

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

Board or Committee:	Redevelopment Authority, Regular Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, April 13, 2022, at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location:	Virtual Zoom Meeting
SRA Members Present:	Chair Grace Napolitano, David Guarino, Cynthia Nina-Soto, Dean Rubin
SRA Members Absent:	Russ Vickers
Others Present:	Tom Daniel – Director of Planning and Community Development
Recorder:	Colleen Brewster

Regular Meeting

Executive Director's Report

Mr. Daniel stated:

1. Russ Vickers has officially resigned after serving on the SRA for many years as the gubernatorial appointment. Mayor Driscoll is working with the Governor's office to fill the vacancy. A certificate will be sent to him to thank him for his service and contributions to the city of Salem.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated:

2. Outdoor Dining: Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the outdoor dining extensions enacted at the height of the pandemic were extended again in early April 2022 and will allow local Licensing Boards to grant liquor service to extended dining areas. In anticipation of the continued extension, the same on-line review process has been reestablished. When applications are filed several city departments are notified: herself in the Planning Department, Licensing Board, Parking & Traffic, DPS, Health Department, and when necessary, the Building Department, Engineering, and Public Safety. One of the biggest differences will be no large tent outside Ledger, the city will construct a large platform at some of the angled parking spaces. It will function as a sidewalk for pedestrians so seating can be placed closer to the restaurant. The Licensing Board approved most of the applications on April 11, 2022, but held back on a couple where additional information was required. Most of what has been seen in the past 2-years will return in 2022, barriers for safety, outdoor platforms, etc. The Licensing Department is alerting all restaurants that an extension by the city may not be granted in 2023, so they should contact the state liquor board on their own to receive an official extension for the liquor service. If that occurs the city will have to adjust their process to fit more typical regulations. Chair Napolitano asked if the restaurants within the Urban Renewal Area would have to return to the SRA for review and approval or if that could be included in the adjustment process. Ms. Newhall-Smith replied that if the process returns to normal those restaurants would need submit an Outdoor Dining Permit to the SRA and DRB. Mr. Daniel added that the Board would have to vote to change the process. ~~Mr. Rubin asked if umbrellas with logos was addressed.~~ Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that they've been lenient with umbrellas with logos the past two years, and they will be again this year. The Board discussed their concern with the continued use of umbrellas with

logos and the downtown being plastered with logos for liquor companies rather than the restaurants. Chair Napolitano encouraged the businesses to be told well in advance that they will no longer be allowed. Ms. Newhall-Smith agreed and noted that the new application includes language that logo umbrellas should not be used. Mr. Rubin stated that there is still a signage ordinance and umbrella logos should apply. Mr. Daniel added that restaurants should be notified in advance of needing to return to the SRA and the rules around umbrellas.

Projects in the Urban Renewal Area

1. **5 Summer Street:** Small Project Review – Review of DRB Recommendation for the installation of up to 82 solar panels on roof. – Request to withdraw without prejudice

VOTE: Guarino made a motion to accept the request to withdrawal without prejudice. Seconded by: Rubin.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

2. **15 Summer Street:** Small Project Review – Review of DRB Recommendation for the installation of up to 32 solar panels on roof. – Request to withdraw without prejudice

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to accept the request to withdrawal without prejudice. Seconded by: Nina-Soto.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

3. **24 Charter Street:** Small Project Review – Removal of two windows on the rear elevation to facilitate interior remodel of residential building.

Matt Tatkow, owner of property, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Tatkow stated that he intends to move into the third-floor unit. There is one window on the second and third floors that he is like to remove to install a kitchen along the wall, and this façade isn't visible from any public ways. The proposed color options are Benjamin Moore: Sea Pearl or Beige for the façade, the storm windows would be Benjamin Moore: Black, and the exterior window frame, concrete header, and sills Benjamin Moore: Simply White.

