



Peabody Planning Board Minutes
FOR AUGUST 15, 2024, MEETING
APPROVED SEPTEMBER 5, 2024

Planning Board Minutes

August 15th, 2024

Time: 7:00—7:32p.m.

Location: The Wiggin Auditorium and simulcast on Peabody Access TV.

Members Present: Mr. John Ford, Attorney Peter Arvanites, Mr. Roy Simoes, Mr. Joseph Gagnon, Dr. Judith Otto, Mr. Matthew Genzale, Mr. Sean Walsh

Others Present: Andrew Levin, Michael Votto

▶ Acting Chairman of the Board John Ford called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

A. Approval of Minutes: 8/1/2024

→**Motion:** Attorney Peter Arvanites—Move to approve the minutes of the August 1st, 2024, meeting.

→**Seconded:** Dr. Judith Otto

Unanimously approved and 1 Present.

B. ANR/Land Court: None.

C. Site Building Permit Plan Reviews:

15 NEWBURY STREET (Map 88, Lot 6)

This is an application by GR Development, LLC—seeking a site plan review to construct a car wash to be located at 15 Newbury Street, Peabody, MA. The proposed development involves a single 69,360 s.f. Parcel. The property is located in the {BR1} Zoning District, where a car wash use is permitted by Special Permit from the City Council. The development will include a 4,765 s.f. car wash building with a 135' long single tunnel wash, an equipment room, restroom, office area, and customer service area. To review plans and corresponding documents for this agenda item, please contact Andrew Levin, andrew.levin@peabody-ma.gov, 978-538-5783.

▶ CONTINUED FROM 8/1/2024

▶ ACTION CONTINUED TO 9/5/2024

● Mr. Andrew Levin refreshed the Board's memory on the application. The applicant had submitted a letter requesting to continue the application to the September 5th, 2024, meeting. Mr. Levin informed the Board that he plans on having a conversation with the applicant sometime between now and then—to see where the project stands.

10 LOWELL STREET (Map 85, Lot 185)

This is an application by MRG Construction Management Inc.—seeking a site plan review to renovate and construct an addition to an existing commercially developed property within the footprint of the existing building located at 10 Lowell Street, Peabody, MA. The property is located in the {BC} Zoning District—a 4,597 s.f. Parcel. To review plans and corresponding documents for this agenda item, please contact Andrew Levin, andrew.levin@peabody-ma.gov, 978-538-5783.

● Mr. Matthew Genzale recused himself from the 10 Lowell Street agenda item since he's the applicant on the project. Acting Chairman of the Board John Ford asked if Mr. Genzale would be making the presentation. Mr. Genzale confirmed.

●Mr. Matthew Genzale {MRG Construction Management-3 Centennial Drive, Peabody, MA 01960} informed the Board that he was here tonight on behalf of the 10 Lowell Street application {MJV Capital, which is Mr. Michael Votto}. Mr. Genzale explained that they are looking to have their “Site Plan Review” done for the addition and renovation at 10 Lowell Street—working within the existing foundation and footprint. The vertical addition is approximately 2,970 s.f., bringing the total of the building to 10,670 s.f. Mr. Genzale explained that the vertical addition is the reason for being before the Board tonight. Mr. Genzale then proceeded to give an overview of the project. The proposed building will include a new two-story Brodie’s with third and fourth-floor Salon Suite businesses above. The building will have a new four stop passenger elevator, new sprinkler and fire alarm systems and ADA compliant access from the sidewalk—construction is being completed with fully designed stamped architectural, civil utilities plan, MEP and sprinkler firearm drawings—which have all been reviewed and shared with Mr. Andrew Levin as part of the application process. Mr. Genzale also mentioned that two days ago he met with the Board of Health, Engineering, Fire Department and PMLP—feedback was received regarding the Plan, and we were hoping with the Board here tonight to answer any questions, and to seek approval of the “Site Plan.”

●Mr. Andrew Levin informed the Board that he has the presentation that was provided in the Board’s packets if the applicant would like to go through. Mr. Levin also believes that Mr. Ryan Tumi is on as well, if he needs to speak. Mr. Matthew Genzale explained that Mr. Tumi is a Project Manager at his company, so if there’s any technical questions, Mr. Tumi would be more suitable to answer since he is more familiar with the data. Mr. Genzale then proceeded to go over the impact statement that was prepared as part of the application—traffic flow and circulation, this proposed renovation in addition to the subject property doesn’t impact, affect or change any traffic flow or circulation in the area [no site work to speak of aside from utility plan—bringing a new domestic and fire service sprinkler line into the building—it’s a zero-lot line property for the most part]. The environment of the project does not propose any increase to the impervious surfaces on its site—we’re working with the footprint of the existing building—because the brook runs below a portion of the building the project had sought and received determination of applicability from the City of Peabody’s Conservation Commission, so that part is behind us. As for municipal services, we feel as though the proposed renovation and addition will increase the square footage of the building—as mentioned the businesses that will be housed will provide numerous [probably 40-50 food service, hospitality, hair stylist and cosmetology] employment opportunities once completed. Mr. Genzale noted that the architect and design teams’ intent was to complement the character of downtown Peabody—reinforce the qualities of the buildings located downtown and create a new destination in Peabody Square [we hope it’s a catalyst for other projects in the area]. Mr. Genzale then utilized plans/renderings to paint-a-picture of what the project will look like once complete—at length.



