

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

Board or Committee: Redevelopment Authority, Regular Meeting
Date and Time: Wednesday, February 13, 2019 at 6:00 PM
Meeting Location: 98 Washington Street, First Floor Conference Room
SRA Members Present: Gary Barrett, David Guarino, Dean Rubin
SRA Members Absent: Chair Grace Napolitano, Russ Vickers
Others Present: Tom Daniel – Director of Planning and Community Development, Kathryn Newhall-Smith
Recorder: Colleen Brewster

Mr. Guarino calls the meeting to order. Roll call was taken.

Projects Under Review

Executive Directors Report:

Daniel stated that;

1. Bridge at 211: The SRA holds a façade easement on the building and has supported their CPA application. They have been awarded additional funding and are applying for a grant from the state to that will get a report that will inventory and study the preservation challenges in the building and help them prioritize projects. The grant request for a study needs a letter of support from the SRA that Ms. Newhall-Smith will draft.
2. Witch City Mall: Ms. Newhall-Smith noted that Mr. Marley has been responsive, he is finalizing the signage design, and says he will be on track to meet with the SRA in March.

Mr. Guarino stated that the Board is now using electronic submission that require them to refer to their electronic devices during meetings.

Old Business

1. **5 Broad Street (former Salem Senior Center):** Update on developer selection

Mr. Bill Luster was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Luster provided an updated spreadsheet and revised plan and proposal. He stated that they've exhausted all options for increasing the bid price and they still haven't reached the minimum amount. He previously suggested the City reconsider the appraisal price, but the revised submittal contains numbers they can use for negotiations. They've reached a revised price of \$1M by adding saleable square footage to meet their investment criteria. They requested a meeting with the appraiser to make up some of the value, who previously used 12 ½ units because 1 unit is affordable. They'd also request a meeting with staff or Board member to discuss further in the next couple of weeks. Mr. Luster noted that rear recessed balconies are also being proposed. Want to revise it by the next SRA meeting. Mr. Rubin stated that both the Planning Department staff and SRA can provide comments within the next week. He asked if new balconies are likely to be approved by the Historic Commission. Mr. Luster replied that the dormers weren't original and the proposed is a

sensitive treatment that he hopes to get it approved. They have neighborhood support, which will make for a good continued discussion with the neighborhood and HSI.

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

1. Sidewalk at 285 Derby Street: Discussion on proposed location for Zagster bike sharing dock

Tom Devine, Salem Senior Planner, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Devine stated that Blue Cross Blue Shield is sponsoring several new bike share racks in the City including this one on the sidewalk in the urban renewal area. The sidewalk at this location is 90-foot-long along the length of the building and tapers down from 30-foot-wide to 10-foot-wide. A 10-bike station at 23-foot-wide is proposed; however, an 8-bike station will be installed. Two options have been provided, Option A is preferred, and Option B includes a future proposed outdoor dining area. Mr. Rubin asked if approval for both was preferred since the future use is an unknown. Mr. Devine replied yes. The bike rack won't be secured to the ground it would be easily moved.

Mr. Guarino opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Guarino closes public comment.

Rubin: Motion to approve Zagster bike location A and pre-approve location B should the City need to include future outdoor seating.
Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 3-0.

2. Derby Square Electrical Box: Discussion of alternative locations.

John Giardi, City of Salem Electrician, Ray Jodoin, and David Pabich, were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Giardi stated that the cabinet still needs power. The first proposed location was at the end of the ramp, which would block access to the ramp. The second proposed location was at the west side of the Derby Square beside the Distillery condos in a City-owned shrubbery bed but would have needed to remove 1 of the shrubs. It would have been placed between a window and the edge of the building, set approximately 18" away from the face of the building. The cabinet is 30-inches wide and 4-feet high and will require more power than before. The previous cabinet had six (6) 20-amp outlets which wasn't enough to power large scale events. He provided an accessories plan indicating that 1-foot outside the perimeter of the building is available to the City as a potential location. Mr. Pabich noted that this matter will be discussed at the next Distillery Condo meeting.