Mr. Rubin asked if the building was historic. Mr. Tatkow replied that they have a historic easement placed by the PEM which has already approved of the request to remove the two windows. Ms. Newhall-Smith added that the building is historic, however this is not its original location on Charter Street, the PEM moved it from Liberty Street to make room for one of their expansion projects.

Mr. Rubin asked what building faces this façade. Mr. Tatkow replied that the Women's Friend building and the PEM parking lot. To the left of this building is the PEM security headquarters.

Chair Napolitano asked if this triggers a Historic Commission review or just the PEM. Ms. Newhall-Smith said no. Mr. Tatkow noted that the building is not within a historic district and the historic easement was a contingency to close on the sale of the property with the museum, and they have a point person at the museum that deals with exterior maintenance. Mr. Daniel noted that the building is within the Urban Renewal area and not a local historic district.

Mr. Guarino requested photos of the rear façade. Mr. Tatkov replied that to the right of the windows is an emergency stair addition that the PEM constructed in 2000, after the building moved. The addition has unpainted wood siding and windows that will remain in place. Chair Napolitano asked what buildings view this side of the building. Mr. Tatkov replied that the Women's Friend Society building and the PEM parking lot. Mr. Daniel requested confirmation that the first-floor window would remain due to a different layout. Mr. Tatkov replied yes. Mr. Guarino asked how many windows were on the addition. Mr. Tatkov replied one window per floor that also face the back.

Mr. Guarino noted his concern for the window configuration along the rear with two windows missing. Mr. Tatkov replied that this façade is minimally visible and hidden by the rear of the Women's Friend Society building.

Ms. Nina-Soto believed that windows along the left façade appear to have already been removed, the first and second closets to the street and one window at the top left. Mr. Tatkov replied that the front two windows locations are a spiral staircase with a curved wall that did not have windows and at the third floor there is no evidence on the interior of a window being in that location.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Ms. Newhall-Smith suggested recommending approval upon successful review by the DRB since the change will occur at the rear of the building and will be minimally visible.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to approve modifying the building as proposed pending DRB approval. Seconded by: Guarino.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

4. **43 Church Street:** Small Project Review – Construction of a one-story addition on the rear of the building to extend the restaurant's dining area. A portion of the proposed addition is located on land owned by the Salem Redevelopment Authority. – Request to continue to May 11, 2022

VOTE: Nina-Soto made a motion to continue to the May 11, 2022, regular meeting. Seconded by: Rubin.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

5. **38 Norman Street:** Final Design Review – Review of DRB Recommendation for the construction of a new mixed-use building with commercial uses on the ground floor and residential uses above.

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti & Navins, Ryan Wittig and Matthew Moore of Kinvarra Capital, Philip Sima of Balance Architects

Atty. Grover stated the SRA reviewed the project at the February 9, 2022, meeting where it was referred to the DRB; the DRB reviewed the project on February 23, 2022, where they unanimously and enthusiastically recommended a final approval by the SRA. The following design recommendations were suggested that have been incorporated into the current plans.

Regarding the remainder of the permitting process, they have been before the Planning Board (PB) for the last 6-months for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Site Plan Review, and they are expecting a vote from the PB at tomorrow's meeting on both applications, concluding the permitting process which began 1-year ago. They appreciate all the input they have received that has shaped the final project.

Mr. Sima stated that the following changes have been implemented: changing the synthetic turf at the rear seating area to synthetic pavers, changing the painted rear fence to cedar with a natural finish, increased the density of the vegetative screen between their neighboring Crombie Street property, added vegetative screening at all roof decks using tall grasses and native species in aluminum planters with drip irrigation since many are accessed only through the tenant spaces. The architectural changes were: providing a customizable pedestrian alert system along the Crombie Street parking entrance/exit at the left side of the parking entrance, EV charging is being provided at the covered parking spaces, hanging bike parking will be added over each parking space in addition to the 1-1 bicycle parking in the basement, the trash room was compressed to provide a space for electric and gas meters that is enclosed on three side only, and the material palette below the rear lower cornice changed from grey with a red Hardi board at the middle portion to continuous grey.