5. SECOND FLOOR PLAN



General Overview
 - OVERALL GSF: 18,879 +/-
 - FLOOR-1: 3,886 GSF +/-
 - FLOOR-2: 2,873 GSF +/-
 - FLOOR-3: 2,381 GSF +/-
 - FLOOR-4: 2,381 GSF +/-



Site Landscaping, Lighting and Amenity
 Site landscape and lighting characteristics shall enhance the building's architectural and pedestrian-friendly environment and provide a comfortable quality of amenity.

A. Courtyards and Walkways
 Site and street edges shall contribute to the character of the adjacent street and provide a consistent, pedestrian-friendly environment. Site and street edges shall be designed to provide a high quality of amenity and provide a high quality of amenity.

B. Pedestrian Amenities
 Amenities shall include the installation of street furniture, including benches, and provide a high quality of amenity and provide a high quality of amenity.

C. Landscaping
 Landscaping shall be designed to provide a high quality of amenity and provide a high quality of amenity.



Site Landscape, Lighting and Amenity

The landscape and lighting characteristics and features are designed to provide a pleasant, friendly and accessible and provide a consistent quality of amenity.

A. Coordinate Site and Street Edge

Site and street edges shall contribute to the character of the adjacent street and provide a consistent landscape and lighting design that is consistent with the character and lighting of the adjacent street.

B. Integrate Amenities and the Streetscape

Amenities and landscape characteristics of public spaces shall be coordinated with adjacent streetscape and provide a consistent quality of amenity and lighting that is consistent with the character and lighting of the adjacent street.

The lighting design shall provide a consistent quality of amenity and lighting that is consistent with the character and lighting of the adjacent street.



Site Landscape, Lighting and Amenity

The landscape and lighting characteristics and features are designed to provide a pleasant, friendly and accessible and provide a consistent quality of amenity.

A. Coordinate Site and Street Edge

Site and street edges shall contribute to the character of the adjacent street and provide a consistent landscape and lighting design that is consistent with the character and lighting of the adjacent street.

B. Integrate Amenities and the Streetscape

Amenities and landscape characteristics of public spaces shall be coordinated with adjacent streetscape and provide a consistent quality of amenity and lighting that is consistent with the character and lighting of the adjacent street.

The lighting design shall provide a consistent quality of amenity and lighting that is consistent with the character and lighting of the adjacent street.

10. LIGHTING AND ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER



Site Landscape, Lighting and Amenity

The landscape and lighting characteristics and features are designed to provide a pleasant, friendly and accessible and provide a consistent quality of amenity.

A. Coordinate Site and Street Edge

Site and street edges shall contribute to the character of the adjacent street and provide a consistent landscape and lighting design that is consistent with the character and lighting of the adjacent street.

B. Integrate Amenities and the Streetscape

Amenities and landscape characteristics of public spaces shall be coordinated with adjacent streetscape and provide a consistent quality of amenity and lighting that is consistent with the character and lighting of the adjacent street.

The lighting design shall provide a consistent quality of amenity and lighting that is consistent with the character and lighting of the adjacent street.

●Mr. Matthew Genzale then asked if there were any questions or comments. Mr. Sean Walsh then asked if Mr. Genzale could speak a little about the access to the Brook—any protections around the Brook, and access to the building that might interact there after construction. Mr. Genzale explained that the Brook runs approximately five feet beneath the building with cantilevers over the Brook—the area was significantly improved by the work already done—we’ve poured a slab on deck over the cantilevers over the Brook—Mr. Genzale thinks that it’s a dramatic improvement to the underside of that. The old building was wood, and you know in severe trouble. Mr. Genzale thinks that as a result the completion of the project is going to be an improvement to the protection of the Brook—during construction we are protecting it per the instruction of the Conservation Commission—we’ve got panels and fabric collecting any debris that might fall during construction, so when it’s complete, Mr. Genzale doesn’t think that there’ll be any impact. Mr. Walsh’s follow-up question to Mr. Genzale [based on the renderings] was concerning the height of the fence. Mr. Genzale explained that there was a fence on the Park side [the City side], but there is no fence on Brodie’s property. Mr. Walsh then inquired about roof access on the shorter side of the building. Mr. Genzale explained that on the third floor there’ll be five windows [already framed and open] and a man door that’s going from the third floor next to the bathrooms out to the low roof for service of the exhaust fan and cleaning of duct work that needs to get done. Roof access to the high roof will be via the back emergency staircase, when you get to the top there’s a hatch on the upper landing.