Mr. Rubin asked if the new cabinet could be placed within the information kiosk or below ground. Mr. Giardi replied that the kiosk has been removed, the proposed cabinet is the smallest size cabinet available, and a cabinet below ground would be costly. The additional options were to use Maria's or the Distillery Condo's electrical power but a mechanism to calculate the power used couldn't be measured properly. He noted that the final option was along Front Street, in front of the Distillery building near an existing tree. Locating it in the square on City land makes more sense.

Mr. Rubin asked if the box could be painted. Mr. Guarino asked if it could be located in or against a building where it is less obstructive. Mr. Giardi replied that a different meter would be needed if

they placed it in a building; the boxes can be painted. Mr. Pabich noted that the step can be repaired once the cabinet is relocated.

Mr. Guarino opens public comment.

William LeGault, 2 Orne Street. He is glad to see that the cabinet will be relocated and he likes the location behind the distillery. He noted that the section of landscape between Derby Square and Higginson Square in option 2 is named Follet Way.

Jody Slazy, Trustees at the Distillery. She heard about the alternative locations from their property manager, Robert Polansky. The residents don't want it outside their house in option 2 or outside their windows in option 3 along Front Street. The City should find another solution.

Mr. Guarino closes public comment.

Mr. Giardi stated that this topic will be on the agenda at the next condo meeting.

Mr. Guarino asked that the City, which hasn't come before the SRA before regarding electrical box locations within the Urban Renewal area, should do so in the future to make ensure they are places in appropriate locations.

3. 53 Charter Street (Grimshawe House): Discussion of redevelopment of existing structure.

Walter Beebe-Center, of Essex Restoration, was present to represent the owners and discuss the project.

Mr. Beebe-Center stated that he presented this to the Historic Commission the previous week to receive their blessing, despite not being within their jurisdiction. Mr. Guarino stated that he received a letter from the Chair Herbert and Councilor Furey, both of whom are in support of this project. Mr. Beebe-Center noted that 2 years prior the SRA approved of the proposed restoration, and the newly proposed work now includes a building addition on the opposite side of the house. The garage will remain; however, the garage roof will be replaced. They've used historic images for inspiration and are partly through the previous renovation work.

Mr. Rubin suggested they determine whether a single toilet would be enough for the first-floor offices. Mr. Beebe-Center replied that there are 3 offices, 1 bath, and a care-takers apartment, but he will ensure that the toilet facilities count meets the requirements.

Mr. Beebe-Center provided a property survey and noted the parking challenge on the lot. He noted that the lot was once joined with the lot next door and they'd like to join them again, but it is owned by the SRA. The Historic Commission and others have commented on the possible tragedy of saving this structure and having a new condominium structure built 9-10 feet away.

Mr. Rubin stated that as a neighbor and resident of 17 Central Street, he would normally recuse himself; however, no other Board member could attend tonight's meeting, but with pre-approval from the City Solicitor they will invoke the rule of necessity because a quorum is needed.

Mr. Guarino stated that the proposed changes will be good for the area and the city. Mr. Beebe-Center replied that the Owner bought it to keep it from being demolished when the PEM wanted to make it a parking lot.

Mr. Daniel requested the timeline. Mr. Beebe-Center replied that with DRB approval and warmer weather they will continue with the exterior. They documented the rear entry that was relocated to PEM's Phillips Library and they will build a replica if the PEM doesn't agree to allow it to return to the house. They will also restore the windows, replace the roofing, build the deck railing, add trim, siding and painting will start this spring and should take 1 year to complete.

Mr. Guarino opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Guarino closes public comment.

Barrett: Motion to refer the application to the DRB for review.
Seconded by: Rubin. Passes: 3-0

4. 281 Derby Street (Waters & Brown): Discussion of proposed façade renovations

Richard Griffin, Architect, was present to discuss the project. Lus Tanser of Waters & Brown of Waters & Brown was also present.