Mr. Rubin requested clarification on the location of the meters. Atty. Grover noted that the DRB and PB was adamant about the meters not being visible from the street.

Mr. Rubin asked if there will be association By-Law's stating that a tenant must maintain all vegetative screening. Mr. Sima replied that as rental units ~~not~~-maintenance will ~~not~~ fall on the tenants. Mr. Wittig added that the maintenance team will oversee plant care, ~~trash removal, and cleaning and can check on them~~ by looking down on ~~them~~ the lower floor balconies from the roof. Ms. Nina-Soto asked for specifics regarding the denser planting area between the Crombie Street neighbor. Mr. Sima replied that the elm streets will be closer to the street and the shrubbery should be no higher than the 6-foot fence that will divide the properties to reduce shadows.

Ms. Nina-Soto asked if the EV chargers would be open to the public or exclusive to the tenants. Mr. Wittig replied that the parking is exclusive to the residents and commercial space tenants. Ms. Nina-Soto asked if EV parking spaces would be exclusive to electric vehicles. Mr. Wittig replied that the process will need to be managed, however, priority will go to EV's.

Public Comment:

Anna Gordon, 12 Crombie Street. Concerned with the couple of months in the winter when there will be a significant reduction in daylight at 16 and 18 Crombie Street, particularly for the rooftop solar panel on the roof on 16 Crombie Street. Requested confirmation that the lower-level roof terrace is on level three not four. Mr. Sima replied yes, it was a typo on the Drawing L-105. She appreciated that the overall height is reduced but still can concerns with the loss of daylight for her neighbors.

Attorney Chris Drucus, 81 Washington Street, Representing the owners of 16 Crombie Street (Mr. Willis) and 18 Crombie Street (Ms. Roberta Hussey). Thanked the neighbor Ms. Gordon for stating the issue concerning his client. They believe the building is still too high, shadow studies show that during the coldest months of the year, October through March, much of the sunlight will disappear at 18 Crombie Street which could have psychological effects. At 16 Crombie

Street, Mr. Willis will suffer a monetary loss due to shadows on his rooftop solar panels. The shadow study only showed the first day of each month. There are many other uses that could be constructed on this site, and it is up to the permit granting authorities to determine an appropriate use for the site because the damage it will cause for his clients. Removing 1-floor could still make this a viable project. The developer should consider a different project. His client at 18 Crombie Street asked for a reduction in parking spaces from 30 to 25, they are not pleased with the Crombie Street vehicular entrance, particularly now that an audible sign will be installed.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Atty. Grover stated that the height of the project has already been reduced from 6 to 4 stories to mitigate the impact on the neighborhood and the unit count from over 30 down to 20. They have adhered to the SRA design guidelines by moving it away from the residential neighborhoods 3-feet and where the proposed building abuts a residence the building steps down to 3-stories. This is the Urban Renewal Area which is a mix of commercial and residential uses and the design criteria they have adhered to is designed to protect the residential neighbors. Mr. Sima added that their shadow study saw almost no impact on the solar panels at 16 Crombie Street except for early morning and early afternoon in the winter months, when photovoltaic panels are not producing much electricity. Atty. Grover stated that the B5 zoning by right allows a 70-foot 6-story building which they are below, and the allowed rear setback is 5-feet, and the proposed building is further away from the rear lot line.

Mr. Rubin asked if ~~there would be an~~ the internal traffic study was completed. Ms. Newhall-Smith replied that ~~they were~~ it was generated for the PB, but she does not have ~~them~~ it. Atty. Grover stated that MDM Transportation completed a traffic study ~~and~~ that the city requested it be peer reviewed by Jacobs Engineering, ~~and changes were made~~ The Developer made changes in response to some of ~~their~~ the concerns the peer reviewer recommended. In response to the concerns with the audible sign at the parking entrance, ~~Atty. Grover noted that~~ the sign was selected because it has controls to adjust the decibel level emitted.