●Dr. Judith Otto pointed-out that the existing footprint encroaches on the railroad property, is that a concern at all. Mr. Matthew Genzale confirmed that they are on the property, however it was an existing condition many, many months ago when we had the first survey done—it was revealed to the project team [existing non-conforming fact that we just had to work around]. Mr. Genzale expressed that at the moment there is no need for concern since the railroad track is currently not running. Mr. Genzale believes that the railroad successfully operated without impacting the building [aside from many years ago when a dumpster got pushed into the side of the building, up at the front]. Dr. Otto’s follow-up question concerned the negative determination from the Conservation Commission—since work has been going on there now for many months, Dr. Otto is curious as to the full status of the permitting. Ordinarily, the Board would be making a recommendation for the Building Inspector to allow “permit-to-issue,” but that doesn’t really hold in this case. Mr. Genzale responded as such, originally, we sought a “building permit” for structural work at the end of last year, which was granted [a lot of improvements were done to the interior soil conditions and how to reinforce the existing foundation from within]. Mr. Genzale continued to elaborate on the subject at length.

●Mr. Joseph Gagnon commented that he had the exact same question about the easement—whether or not you had one from the railroad, and since that was answered, I just wanted to follow-up and say that it looks like a great project, beautiful building, and it’s certainly an improvement to that building as well as the surrounding area, so at the end of the day—Mr. Gagnon looks forward to going there and enjoying a good meal. Mr. Roy Simoes noted that he agreed with Mr. Gagnon’s comments and expressed his opinion [you took a dilapidated building, and from the renderings—Mr. Simoes can’t even explain the development here—how good this is going to be]. Mr. Simoes then asked about the dumpsters. How does the trash get in-and-out of here. Mr. Matthew Genzale explained that there’s an existing partial dumpster enclosure that is still there, it’s just a small, fenced area with a pad underneath it for where the old dumpsters were. The intent was to find the appropriate way to do a more substantial dumpster pad enclosure in the exact same footprint. Mr. Simoes wanted to know if it was where it used to be when there was two different businesses there [Mr. Simoes elaborated]. Mr. Michael Votto explained that the dumpsters are located behind the building. Mr. Simoes then asked how does a truck get back there. Mr. Votto noted that it’s not actually a dumpster, it’s individual totes that get rolled out to the street and then get picked-up by the trash trucks [very similar to what they do in the Northend]. Mr. Simoes then inquired about the schedule of trash pick-ups. Mr. Votto explained that prior to the renovation the frequency of trash pick-up was around four times a week. The discussion on trash removal continued between Mr. Votto and Mr. Simoes.

●Mr. Andrew Levin informed the Board that he met with the applicant and their team on Tuesday as part of “Construction Review Committee.” Mr. Levin then listed the other departments in attendance at that meeting and relayed their comments on the project at length to the Board [PMLP, Fire, Conservation, Board of Health and DPS]. Mr. Levin explained that the utility connections will now be on the front—there’s a water and sewer line that’s being put in across the street towards the Courthouse Plaza. Mr. Levin then continued with his synopsis on the standing of the project with other departments. Mr. Matthew Genzale then interjected and explained that there is no new sanitary line there’s just two water lines [2-inch for domestic, and a 4-inch for the fire service]. Acting Chairman of the Board John Ford then asked if there were any questions or comments, hearing none, he’d entertain a motion.

→**Motion:** Attorney Peter Arvanites—Move that the Board approve the application for “Site Plan Review” to renovate and construct an addition to an existing commercially developed property—applicant is MRG Construction Management, Inc.

→**Seconded:** Mr. Sean Walsh

Roll call: 6 to 0.

D. Appointments: None.

E. Subdivision Board Action: None.

F. Correspondence:

1. 10 Lowell Street {Brodie’s Pub}: General Design Overview Plan Packet.
 - i. Proposed Building Renovation Plan.
 - ii. Brodie’s Pub Concept Drawings Plan.
 - iii. Proposed Utility Connection Site Plan.

G. City Council: None.

H. Other Matters before the Board: None.

●Mr. Andrew Levin gave an update to the Board on Dr. Judith Otto’s subcommittee meetings reviewing the “Rules & Regulations” of subdivision control—there have been two meetings, should Board members who are not on the subcommittee wish to participate, please forward your questions and comments to him and he’ll bring them with him to the meetings. Acting Chairman of the Board John Ford then extended an invitation to anyone who wants to sit in on the meetings—they take place an hour early on the day of the Planning Board’s meetings. All are welcome.

I. Adjournment: 7:32p.m.

→**MOVE to adjourn:** Mr. Roy Simoes

→**Seconded by:** Dr. Judith Otto

Unanimously approved.

An audio and visual recording of the meeting is available by following the link below or copying this link into an internet browser: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Uw1U2X0aBmI> .