



CITY OF SALEM PLANNING BOARD

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday March 30, 2023, at 6:30 p.m. via remote access. Public participation was possible via Zoom video and conference call.

Chair Griset opens the meeting at 6:30 pm.

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Bill Griset (Chair), Kirt Rieder (Vice Chair), Sarah Tarbet, Tom Furey, Carole Hamilton, Zach Caunter, Jonathan Berk, Helen Sides (8)

Absent: Josh Turiel (1)

Also in attendance: Elena Eimert, staff planner, Cassie Moskos, senior planner

II. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. Location: 266 Canal Street (Map 32, 0038), 282 Canal Street (Map 32, Lot 0037), 286 Canal Street (Map 32, Lot 0036), 282 Rear Canal Street (Map 23, Lot 0144), and 2 Kimball Road (Map 32, Lot 0102)**

Applicant: Joseph Correnti f/b/o Canal Street Station, LLC

Description: A continuance of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of Joseph Correnti f/b/o Canal Street Station, LLC, for the property located at 266 Canal Street (Map 32, 0038), 282 Canal Street (Map 32, Lot 0037), 286 Canal Street (Map 32, Lot 0036), 282 Rear Canal Street (Map 23, Lot 0144), and 2 Kimball Road (Map 32, Lot 0102) in the RC, B2, and I Zoning Districts for Site Plan Review in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 9.5 Site Plan Review, 7.3 Planned Unit Development Special Permit, 8.2 Entrance Corridor Overlay District, and Section 8.1 Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit and Section 37 of the Salem Code of Ordinances, Stormwater Management Permit.

The applicant proposes to redevelop portions of the parcels located at 266, 282, 282R & 286 Canal Street and 2 Kimball Road into a multi-use Planned Unit Development consisting of residential units, 20% of which will be affordable, commercial space along Canal Street, and over 9 acres of open space. The redevelopment of the property will include razing and removal of all existing buildings and infrastructure, construction of five new buildings, which total approximately 73,615 square feet, 250 residential units, 117 surface parking spaces, 196 garage parking spaces, and supporting infrastructure.

Attorney Joe Correnti is representing the Applicant. The team has filed a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the Conservation Commission. Been to DRB twice and getting input. Traffic and civil engineering peer reviews are underway.

Also in attendance are Bob Uhlig, Chris Koeplin David Seibert, Scott Cameron, Marc Thanos.

Bob Uhlig, *landscape architect, Halvorson Tighe & Bond Studio*, provides updates based on staff and board feedback. Building A is adjacent to Canal (south end of site). Building B-E are on the north side of the site. There is a two-way egress in and out of the site. Between buildings B-E, there will be a pedestrian boulevard. The Salem Rail Trail is a border for the property as well. Building A is on the southside, streetlights are on east side of street as are utility poles with overhead utility wires. We are looking to create a unified streetscape. The northeast corner of building A will house the leasing office and gym. The southwest corner is anticipated to play host to a café. Adjacent to community open space is a blue bike station and a rest space for rail trail. Again in the southwest corner of the building, anticipating having two tiers of plantings rather than lawn. There will be a rhythm of single trees and then paired trees along the street and the idea is that the light poles on the other side of the street are not sufficient. There will be supplemental lighting as well. Along the north, boulder configurations will add more New England character. Along Canal Street, there will be 25 feet between pairs of trees with bench groupings between the pairs are 40 feet on center. The exact type of tree is still up in the air but will be ornamental, the team will discuss this with the Tree Warden. In the community open space (between buildings A&B), there will be a seating and planting buffer, *images of the seating elements are shown*. In the Boulevard space, (Buildings B-D), there will be trees on the east side, west of that is shared pedestrian and vehicular space. Unit pavers in the ground will indicate that this is a pedestrian environment. Paving treatment carried across entries to parking areas and to buildings D & E. There are 28 bicycle accommodations between buildings and accommodations for each parking space underneath the building, around 300 total parking spaces. Cross sections of area between the building shown. Have relocated a pedestrian area closer to the rail trail and have introduced access to Rosie's Pond with searing area. Unit pavers in the drive aisle show that it is a turnaround area. There is differentiation between pedestrian and vehicle areas. Slideshow continues showing the pedestrian and vehicular movement through the site.

David Seibert, *project architect, BKA Architects*. Modifications have been made to cladding and colorization across the five buildings. The base material is darker and an emphasis on calming down the façade in general and therefore some of the cladding has been simplified (deletion of corrugated metal and emphasis on retail sign band). Have incorporated the landscape scheme into the new rendering. Lighting at the roof deck level has been simplified. Removed balconies at the facade on building B. and lightened up other buildings. Simplified the corner at Kimball. Same modifications across the buildings but the retail in building A is less prominent. On building A, the hue of the base is more controlled.