Mr. Griffin stated that the Owner would like to restore the rear of the building and refine the front. They will install new storefront glass with higher doors like Notch Brewery, replace a second-floor window and steel overhead door with a side by side swinging doors at the loading dock. A new post and beam style wood pergola will be installed at the rear door, wood will be installed over the second-floor black steel door with a new black metal frame. The pallet will be kept simple, the existing brick will remain, the storefront and windows will have black frames, and the new natural wood will add warmth.

Mr. Griffin stated that at the front façade the Waters & Brown sign will be rehung, they will reuse the existing bracket, and a new black and gold sign will match the existing. They will add accenting lighting for the blade sign, and LED lighting from the top and bottom to illuminate the main Waters & Brown sign. At the rear, they will add similar gold lettering directly on the brick and stenciling onto the new wood panel upper door. The entryway will install bluestone to add more life to the front entry instead of the existing concrete.

Mr. Rubin stated that a fresh new look is a great idea. Mr. Tanser replied that there will also be an interior remodel also to refresh the store. Mr. Guarino asked if there is more traffic at the rear entrance. Mr. Tanser replied that there is a new focus on the rear entrance since Notch brewery opened.

Mr. Guarino opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Guarino closes public comment.

Rubini: Motion to refer it to the DRB for review.
Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 3-0

5. 163-189 Washington Street (The Derby Restaurant): Discussion of proposed façade, patio, and signage renovations. Discussion on Outdoor Café Permit application

Attorney Joseph Correnti, of Serafini, Darling & Correnti, L.L.P., was present to discuss the project.

Atty. Correnti stated that this establishment was previously Tavern in the Square. It has been closed since early November and is currently being renovated with minor exterior changes. The proposed signage will be less than what previously existed, and the patio will remain, but with new lighting, lattice, different tables, and 4 gas fire pits instead of the gas lanterns previously used. The ownership team is the same, but the management has changed with a new recommitment to the brand image and to Salem. The restaurant should open in early spring.

Mr. Rubin asked if the gas outlets in the patio were existing. Atty. Correnti replied yes, and the lanterns will connect them to it. He asked that they show an accurate seating counts for the DRB since the numbers vary on the documents.

Mr. Daniel stated that a detectable barrier will be required for visually impaired pedestrians when the sidewalk is closed. Atty. Correnti replied that he will coordinate that. Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that another city council vote might be needed to allow that temporary sidewalk closure.

Mr. Guarino opens public comment.

Councilor Christine Madore. She hopes to revisit the issue of cutting off the sidewalk. Atty. Correnti replied that the sidewalk was closed because alcohol can't be brought across the public way to get to the patio. This issue was discussed for 9 months, blocking off the sidewalk will not change, and they don't want to have a revote on that issue; however, they will comply with the accessibility issues.

Mr. Rubin stated that the straight line of walking across the sidewalk to the Derby Street creates a jaywalking condition and continuing to force people around the patio will force people to cross at the crosswalk. Atty. Correnti replied that he will contact the architect for review any new regulations.

William LeGault, 2 Orne Street. He would be surprised if there were changes with the sidewalk, but the corner needs to be activated. As a member of Salem with disabilities he knows that the sidewalk around the patio doesn't meet the grade requirements and it may not be legal to force those with disabilities up the hill when the sidewalk they are on is level. They could install a similar railing to stop people from walking through but need to meet code requirements for that to treat the disabled fairly. He will add this item to the agenda for the Disabilities Commission.

Mr. Guarino closes public comment.

Barrett: Motion to refer it to DRB for review.

Rubin: Amended motion to request the applicant investigate if there is a sidewalk issue and determine if additional permission is required.

Seconded as amended by: Barrett. Passes: 3-0

5. 300 Derby Square (Casa Tequila): Discussion of proposed façade and patio renovations

Attorney Chad Carlorusso was present to discuss the project. Gilberto Reyes, Owner of Casa Tequila, and Lydia Szydłowska, Architect were also present.

Atty. Carlorusso stated that they went before the DRB and suggestion were proposed by the Board to show the whole plan, including signage, portico, and what will be restored.

