

**City of Salem Massachusetts  
Public Meeting Minutes**

**Board or Committee:** Redevelopment Authority, Regular Meeting  
**Date and Time:** Wednesday, February 14, 2018 at 6:00 pm  
**Meeting Location:** 120 Washington Street, Third Floor Conference Room  
**SRA Members Present:** Chair Grace Napolitano, David Guarino, Dean Rubin,  
Gary Barrett  
**SRA Members Absent:** Russell Vickers  
**Others Present:** Tom Daniel – Director of Planning and Community  
Development, Tom Devine  
**Recorder:** Colleen Brewster

Chair Grace Napolitano calls the meeting to order at 6:10PM. Roll call was taken.

**Projects Under Review**

---

**Executive Directors Report:**

- Mr. Daniel introduced Matt Coogan as the Principal Planner.
- Mr. Daniel stated that the ULI panel report should be ready in a couple weeks. Barry Abramson let him know that the Panelists enjoyed their experience and they can help with marketing the projects. Mr. Rubin asked if the Panelists thought that Salem was unique. Mr. Daniel replied that Mr. Abramson was on a 2009 panel discussion for Salem and he noted that Salem listened and implemented what they said which isn't always done.
- District Court: Daniel stated that the project is continuing with its Planning Board approval process, and will return to that Board on February 14<sup>th</sup>. It's going well and they hope to wrap up with it in March. They are submitting a request for City Council approval on the Tax Increment Exemption (TIE) agreement. It will be introduced to the Council on Feb 22<sup>nd</sup>, it will be discussed by the public after that date, and they expect it to go before the City Council for final approval on March 8<sup>th</sup>. The process was nearly complete in November but the DHCD wanted a few items from their boiler plate language adjusted, which have been addressed.
- Superior Court and County Commissioners Buildings: Mr. Daniel stated that there has not been a meeting with the state stakeholders since December. Mayor Driscoll, Senator Lovely, and Representative Tucker will meet with Secretary Galvin to discuss the project and amend the legislation. They are building from the ULI panel recommendations and thinking about how to structure the RFP process and the Tabernacle Church has asked to be included. They applied to Mass Development for technical assistance for structuring an RFP that includes both private and public parties. They received a positive read but no formal decision has been made.
- Bridge at 211: Mr. Daniel stated that he reached out to them and they are considering being included in the process. They have a building and a mission for an arts and cultural events but they don't need all of their space.
- Phillips Library: Mr. Daniel stated that there is a work group in place to look at how to increase access to the collection and public use of the building. Their next meeting will be in Rowley and they are starting with the Historic Commission since it's within their district.
- Witch City Mall signage: Mr. Daniel stated that Amanda Chiancola has reached out to them and hasn't heard back, but she will continue to follow-up with them.

- Mr. Daniel stated that they will move into the new City Hall Annex on April 1<sup>st</sup> which will have first floor public meeting rooms.
- Mr. Rubin stated that Ledger's trash enclosure has been installed.

## **Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review**

---

- 1. 203-209 Essex Street (Hotel Salem):** Project update on remaining façade restoration and related SRA approvals (No vote required, project update only)

No one was present to discuss the project. Mr. Daniel stated that his office will follow-up with them since they are supposed to present the SRA with monthly updates. A number of exterior improvements have not yet been completed, they received a temporary certificate of occupancy when they opened but they are aware that some items aren't in compliance and the build department is working with both the SRA and Hotel Salem. They agreed to update the SRA at each monthly meeting until the items have been completed, such as the installation of their sign ban, cleaning up of the brick façade, and repairs and/or stabilization of the cornice will be done, etc.

- 2. 30 Church Street (East Regiment Beer Company):** Discussion and vote on proposed deck and entryway area.
  - a. Discussion on proposed term sheet of license agreement**

Josh Engdahl was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Daniel stated that they had previously come before the SRA. The SRA approved the terms of the licensing agreement and authorized Chair Napolitano to execute a draft licensing agreement. They were waiting to receive the draft back from Atty. Scott Grover, finalized from the City Solicitor, and circulated to the SRA for comments prior to its official execution. The applicant is also waiting for the Licensing Board to complete their permitting before proceeding with the licensing agreement.