Mr. Guarino stated that he appreciates the work done, this was not an easy project to review, the process has been long for the neighbors, but he feels they've made the project better. He was thrilled to see a new project in development at this site which is an eyesore, and the final project will improve the downtown and this area. The design team has adjusted the plan to lessen the impact on neighbors, but this is an Urban Renewal and downtown area, and the final project is a good one.

VOTE: Guarino made a motion to approve with the DRB recommendations. Seconded by:
~~Guarino~~ Nina-Soto.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

6. **73 Lafayette Street and 9 Peabody Street:** Schematic Design Review – Demolition of existing building at 73 Lafayette Street and construction of new, mixed-use structure with 35,000 square feet for the North Shore Health Center, pharmacy, and urgent care facility and for income-restricted senior housing residential units. Construction of a new mixed-use structure on 9 Peabody Street with income-restricted senior housing residential units, commercial and gallery space, continued from ~~2/9/22~~ February 9, 2022.

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti & Navins representing South River Partnership, LLC (joint venture between the Northshore CDC and North Shore Community Health), Jonathan Evans and Megan Altendorf of Mass Design Group, Ilene Vogel and Mickey Northcutt of Northshore CDC, and Margaret Brenna of North Shore Community Health Center were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Grover stated they were last before the SRA on February 9, 2022, where they discussed the possibility of preserving the façade of the existing building. A series of investigations were underway and are now complete and tonight's focus will be the results of those investigations. They will also explain where they stand with the Ch. 91 licensing process on the former tidelands site. They were also asked to provide data on how patients are expected to travel to and from the health center and how it would impact traffic and parking.

Mr. Evans stated that at the Lafayette Street building they have removed the artist housing on level two, swapped the first-floor urgent care center and bank to keep the bank in operation with a relocation of the drive-thru, which will allow for a grander public way entrance to the harbor walk from New Derby Street. The harbor walk will have views connecting it to the Lafayette Street building, permeable paving, and significant ecological investments. At the Peabody Street building there has been a reduction in commercial space, the building has a patina copper crown over the first-floor gallery space to celebrate the public programming, and next to the building will be the revitalized park. ~~Front the~~ On the front side of the building on Peabody Street ~~side~~, the proposed brick façade will tie-in with the other structures on the street but will use different patterns to make it more playful.

Mr. Evans stated that at the Lafayette Street building there are ~~constructability~~ construction challenges, and risks and realities of the building code have made it so the façade cannot be kept in place. They made this determination based on resiliency and building code requirements, the structural assessment report, and contractor's assessment report, which were submitted to the Board. But they would like to pay homage to the existing building. Sea level rise, coastal flooding, and storm surge are important factors to consider. Base Flood Elevation (BFE) is +10 above sea level and the code minimum is 1-foot above sea levels, but they want to be at +15 or +16, or 4 or 5-feet above the current first floor elevation. These changes in floor elevation would have severe impacts on the current building and the new floor lines would be mid-way up the first floor and any investment in the existing building would require meeting the current building code.

Mr. Evans stated that the structural assessment determined that keeping the building in place would not be guaranteed during construction, the building could fall, and there would be aesthetic impacts. Ms. Altendorf added that the required culvert work could have a significant impact on where the façade could be saved, ~~but and that~~ the bracing needed to save the façade is unknown. The assessment from Groom Construction ~~who~~ engaged a masonry restoration subcontractor and a bracing and scaffolding contractor, ~~who~~ concluded ~~that investigated that there were~~ two options. Option 1 would brace and maintain the existing façade in place, which interferes with aligning the building with the raised floor elevations, ~~use of using~~ the sidewalk for 8-9 months for bracing, and ~~securing a guaranty from~~ the GC and subcontractors ~~not guaranteeing~~ that the work will not suffer a catastrophic failure. Option 2 would deconstruct and rebuild the façade using original materials, although they estimate only 20-30% of materials will be salvageable deeming it an unfeasible approach. Mr. Evans stated that a third option would involve constructing a new building with materials and details that pay homage to the existing façade but not replicating it. It

would include the raised floor elevations ~~but~~ and would incorporate some modern materials and patterning. A display window could be incorporated into the Derby Street façade to celebrate the existing building that was once there.