Mr. Rubin stated that the previous restaurant has debated with neighbors regarding the volume of music on the patio. Mr. Reyes replied that he had a meeting with the neighbors and he's aware of their noise concerns. The restaurant will be family style with low-level live music during event only that will follow city guidelines. Atty. Carlorusso added that the restaurant will close at 10 or 11PM.

Mr. Daniel stated that he and Ms. Newhall-Smith attended the DRB meeting when the applicant presented their proposed design. The DRB requested visuals of the large façade compared to their signage dimension and where the signage would be in relation to the portico. Ms. Newhall-Smith reviewed the submission in relation to their standards. The proposed is a diversion from the standards and it reads as a Mexican restaurant; however, since this is a deviation from the standards, the Board should discuss if they want to comment on the direction of the proposed design before it goes to the DRB.

Mr. Guarino asked if the applicant is open to be more in fitting with the historic nature of the building. Ms. Szydłowska replied that the structure looks as if it comes from a different country and the Design Guidelines commented on "good design creates a place where people want to be, socialize, relax and shop" statement in the guidelines. The landscape and streetscape are eclectic and all the buildings in the area are different. She noted that Salem has immigrants from 57 foreign countries and the community is an accepting one.

Ms. Szydłowska stated that 2 gates, 2 entrances, including a side entrance are proposed. The colors selected pick up on the awning colors. They will use halo lighting along the perimeter with some color. The logo was modified from what was previously reviewed. Atty. Carlorusso wanted to blend in somewhat with the City and will use stamped concrete on the patio; however, they are receptive to any recommendations.

Mr. Guarino asked for the façade color. Ms. Szydłowska replied that the façade color will blend in with the brick, and will change the railing and perimeter and interior lighting for a warmer feel.

Mr. Daniel stated that changes to standards the applicant needs to explain why a deviation from the standards are being proposed. Atty. Carlorusso stated that Historic Commission guidelines and other guidelines govern their proposed design. Mr. Daniel noted that this structure is within the Urban Renewal area, and it's over 50 years old, so the Secretary of the Interior Standards and Salem's Historic Commission guidebook need to be followed. If the structure is less than 50 years old there is a different set of standards. The DRB needs to review the application but a case must be made for the deviation because a different design approach consistent with those standards would be preferred to maintain the historic fabric. Mr. Guarino stated that the main building was a warehouse from 1914 until after the big fire and the proposed design deviates from the historic fabric.

Guarino opens public comment.

William LeGault, 2 Orne Street. He stated that this building was originally the Brown Paper Company, then the Salem Paper Company. There was a single-story storefront on the building that he's been unsuccessfully searching for pictures of, unsuccessfully. He likes the proposed design but to maintain the historical accuracy a cinderblock building would need to be constructed. Mr. Daniel replied that a proposed structure appropriate with the standards is the focus, not historic preservation, and if not there should be a rationale as to why.

Mr. Guarino closes public comment.

Rubin: Motion to refer it to the DRB for review.
Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 3-0.

6. 25 Lynde Street: Discussion of residential redevelopment of existing structure

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti, Quinn, Grover & Frey, was present to discuss the project. Tom Mayo, of Tom Mayo Associates Architects, and Michael Becker and his associate were also present.

Atty. Grover provided revised plans as a result of comments from the Ms. Newhall-Smith, regarding the design guidelines. The main change was to eliminate 1 story and to preserve the historic integrity. The structure once housed a law office but it's now 3 residential units and the first-floor is still a commercial unit. It is a historic Georgian structure with rear additions that they want to demolish and reconstruct and convert into 5 residential units. There is proposed new covered garaged parking and a driveway on both sides of property. The original 3 parallel parking spaces will become 2 spaces. On the left side there will be three parking spaces under the bldg. 5 spaces are required and will be provided.

Mr. Mayo stated that the original design was overdone and has been dialed it back. Three parking spots are owned by others but can't use them and the applicant has the right of way for the driveway. There is another right of way on the right side where vehicles will pull into the garage. Directly off Lynde Street, 1 pull-in garage is proposed with 1 parallel parking garage spot behind it in the new addition with 2 living floors above. Atty. Grover noted that with the easement on both sides of the property, there is also 1 spot off site will be added but doesn't count in the property totals for zoning purposes.