Mr. Daniel stated that the design for outdoor seating and signage was presented to the DRB twice before and again at a special meeting held last night, February 13<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Coogan stated the special meeting held last night was to keep the applicant on track with the SRA schedule. Several design changes have occurred. The main change being that the awning is black not green, signage is square and centered above the canopy entrance, and the decking will be darker. There was some discussion about the function and look of the drink bar which will now have a backsplash to provide a buffer between the outside space and fencing below the bar to define the area. The canopy will have roll down sides to be closed during the winter and the entrance along the walkway will not be used as an entrance in the winter. The footprint is the same, as is the lighting and radiant heat source, and shop drawings were requested from the awning company. The applicant is working with the Tree Warden on the removal of the existing trees and the license will come eventually. The DRB was extremely helpful to the applicant even having a special meeting and providing pointers on the design and the end result is a much better project that the applicant is happy with.

Mr. Engdahl stated that they were unprepared to present and the DRB and Glenn Kennedy was especially helpful. Mr. Rubin asked if there would be additional signage even on Church Street as people will not know what it when walking by. Mr. Engdahl replied no, the DRB was concerned with additional signage and banners, and no logos will be seen until you come around the corner because they wanted to keep the façade clean. Mr. Coogan noted that when sides are down they wanted to reduce the amount of sign clutter and the signage will be where the entrance is. Mr. Engdahl stated that the DRB did approve the use of an A-frame sign.

Chair Napolitano asked if after this project is reviewed by the Licensing Board if it will return to the SRA for approval or just for signage approval. Mr. Daniel replied that the license agreement to use the space is separate from the Licensing Board's Pouring Permit. The license agreement will be for the applicant to use the space with the SRA's permission. After the licensing board approves, Atty. Scott Grover and Beth Rennard will review and it will be circulated to the SRA for comments but it will not need to be voted on again.

Mr. Rubin asked if there is a requirement to replace trees that are proposed to be removed. Mr. Daniel replied that that is for the Tree Warden to determine, the applicant could be required to provide a payment or to plant new trees elsewhere. Mr. Engdahl noted that have reached out to the Tree Warden both before and after the first SRA meeting and spoke to the secretary but they have not heard back about how to move the process forward. Mr. Daniel stated that they have reached out to Rick Rennard the Tree Warden and will continue to do so.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

*Chair Napolitano closes public comment.*

Rubin: Motion to approve as recommended by the DRB.  
Seconded by: Guarino. Passes 4-0

**3. 211 Bridge Street (The Bridge at 211):** Discussion and vote on letter of support of CPA application

Mr. Daniel stated that they are submitting an application for CPA funding to replace 24 windows and they are looking for a letter of support from the SRA, HC, and Public Art Commission. This is their priority project and the first on their list of Capital needs to tackle. The Bridge at 211 wants to get their identity out there as a "hub for artistic, cultural, and social events" and to let people know that their space can be rented for functions. This window project will help preserve the building. The SRA holds a façade easement so we have an interest in their investment.

Mr. Rubin asked if there is a downside to supporting it or a precedent that gets set for other projects like it. Chair Napolitano noted that the project will be reviewed by the DRB and asked if will also return to the SRA. Mr. Daniel replied yes, and the window replacement will be its own project. Mr. Guarino asked if there will be any legal issues with reviewing a project they've recommended to receive funding. Mr. Daniel replied no, that they are looking for support so there should be no conflict. Mr. Guarino asked if a specific amount of funding was being sought. Mr. Daniel replied that the amount is unknown, the CPC will review and make funding recommendations and more requests than funding can always be made.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

Councilor Tom Furey. He stated that there is a downside as there were some concerns by some Councilors that CPA funding should just go to public projects and not private entities. There are always councilors questioning why so it is controversial.

*Chair Napolitano closes public comment.*

Mr. Daniel stated that he will draft a letter for Chair Napolitano to sign before March 23rd

Guarino: Motion to approve sending a letter on behalf of the SRA.  
Seconded by: Rubin. Passes 4-0.