Mr. Evans noted that their Chapter 91 review with the state is underway and there is an environmental justice public meeting planned for early May with a formal filing of Expanded Environmental Notification Form planned for late Spring.

Ms. Brennan stated that the North Shore Community Health Center patient population consists of 74% ~~of their patients are~~ low-income that qualify for Mass Health & Health Safety Net, 13% ~~are~~ Seniors or Disabled that are on Medicare, and 13% ~~others that~~ have private health insurance, ~~but~~. Mr. Brennan affirmed that the health Center serves anyone regardless of their insurance. They anticipate a steady growth in their number of patients from those that find this geographical location extremely convenient. ~~and based on income requirements for health care coverage utilized at the health center, it is unlikely that many of their patients have vehicles.~~ Their current location has extremely limited parking for their patients and ~~those~~ patients have never noted it as an issue in their annual patient surveys. Mr. Rubin noted that wasn't particularly relevant given the current location at Shetland Park has ample parking available for whatever number of patients drive to the site. Mr. Brennan replied that there are two other successful instances where buildings of significant size were constructed in urban areas such as the East Boston Neighborhood Health Center, a 40,000 SF building in Maverick Square with limited on-street parking and a lot 1-block away, and the Lynn Community Health Center, a 76,000 SF building in downtown Lynn with a parking lot 2-blocks away.

Ms. Nina-Soto noted her concern with ~~moving the bank to Lafayette Street which could lead to the likely increase in the number of vehicles lining up on the Lafayette Street to enter the driveway for the combined bank and health care facilities.~~ Mr. Evans estimated that 4 or 5 vehicles would be able to line up before ~~entering~~ blocking the public way, and this configuration is being reviewed by the traffic engineer and it will be peer reviewed. Mr. Northcutt noted that the bank only requested a double-lane drive-thru to match their current configuration. Mr. Evans noted that there will be a total of three lanes, a teller lane, ATM lane, and a bypass lane that leads to parking or to exit the site. ~~Mr. Rubin stated that the number of vehicles that can utilize the drive-thru is critical.~~ Ms. Nina-Soto believed the proposed configuration would cause a back-up onto the street and make it difficult for additional vehicles to enter the parking lot. Mr. Northcutt noted that the ATM lane also has a teller tube, the bank was satisfied with the two lanes configuration, and he believes there would be sufficient room for the banks typical drive-thru use. Mr. Evans added that signage will clearly identify each lane. Atty. Grover reiterated that the proposed site circulation and drive-thru lanes are being evaluated and peer reviewed.

Mr. Daniel asked how the drop-off zone will be used and the frequency of use. ~~in which they will be dropped-off.~~ Mr. Evans replied that they have ~~discussed~~ considered and rejected having a drop off area in front ~~but they will need to be mindful of this~~ because it is a major intersection in Salem. ~~Therefore, so~~ patients will be dropped off at the back. Ms. Brennan replied that no line of vehicles is created at their current location for drop-offs and pick-ups. Mr. Rubin noted that at the current facility is a private lot where drop-offs and pick-ups do not impede traffic and some people may take longer to exit the vehicles than others. The same percentage of drop-offs and pick-ups could create some congestion at this new location. Ms. Brennan replied that they do not have responses from patients to their transportation survey yet. ~~many~~ Many either walk or take the bus, ~~but~~ and no one has ever said it was an issue. Mr. Rubin noted that people would need to

cross the bank ~~drive thru~~ lanes to enter the building. Mr. Evans replied that they are trying to determine a buffer to protect pedestrians. Ms. Altendorf added that the drop-off lane was designed wider than usual to provide some protection to passing vehicles.