Mr. Mayo stated that the original scheme called for 4 stories with another floor with a gambrel roof. With the top floor removed the structure will be down to the original size of building. The proposed gambrel roof creates an issue at the roofline that doesn't match. The applicant will keep the existing roof design over the bay but will setback the garage beyond an archway by 2-feet, on the first-floor level only, and a parallel parking spot on the side will be in a garage with replicated arches above. Dormers have been added to the top floor of the addition, and on the front elevation, shutters will be added to match the existing windows. The front roof will have shingles to match the existing and the flat roof will be built-up for proper drainage. There are 3 similar 3-story buildings on the street, and only rotten clapboards on the front façade will be replaced, to maintain the streetscape.

Mr. Rubin stated that this structure is over 50 years old. A modern renovation is planned for an old building which changes the structure and deviates from the guidelines.

Mr. Daniel noted that since the revised plans were just distributed at this meeting and Board hasn't reviewed it. Only 2 floors will remain on the front which will be the only portion of the building that will remain the same. The doghouse dormers are new, the windows will be replaced and realigned, and the top floor windows don't meet code. Mr. Becker stated that the top floor ceiling height is 6'1 and they want to raise it to provide more headroom and none of the existing windows currently meet the egress code requirements.

Mr. Guarino noted that the Planning Department staff reviews plans before-hand. Mr. Becker replied that Planning Department previously reviewed it.

Mr. Daniel stated that he is not comfortable with the new revision and a large garage for parallel parking is not typical for the Urban Renewal area. Atty. Grover asked whether the SRA would like

to continue the discussion to review the revisions or refer them to the DRB to refine the design. Mr. Guarino replied that they need time to review it. Mr. Daniel noted his reservations with the revised plans. Ms. Newhall-Smith added that the DRB wants to provide guidance only and not to design it and they have provided tool for standards to meet. The applicant can use those standards or provide a response for why they are deviating from the standards. Mr. Daniel agreed.

Mr. Mayo stated that they will review and incorporate new changes within the next two weeks. There are 2 legal residential units exist but the owner wants 5. Mr. Daniel stated that the design seems to focus on a place to park the cars. Mr. Mayo noted that the side garage doors are well hidden from the street view. Mr. Daniel stated that the SRA approves the general scheme but wouldn't know the end result if they approved it prior to DRB review.

Mr. Guarino stated that he is not a fan of front facing garages which would also be awkward for this neighborhood. The design is more about the parking and the visual sightline of a garage is negative. Mr. Daniel noted that the Historic Commission does not have jurisdiction over this property and the proposed design is outside the norm. Mr. Barrett agreed. Mr. Guarino stated that this area needs some attention, but the garages will stick out. He suggested the applicant work with staff and return to the SRA in March.

Mr. Mayo stated that they can leave the parking all uncovered; however, they wanted to minimize the number of cars out in the open. Mr. Rubin replied that exposed parking would be consistent with the neighborhood. Mr. Guarino agreed. Mr. Becker suggested carport style parking instead. Mr. Daniel replied that carports are not preferred. Mr. Rubin noted that the proposed would become the most modern structure on the street. Mr. Becker's associate asked the Board to visit the site to see how the structure has been added onto several times over the years and provide suggestion on how they can make it more pleasing.

Mr. Guarino opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Guarino closes public comment.

Rubin: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting of the SRA.
Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 3-0

7. 23 Summer Street: Discussion of residential redevelopment of existing structure

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti, Quinn, Grover & Frey, was present to discuss the project. Tom Mayo, of Tom Mayo Associates Architects, and Michael Becker were also present.

Atty. Grover stated that this Federal style building on corner of Summer and Norman Streets, and there were several rear additions over the years. The property is in a B5 zoning district and there are currently 5 residential condominiums and an addition of 5 more units are proposed for a total of 10. There will be 6 surface parking spots and 4 covered parking is proposed.

