summary
- Trip Distribution Map
- Summary of Recommendations

Mr. Correnti outlines the previous comments on width of the roadways. The Applicant is also in discussions with the fire dept. and the City peer reviewer will also comment on any issues. Chair Anderson asks about the counts of 13-20 cars per hour on Buffum St. No distinction is made but between residential and commercial traffic, but most likely that figure is for commercial.

Mr. Ryan McShera of Red Barn Architecture reviews the relevant points of the project:

- Existing and proposed structures
- Neighborhood context, Buffum St. and NRCC
- New Building design
- Existing Building design
- New and Activate Residential Neighborhood

Mr. Correnti states that this concludes the formal presentation, and that the applicant would like to work with peer reviewers in the next 6 weeks, and with Design Review.

Noah Koretz reiterates his comments from the previous meeting, that it is a great site and an opportunity to repurpose the industrial building, but that the applicant should “own” the industrial building, and make it distinctive. Helen Sides, who is also on the DRB, agrees with Noah Koretz and cautions the applicant on making the structures, appear “historic,” as modern materials would be plastic, not wood, so the interpretation would be different.

The landscape plan is not complete at the moment; there will be a future presentation covering landscaping and civil engineering. Kirt Rieder feels that a greater density of shade trees should be provided for residents, and asks that a more appropriate species than pear trees be selected. Snow storage is briefly discussed.

Matt Venio agrees with Noah Koretz on maintaining the uniqueness of the industrial building, and feels that today’s features should be emphasized, rather than trying to blend the re-ornamented building with those surrounding it.

Chair Anderson echoes the other board members’ view that this is a unique building and an opportunity to showcase it.

Chair Anderson opens the public but there are no comments.

*A motion to continue the October 20, 2016 meeting is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Dale Yale, and passes with all (9) in favor and none (0) opposed.*

**F. Location: PEM 161 ESSEX STREET (Map 35, Lot 303)**

**Applicant: PEABODY ESSEX MUSEUM**

**Description:** A public hearing for a Site Plan Review in accordance with the Salem Zoning Ordinance Section 9.5 Site Plan Review. Specifically, the applicant proposes the partial demolition of existing buildings and the construction of a 37,950 square foot addition primarily within the footprint of the Asian Garden, in addition to site improvements including a garden and utility work.

A 23 (B) 3 form has been filed by Noah Koretz, as his agency is a conduit bond issuer to this project, but he can impartially evaluate the project.

Thus far, the applicant has met with the Design Review Board, Historic Salem, and the Salem Redevelopment Authority.

Steven Chu presents first, outlining:

- Elevational, Essex St. This is the best, smallest version of all studies. Ultimately decided to do scheme most respectful to existing buildings that have historic buildings, museum is a collection of houses as well as art, so must respect scale of houses and Essex St. facades.
- Basement plan: because of existing soil conditions, there will not be a full basement
- Ground Floor Plan: 5000 square feet per floor, with 3 floors, playing off East India Marine hall as a scale of reference. The museum has always used this as reference for floor heights. Work will be done on East India Marine (EIM) hall itself. Three building elements in the garden will be demolished as will a single story structure behind other buildings to make room for another garden. The applicant wants to bring back the elevation of East India Marine Hall to distinguish it. They will restore the façade which will be internalized and protected. Pulling the addition away from EIM hall means have room for a needed atrium.
- Second Floor plan: skylight will be dropped to this floor, attempting to create non gallery space in order to provide views in and out, not have a blank façade on Essex St. to engage it
- Third Floor
- Architectural elevations – Chelmsford granite will be used but it has a split rock face to distinguish it.

Mark Streeter, landscape architect, presents:

- Charter Street Service Area, PEM Garden, Essex Street
- Frontage on Essex St. Will frame East India Marine hall with Ginkos because of its upright habit, hardy tree good in urban environments, more details provided about trees. Paving will be in kind and over sand based soil to provide continuous root zone and soil value; will be irrigated.
- Rendering of frontage/facades, one small historic building will be moved to other side of EIM hall. Group entry (not a public entry) will be provided here. ADA ramp is now interior.
- Night View
- Proposed garden, takes into account history and mission of PEM, hybrid of garden history overlaid with free form/organic garden traditions of Asia, horticulture also relates to that story
- Garden species
- Charter St. landscape/service area. As little hardscape as possible has been used. Tried to provide screening but still open-ness. Street trees will be added along with an evergreen hedge. PEM has consulted neighboring residents re screening. Utility company needs access to their equipment so it cannot be covered.
- Charter St. views



David Conway, Civil Engineer, outlines that portion of the project. This project has very light impact on the ground, with impervious surface only increased by 3,000 square feet. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) cited not much impact, as no large underground infrastructure is involved.