#### 4. Discussion of 2018 Goals

- A: Mr. Daniel stated that a discussion of SRA goals hasn't been done in at least 10 years and he wants to look at priorities for projects. They want to close on the District Court project and that should happen. The DCAM deadline expires in August of 2018 and DCAM is aware that they may need a 2 month extension although the developer wants it done sooner rather than later. The critical path is ensuring that the City Council approves the tax increment exemption agreement and state approval for the tax credit allocation, and time is needed to get through that process. Once that is in place the closing can occur.
- B: Salem Superior Court & County Commissioners Buildings: Daniel stated that the legislation needs to be amended so the projects can move forward as well as the RFP disposition process which they want to happen this calendar year.
- C: Daniel stated that he met with Tim Jenkins and Emily Udy of Historic Salem, Inc. and they want a symposium this year looking at excellence in design. This is a good time for all those boards to collaborate and jointly participate in it.
- D: Daniel stated that Salem received a grant from Mass Historic. Patti Kelleher conducted a survey of approximately 120 downtown properties and the historical record forms were updated along with photographs. The forms have been accepted by the MHC but the final step is to make a presentation to the SRA. He spoke with Patti about having a joint SRA, DRB, HC, and HSI to have a joint historic preservation community meeting. This group discussion could be a challenge but as of now it is in talks only. May is Historic Preservation Month and several events are being planned but he would prefer not to wait until May and to have a joint meeting with the Historic Commission before May and to participate in something else later on. Mr. Rubin asked what really needs to be addressed or changed by having this group meeting. He suggested that one member of each group attend another Boards meeting to help address whatever the issues may be. Mr. Daniel replied that there are multiple goals and in terms of the survey and grant project there is a narrow goal of 1) Educating the SRA about that resource through their review process, 2) Focus on HSI's desire to collaborate to strive for excellence in design, and 3) To educate all boards.

Mr. Rubin asked if the Historic Commission feels as if they aren't being listened to. Mr. Daniel stated that it was difficult for him to understand how the members of other groups to say they did not know about other projects, such as the Hampton Inn project, has undergone several reviews. Mr. Daniel noted letters submitted from Meg Twohey and HSI about the SRA goals.

Mr. Daniel stated that they want to look at the relationship where members of the Historic Commission and HSI feel like they are being heard and understood, which doesn't necessarily need to happen through a joint event. Mr. Rubin agreed and suggested that there are other ways to accomplish that goal such as asking them what they want to see from the SRA to feel that their opinions are being acknowledged even though they may not always agree. Should there be a change in behavior or how they act to make the change happen faster.

Mr. Daniel stated that there would be a focus on the education and their last goal 4) is to ensure that downtown stakeholders feel involved. Chair Napolitano stated that in regards to the District Court project there have been numerous meetings and other board members can't

come to the SRA in at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour to voice their opinions when the DRB is who offers the opinion on design. The SRA will make a decision about what they think is best for the project. Mr. Guarino agrees and added that it felt disingenuous when they raised that concern with these meetings are publicly posted and you can receive e-mail notices about city meetings. It is a two-way street, they can engage in a discussion with the SRA, and he offered to be a liaison. Chair Napolitano added that if they've made their comments on a particular project to the DRB and the DRB recommended approval to the SRA that disagreed with the comments, she will give deference to the DRB's opinion. Mr. Coogan added that there also seems to be confusion about the process and possibly why the applicant was returning for additional review or to amend an approval if conditions have changes. Mr. Guarino stated that they have a goal of protecting the fabric of downtown while encouraging smart development and suggested that economic development staff be in the room and ask how to include the voices of those interested in the future of the city.

Chair Napolitano asked if other groups can be engaged in the process. Mr. Daniel noted that Chamber of Commerce and Salem Partnership were both advocating for the adoption of the Housing Development Zone change for the District Court project because of the benefits they saw that it would bring to downtown. The Chamber will advocate for certain projects but there needs to be a balance between historic preservation and the investment. Many of these projects are bringing housing and some must be affordable which is a city goal. Numerous interests are being balanced and the private partner still needs to see a return on their money. Mr. Guarino added that parking is a huge part of those concerns as well as traffic.

Mr. Daniel stated that in terms of housing the city is reconstituting their affordable housing trust for housing in 2018. The Boards and Commissions are looking to balance goals, but the housing goal needs to move forward.

Mr. Rubin asked if there were any goals for the 2020 project goals that they should include in their 2018 goals. Mr. Daniel replied not specifically its only broad goals at this time.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

Councilor Tom Furey. He asked where RCG was in the approval and construction process. Mr. Daniel replied that the permit was updated with the SRA and they need to go back to the Planning Board to amend their permit. They were supposed to go before the SRA in February but they will return to the SRA soon. They are very eager to break ground.

*Chair Napolitano closes public comment.*

Mr. Rubin asked if the goals need to be rewritten. Mr. Daniel replied that they would use the minutes and review it again at the March SRA meeting.

## **Minutes**

No minutes to review.

## **Adjournment**

Guarino: Motion to adjourn the meeting.  
Seconded by: Rubin. Passes 5-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 7:00PM.

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

DRAFT