Planning Board Questions

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

- Tom Furey finds that with an upcoming mayoral election it feels like this project is on the fast track to approval before the next mayor takes office. Mr. Furey feels the building shows no Salem character and that it could be anywhere on the North Shore. It is not an example of smart development. The developers should go back to the drawing board and spread out the properties. We should take no new vote until there is a better project.
- Jonathan Berk likes the better blending of the urban setting. Mr. Berk has concerns regarding the amount of parking and would like to have the number decreased from the planned 313 parking spots. Most of the ground floor is surface parking or at grade parking and that tends to a less welcoming public realm.
- Sarah Tarbet agrees with Jonathan Berk and finds the property still quite vehicle oriented. Who will be walking if there is a way to bring in a car? Ms. Tarbet would like more engagement with Rosie's Pond. Is there a reason it is such a harsh delineation?
 - Attorney Correnti states that the Applicant team is working with the Conservation Commission and that the team will need relief from them to further engage with Rosie's Pond. The team is trying to be respectful on how close we go and how much we build. We continue to look at improving pedestrian access to the property.
 - Chris Koeplin offers that this buffer is a small retaining wall and is something that the Conservation Commission likes, and they would actually prefer a fence in this area. Kirt Rieder asks if this is between buildings C and E. Mr. Koeplin responds that it is from the wetlands on the west and north sides. *The site plan is reshared to enhance this discussion.* Scott Cameron, civil engineer, Morin-Cameron Group, states that it is 4-feet high max and will undulate at the base with a flat top.
 - Kirt Rieder finds that it would be helpful for Halverson to pull in the 1-foot contours from Engineering. There is a dramatic topography behind C & and along Kimball Road. And especially along the rail trail, it is pretty much a wet swale right now. We haven't talked about the trees in the public way of the rail trail. Bob Uhlig reminds that the planting of trees will help to integrate the rail trail as well.
- Kirt Rieder is surprised at the acute angles of the metal grill work. The beige color is causes flashbacks to drugstores and would like to see a gray palette. He would also like more trees and less benches along Canal Street as no one really wants to sit facing Canal Street. Having a hard time seeing the benefits of 4 benches outweighs the benefits of 2 more trees. He also strongly recommends spelling out CSS (Canal Street Station). Likes the catenary lights.
- Kirt Rieder likes the recurring bands of pavers. Do they have vertical changes to slow car velocity?

- Bob Uhlig says the unit pavers are flush and that the team has debated if it is a mountable curb or not. Kirt recommends increasing the . How do you enforce parking in this area? Is worried about opportunistic parking. Does not love the asphalt. Likes the selective use of unit pavers. Likes single trees. Gets the smaller trees on Canal Street 3-feet back from the sidewalk. IT would be useful to reach out to the arborist. Think about using larger shade trees.
 -
- Kirt Rieder questions regarding the Kimball Road sidewalk.
 - Scott Cameron Kimball Road dives down and we went with a low impact stormwater solution. The Edge of road is a biofiltration swale. Runoff will go down Kimball Road into the swale
 - Kirt Rieder finds that the Conservation Commission will have conditions. We are building the site up again. There is some kind of isolated flooding. High pint is at building A and will slope back to a bioretention area with a meadowy pollinator vibe.
- Carole Hamilton is concerned about the feeling of the space between buildings. It seems cavernous and cold. She is also not crazy about the covering for parking areas. It doesn't feel welcoming. And here is no block between the roadway and where you are allowing parking. Also concerned with filling the entire area a good foot. Are you providing any additional flood storage? This area really floods. Scott Cameron allows that they haven't gotten in the technical presentation on that yet. There are mitigating measures we haven't shared yet. We also talked about that we would like more interaction with the wetland area. Scott Cameron says that they have made changes to the plans and have opted to move a crossing to the back of the property.

Tonight's presentation didn't really address interaction with Rosie's Pond . Mr. Cameron shares a slide indicating. Ms. Hamilton asks if they will be dealing with the overgrown vegetation. Mr. Koeplin says that they must clear everything with the Conservation Commission, they want to clear as much as they can conserving the site is a wetland area.

Ms. Hamilton further supports Mr. Rieder's comments on the community open space.

- Kirt Rieder allows that it is good to see improvements in this area, but it would be better if the parking count were reduced. Mr. Rieder follows with the mention of birch trees on train tracks and the importance of being selective on what is pulled out. The trees on the tracks will deter people from accessing Rosie's Pond this way and will push use of the pavement.
- Helen Sides finds that the project looks better each time it is presented. She likes the density of Canal Street. She also reminds that the large lettering on the wall sign does not meet the standards for the city.

- Zach Caunter echoes support for Jonathan's comments on parking. Wondering about the possibility of the raised crosswalk between the buildings on the boulevard. This is inviting problems. Scott Cameron says that it will be more of a speed table for traffic calming and stormwater management. Chris Koeplin say that the Design Review Board (DRB) moved stop signs. Mr. Caunter is concerned that there is not enough space in the turnaround. Will this work and is there enough space? Mr. Cameron replies that it is designed for larger SUVs and pickups. Larger vehicles like Amazon trucks or box trucks will need to do a 3-point turn.
- Kirt Rieder asks how wide the planting strip is between façade and concrete pavement – it is 4 feet.
- Chair Griset wonders why we have a nice buffer on buildings B & D but nothing on the other side. Bob Uhlig says that the team thinks of it as a shared pedestrian and vehicular space. Chair Griset questions requiring pedestrians to make a safety decision, Mr. Uhlig states that they are making enough moves to ensure cars move slowly. Kirt Rieder says that you could duplicate and make the whole thing more symmetrical. He worries that this will be a shared travel lane.
- Elena Eimert jumps in to remind the board that the project is a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and that the amount of parking is at the discretion of the Planning Board.