Noah Koretz compliments the applicant on the presentation. He asks about some buildings to the west and the applicant elaborates. Office spaces will be consolidated at this location and others will be retail space. Noah Koretz opines that the use of granite/textural treatment is exactly what he was talking about in the last presentation, making the project contextually appropriate while maintaining its uniqueness/modernity. This is seconded by Kirt Rieder.

Helen Sides asks about tree placement. Tree placement is discussed regarding the possibility of opening Essex Street to traffic, part time (they correspond with the existing trees today). Kirt Rieder is pleased with the changes to the screening of the transformers. He sees the screened transformers in the renderings which are helpful, but they are not annotated anyway. Mr. Rieder asks that the petitioner confirm, as what's out there today are four enclosures and the plans only show two. Mr. Streeter explains that the current existing switchbox and transformers were intended to be temporary; the wood structure was installed when they were headed in the direction of a much larger project, and the other transformers are on an old electrical service- 41/50 which will be upgraded to 13/8. Therefore, the bulk of the structure off Charter Street will be underground. One will be a splice box that will connect the service to the museum and the other will be the transformer itself. Even if money were the issue, the current service wouldn't power the museum in its expanded form.

Noah Koretz asks about the Yin Yu Tanghouse. That area becomes lawn again with the exception of the installation of trees that do not currently exist.

Kirt Rieder asks about street trees on both Charter and Essex Streets, he is happy the street trees are coming back. Initially he was concerned about structural soils; as he assumed it would be cu structural opposed to sand based, but the applicant has disabled much of his criticism. While the trees that are slated to be removed are not the greatest, they are the best trees along Essex Street. Concerned that the new trees may not accelerate and thrive as much as they should. Were other options considered, e.g. deep root. Mr. Rieder comments that irrigation is a great move. He suggests that the applicant forgo the metal ring and place a fully accessible service. While Mr. Rieder is a proponent of Ginkgo's, he is concerned we are overpopulating with Ginkgos, we may be at the tipping point of too many Ginkgo trees. Mr. Streeter notes they are cognizant of this believes Ginkgo trees are appropriate on Essex Street, but they are open to another species on Charter Street. Mr. Rieder agrees. The trees taken down on Charter were large canopy shade trees, and the best trees along there, thus suggests an Oak or something that could handle the drought to break up the species. Mr. Streeter comments there were a lot of Honey Locust along Charter and London Plain Trees. Mr. Rieder leaves it to the applicant to include something underutilized (not Honey Locust). He suggests that the applicant should plant trees of New England or Asia that are adaptable.

He also comments that the garden is not big enough (should be 3 times larger), but the applicant must work with what they are given. He feels there will be a lot of vegetation in a small spot, further editing will probably be required the process continues.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment.

Dean Rubin, a 17 Central St. abutter, affirms that the applicant has been wonderful in letting residents know of the plans, reflecting concerns on landscaping, and states that the community is supportive of them.

Noah Koretz asks how the garden space is accessed from the interior of the building and Mr. Streeter outlines pedestrian flow.

*A motion to continue to the October 20, 2016 meeting is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Dale Yale, and passes with all (9) in favor and none (0) opposed.*

- G. Location:** 93-95 CANAL STREET (Map 33, Lots 164, 165)  
**Applicant:** SCHIAVUZZO REALTY, LLC  
**Description:** A public hearing for a Site Plan Review in accordance with the Salem Zoning Ordinance Section 9.5 Site Plan Review and a Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit Sec. 8.1 Flood Hazard Overlay District. Specifically, the applicant proposes to repurpose the existing building and convert the candy factory into eight (8) residential units.

Here for the applicant is Mr. George Atkins of 65 Congress St. He describes the project as a conversion of a building used as a candy factory since 1935. The family, the Corcums, would like to sell the building for development. Frank Curtis is also present, as the engineer.