Mr. Guarino noted that the health center is hoping to increase the number of private health care patients and he questioned how that changes their parking requirements for those that do not live in the neighborhood. Ms. Brennan replied there are several options for those that understand the site and parking limitation, ~~but~~ and that many could walk. He restated that they are open to patients with all types of insurance. Mr. Northcutt added that this location is for patients that find it convenient.

Ms. Nina-Soto is excited to see the new location but is hesitant due to the parking constraints but agrees it will be attractive to those for which it is convenient. Mr. Evans noted that this will bring vitality to the harbor walk and make it a destination and a welcoming entrance.

Mr. Rubin asked where utilities and trash will be located at the Peabody Street building, and how ~~trash~~ will ~~it~~ be brought to the street to be picked up. Mr. Evans replied that each building has a trash and compactor room and a set time to collect the trash. Utility connections will connect off Peabody Street and all sensitive equipment will be located at a higher level within each building. Atty. Grover noted that the locations will need to be refined as they move forward with the Planning Board process. Mr. Northcutt added most of the 36 Northshore CDC buildings have no off-street parking and minimal exterior areas used a public space. They have consolidated dumpsters with their neighboring buildings to save space and have numerous pick-ups per week to accommodate the volume of trash.

Mr. Rubin asked if the colors of the brick at the Lafayette Street could match the Derby Lofts for consistency at the intersection. Mr. Evans replied that their intent was to match the ~~aesthetics to the~~ building that can't be saved.

Ms. Nina-Soto ~~stated that~~ asked in terms of sea level rise and flooding, ~~has~~ if there been any consideration for sustainability by adding solar panels or a green roof to the building. Mr. Evans replied that ~~the roof area is too small to use solar panels~~ but that they are using passive house design for less energy use, equipment that uses less carbon, and all electric appliances (no gas). Mr. Northcutt added that the healthcare component will influence their ability to achieve certain certifications, but their priority has been a weather tight energy efficient building envelope with excellent windows and insulation. They've look extensively at renewable energy options in the past and found that they don't add as much value when compared to the costs, but they are open to finding new efficiencies. Ms. Altendorf noted that most of the mechanical equipment will be on the roof, leaving a minimal amount of usable roof area. Mr. Northcutt added that they met with the city's sustainability team to review the strategies Mass Design Group has planned, and the city's consultants from Woods Hole will review them and respond with possible suggestions to make the surrounding neighborhood more resilient over time to the inevitable flooding.

Mr. Guarino asked if the culvert repairs are not as significant as originally thought and if that report was being peer reviewed. Atty. Grover replied that Woodward & Curran expanded their standard civil review to include the culvert investigation and the peer review. A letter on both is expected within the next couple of weeks, ~~to~~ and will be presented to the PB in mid-May. Mr. Evans noted that some repairs were more significant than others.

Mr. Guarino asked ~~that if~~ the current building was not up ~~to code~~ ~~and if would~~ any work ~~was~~ done ~~on~~ the building ~~would~~ need to be brought up to code. Mr. Evans replied that the building preceded the code but any new investment beyond a small bathroom renovation would require an investment in the building to make it meet the current code. Ms. Altendorf added that ~~if~~ construction ~~totals~~ more than 50% of the building's value ~~it~~ would require code upgrades, including meeting the required flood elevations. Mr. Guarino questioned if the city was conducting a peer review on the façade evaluation given that the report is recommending the most cost efficient and desired approach to constructing a new building. Atty. Grover replied that it was unknown if the peer reviewer will review what it would take to save the façade, but they have the reports. Mr. Evans welcomed a continued review of the reports and emphasized that the ~~finish first~~ floor would still be 4-5-feet above the current floor elevation which was a significant driving factor of the design. Mr. Northcutt stated that it wasn't their preference to tear down the building, they assumed the preference would be to save the building and analysis proved otherwise.