Mr. Mayo stated that the proposed addition will be in place of the current rear additions, with the same parking count, the additional parking will be in garages below the proposed addition. The existing landscaping will be maintained, there will be 6 legal outdoor spaces, and 2 double bay garages for 4 cars is proposed. The cornice and ridge line will remain with a hip roof extension at the addition. Two oriel windows are proposed in addition over the parking garages, to match the

existing. The window at the 3rd floor addition will meet the egress requirements and the rear façade of the top floor is a cut out from the roof and will provide a balcony. The new windows will match the original size. Mr. Guarino noted that the smaller windows at top floor of the original building. Mr. Mayo replied that they aren't up to code and may need to be replaced with casement windows.

Mr. Daniel asked if a roof deck is proposed above the original structure. Mr. Mayo replied no, the Federal style houses had a widows' walks, and the proposed railing its decoration and not usable.

Mr. Rubin stated that he has no issue with the proposed garages because of the commercial property next door has garages. Mr. Daniel noted the difference in this design because the historic house is preserved with the proposed additions. The garages are less of an issue and the DRB will provide comment on the design. He noted that Ms. Patti Kelleher can consult on the design for of the Historic Commission. Mr. Becker replied that he will apply to the Historic Commission for a demolition delay and will ask for their opinion on both properties (this one and 25 Lynde Street).

Mr. Guarino asked if parking space between the fence and the hedge are proposed. Atty. Grover replied that the property belongs to the autobody shop next door.

Mr. Guarino opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Guarino closes public comment.

Mr. Daniel noted that the Engineering Department will likely put in a temporary rotary at the corner to test feasibility – the intersection's traffic patterns will be changing in the future.

Rubin: Motion to refer to the DRB for review.
Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 3-0

8. Washington and Dodge Streets (Hampton Inn, Mixed-Use Development): Discussion and vote on proposed modifications to façade material and color changes

Mr. Daniel was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Daniel stated that the applicant went to the DRB to modify the brick color and window colors, because of the lack of color options. They didn't review the transition between the two different building where the horizontal banding increased due to some structural changes. The applicant must build what was approved and they were informed, and additional changes will need to return for review. They are on schedule with the construction of the structure.

Mr. Guarino opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Guarino closes public comment.

Rubin: Motion to approve changes as approved by the DRB.
Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 3-0.

1. ‘Crescent Lot’ Cooperative Agreement:

Mr. Daniel stated that the meeting last Thursday with the City Council’s Committee on Ordinances, Licenses and Legal Affairs went well, and Mr. Barrett and Mr. Guarino attended. There was discussion to model this agreement after the police station cooperative agreement, and one has been drafted and distributed. If after 18-months a developer hasn’t been found, the City will get the land back. Rep. Tucker were present to speak about how important this project is for both him and Sen. Lovely. This is one small step and the public sector plays an important role in making this feasible, along with the City and State, and they will likely need to use other public financing tools.

Mr. Rubin noted that it was clearly spelled out why this proposal was requested. Mr. Guarino added that extensions beyond the 18-month period can be requested. The meeting and representation were great, and Councilor Dominquez was pleased to see someone from the SRA at the meeting. This is a collaborative relationship and SRA members should attend City Council meetings when needed.

Rubin: Authorize the chair to sign a Cooperative Agreement.
Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 3-0.

Executive Session (if needed)

1. To consider the purchase, exchange, lease or value of real property located at 5 Broad Street, Salem, MA because an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the public body.

Rubin: Motion to request an Executive Session to discuss considering the revised proposal options for 5 Broad Street.
Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 3-0 to enter executive session.

The SRA entered executive session at 8:20PM.

Roll call to reconvene to open session at 8:30PM.
Barret, Guarino and Rubin. Passes: 3-0.

Minutes

A review of the minutes from the regular January 9, 2019 meeting were continued to the next regular meeting.

The Board discussed and agreed to the continued use of electronic submissions.

Adjournment

Rubin: Motion to adjourn the meeting.
Seconded by: Barrett. Passes 3-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 8:30PM.

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A §18-25 and City Ordinance Sections 2-028 through 2-2033.