Mr. Atkins provides a history of the site as a B4 automotive zoned site. Originally a third story was proposed, but the idea abandoned after speaking with Ward Councilor Turiel and neighbors, due to privacy and parking issues. There is no change in footprint but one change to the rear of the second floor. A change of nonconforming use was presented to the ZBA and approved with variance required for parking. Councilor Turiel and the neighbors had issues with parking, drainage and multistory buildings occupied in rentals to students. Mr. Atkins states that Mr. Schiavuzzo has no connection to Salem State University, no secret plans to make it a dorm. This is presented as a residential condominium.

A supplemental submission has been made: a rendering from Canal St. is provided and the next two items are a site plan showing landscaping not in the original plan set. The project is now compliant with the number of trees required by zoning ordinance. There may be an error in elevations. The correction is noted.

The site plan is the result of a merger of two lots. The site is described and drainage discussed; the applicant will go before the Conservation Commission seeking a negative Determination. The City Engineer will review the project in lieu of peer review. A supplemental lighting plan will be provided. Also an easement will be filed upon completion of the project to accommodate the use of the shared driveway by residents of this project and the abutter. All snow storage will be temporary, as the site is too small to store snow on. One parking space is designated for this purpose; it will be controlled by Trustees.

Elevation and floor plans are straightforward. The project is designed to satisfy the demand for housing for young families and people who want to work in Salem; the location is ideal for that. He outlines development, current and potential, in the area, and additional reasons why it is ideal for that demographic. He cites a study done for the Planning Department that shows the need for housing in Salem as very high. Councilor Turiel wanted the applicant to address the loss of commercial space, but the need for housing trumps that requirement.

Mr. Atkins would like the Board's preliminary thoughts.

Kirt Rieder asks about parking spaces and trees, and the applicant elaborates. He makes some suggestions on trees, which are normally installed by the applicant then given to the City. The applicant may work with the Planning Department on that matter.

Some Board members comment on the exterior, that the buyers would look for an "urban industrial" feel, and that the project should be indicative of what the building is used for today. It is felt that the applicant may have better luck marketing one and two bedroom condos to empty nesters or younger couples, rather than three bedrooms to families. There is a distinct lack of outdoor amenities in the area so it would not appeal to the

latter. There is a need for more three bedroom residences in Salem, but the Board is not sure this is the proper location for them.

The developer notes that young couples were using the 3<sup>rd</sup> bedroom as an office in his other projects. However, Helen Sides feels that larger spaces would suit the height better, with an open floor plan and industrial sized windows; it would be a great space for commuters. Noah Koretz reiterates his feelings that the building should be showcased, not hidden. Kirt Rieder agrees, opining that it could be marketed as Salem Candy Company Condominiums; giving it an identity that others cannot compete with.

Carole Hamilton echoes the concern about the lack of space for 3 bedroom units. If there is no appropriate outdoor space, kids will play in the street – in this case, Canal St.

Elevations are further discussed.

Additional concerns:

- Exterior materials should be listed
- Plans should be annotated and material samples presented
- Information about heating, cooling and fans, and how the units will be screened, should be provided

Mr. Atkins again reassures the Board the units will not be rented to students and outlines the controls for that.

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

A motion to continue to the October 20, 2016 meeting is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Dale Yale, and passes with all (9) in favor and none (0) opposed.

### III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

#### A. September 1, 2016

Not available; to be reviewed next meeting

### IV. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

#### **Circle Hill Subdivision- Ken Steadman request for Tri-Party Agreement and release of lots for construction of Circle Hill Subdivision.**

This item is taken first. Ken Steadman is present and states that confusion about the subdivision has been resolved, so he is requesting that the three lots in question be released. Utilities are all installed, and lighting is in the process of being installed. Only the finish asphalt and sidewalk remain.

Erin Schaeffer states that the bond is for \$25,300 to ensure completion of the work outlined; the City Clerk of the Works has sent a letter to the Planning Department stating that the work outlined does remain; the City Planner agrees that the bond is a good amount to cover the cost of the remaining right of way for any repairs.

A motion to release the lots is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Matt Veno, and passes in a roll call vote with Ben Anderson, Carole Hamilton, Noah Koretz, Matt Veno, Helen Sides, Kirt Rieder and Dale Yale(7) in favor and none (0) opposed.

Bill Griset arrives at 7:11PM.

## V. ADJOURNMENT

*A motion to adjourn is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Dale Yale, and with all (9) in favor and none (0) opposed.*

The meeting ends at 10:07 PM.

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,  
Stacy Kilb, Substitute Recording Clerk

Approved by the Planning Board on 10/20/2016

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