Public Comment

There are 3 written comments in the SharePoint file since the last meeting on this project. Comments available are from Ben Anderson, Emmett Cohen, Jeff Cohen. [Public Comment](#)

Polly Wilbert

7 Cedar Street

This looks like an office complex. It makes Canal Street seem like a different part of Salem. Buildings on Canal Street are dead zones. This is not kid or family friendly. Are these adjunct dormitories for Salem State? There is not a walkable nearby park. There is a lost opportunity to have usable greenspace. Philosophically, the Planning Board needs to think about who this is designed for. The balconies should be offset, otherwise you would feel you have no privacy. How are the residents interfacing with the MBTA bus stop? Don't see any real entrance way planned for building A. There is no functional safe areas for food delivery, Ubers, Lyfts, etc. There are very few amenities in this area. The site is car driven or delivery driven. If you reduce parking, we aren't taking into consideration the reality. The Boulevard on the site is a noise trap.

Planning Board Comments

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

Sarah Tarbet is concerned about the lack of activity and engagement with building A. There should be more commercial space. Is there any way to have more building A resources with less parking?

Motion to continue to the April 20, 2023 meeting is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Helen Sides, and passes in 8-0 in a roll call vote.

Bill Grisct	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Carole Hamilton	Y
Zach Caunter	Y
Jonathan Berk	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Kirt Rieder	Y
Sarah Tarbet	Y

III. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

A. Presentation and Discussion of updates to the City of Salem Subdivision regulations

- Cassie Moskos, senior planner, presents the updates to the City of Salem Subdivision regulations. This will be a high-level presentation and discussion this evening. Cassie Moskos shares the memo sent to PB prior to the meeting.
 - Section 1 is the legalese of the document. It is standard language in many zoning/subdivision ordinances.
 - Section 2 captures definitions. Several definitions were added to the document to capture more of the essence and information in the document.
 - Section 3 is general administration. A lot of this language comes from the state code, adequate access; how applicants can request waivers, etc. Mostly reviewed by the City's Legal Department. The Planning Board has the ability to revise regulations, which this is, but not the zoning ordinance.
 - Section 4 is new and outlines things that apply to all types of applications. If the board needs to see it on ANRs or preliminary subdivision plans, it will be on the list in section 4. Going forward, we will just reference section 4. Kirt Rieder reminds everyone that the Planning Board has only come across 3 subdivisions in the last 10 or 15 years (reiterating that this is a nice opportunity but not really a board priority).
 - Section 5 outlines the ANR process and what is needed for that
 - Section 6 refers to preliminary subdivisions

- Section 7 refers to definitive subdivisions which has more regulations. It takes the process we do now and puts it into a space for people to find and understand better.
- Section 8 lays out technical details and is where we get into the tree lawns and amenity strips and how wide lanes need to be. Basically, how do they build the subdivision.
- Sections 9/10 refer to processes already in place. This makes the language and process more transparent and visible.
- This takes our actual practices and puts it down
 - Kirt Rieder comments that structural soils can be done anywhere but they are more expensive. I am for them having the ability to do this. Developers will be resistant to this.
 - The Board will reach out to Cassie directly. Will return in May with a final draft.

B. Updates from Staff

- Elena Eimert states that the full draft of the Subdivision Regulations are available in SharePoint.
- Remote meetings will continue until March of 2025, and it remains the will of the Planning Board to stay remote.
- Board members must complete their ethics training if they have not already done so.
- Please let Elena Eimert know of any upcoming absences so that Applicant teams can make decisions.
- Kirt Rieder shares that Elena Eimert has forwarded a notice of the Flood Hazard Overlay District (FHOD) public meeting and this eased out of this board. This board was unable to make comments about the Amazon distribution center. He asks whether there should be a different mechanism for the Planning Board to have more to say on the FHOD. Sarah Tarbet agrees, and she and Kirt are looking for a straw poll, of sorts, board members are to email the two of them.
- Tom Furey asks if there progress on the Cataldo facility? Elena Eimert has nothing new to share since the last update. Chapter 91 is in place, and they are working through the building permit pre-conditions.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of the March 16, 2023 regular Planning Board minutes

Motion to approve the March 16, 2023 regular Planning Board minutes is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Jonathan Berk, and passes 8-0 in a roll call vote.

Bill Grisct	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Carole Hamilton	Y
Zach Caunter	Y
Jonathan Berk	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Kirt Rieder	Y
Sarah Tarbet	Y

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made by Helen Sides, and seconded by Sarah Tarbet, and passes 8-0 in a roll call vote.

Bill Grisct	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Carole Hamilton	Y
Zach Caunter	Y
Jonathan Berk	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Kirt Rieder	Y
Sarah Tarbet	Y

Adjourned at 8:20 pm
Approved by the Planning Board on March 30, 2023