Chair Napolitano asked if any reuse of the building would require the floor elevations to be raised. Mr. Evans ~~replied restated~~ that any rehabilitation work that would cost more than 50% of the price of the building requires meeting code. ~~The which is a~~ minimum increase ~~is of~~ 1-foot above floor elevation and is based on FEMA maps which are extremely conservative. Ms. Altendorf added that the FEMA maps are based on historical data and they do not consider sea level rise and extreme storm surge events. Mr. Evans noted that the lobby is above the minimum but not at the level of the urgent care center so that the entrance fits into the urban fabric rather than acting as a wall around the perimeter of the building.

Chair Napolitano asked about the historical commission process and the 18-month waiting period. Mr. Northcutt stated that they were not asking for the demolition delay to be granted. They only wanted to get before the Salem Historical Commission (SHC) and that was their part of their administrative process. The SHC jurisdiction is unknown. They are subject to Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) review as well, who will consult with SHC. They will go before SHC again during the consultation process. Atty. Grover added that the SHC is open to releasing them from the demolition delay timeline once they demonstrated that saving the building may not be feasible.

Mr. Daniel asked what Chapter 91 would require from the site. Mr. Evans replied that they haven't formally filed but it will include public access to the waterfront. Ms. Vogel added that there were significant changes enacted by MEPA January 1, 2022, and they are still determining what those impacts might be and if adjustments will need to be made to the plans. A more substantive version of the E&F will be filed by the end of May 2022 and the permit could be obtained by the end of the year.

Chair Napolitano asked if this project was triggering historical review because its historic or because of the use of federal funds. Mr. Daniel replied that in Salem this building triggered a review because it is older than 50-years-old which triggers a Demolition Delay review by the SHC and an SRA review because its in the urban renewal district. Chair Napolitano asked if The Point Neighborhood is on the National Register. Mr. Northcutt replied that The Point is on the National Register, ~~but that~~ this building is not within that district. ~~However~~, they recently nominated the lower Lafayette Street District ~~for inclusion in The Point National Historic District even though and although~~ this building falls outside that area. ~~They~~ were advised by their historic consultant to create a new district rather than amend an existing one and this building is listed as a

contributing building to that National Historic District. Filing that allowed them to use historic tax credits and the use of those funds is the biggest trigger.

Public Comment:

Emily Udy, HSI. Appreciated the thorough conversation and her topics of choice were discussed. They appreciate the investigation by the Northshore CDC to the potential demolition of the façade and not taking that lightly. They look forward to MHC's involvement and one of the key parts is an alternative to demolition and the reports obtained will be key. ~~Regarding the peer review of the existing façade, that information would will~~ be beneficial to the historical commission as well. There is a question about proving the point for demolition and how accurately the new façade would reflect the existing façade, ~~or~~ if an homage is desired or stronger accuracy. ~~, which These~~ will be discussed in the historical and DRB review process.

Christopher Barlow, 289 Essex Street. Regarding traffic concerns, people will utilize the facility for its convenience and he purchased his condominium for walkability within the city since he does not own a vehicle. He likes the amount of greenspace and effort put into the pedestrian experience and thinks Salem should ~~put~~ more of this type of energy into designing for the people rather than focusing on vehicles and traffic. He would prefer to ~~see~~ less asphalt and more greenspace when it comes to designing for the future.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to refer to DRB. Seconded by: Nina-Soto.

Chair Napolitano asked if the peer review could be expanded and if the DRB can be asked to provide an opinion on it. Mr. Daniel replied that the PB is managing the peer review. ~~and may be a request to explore with the applicant.~~ Mr. Guarino requested to see the peer review analysis and noted that while he is supportive of keeping the review process going, he does not want the DRB to take their review recommendation as if they have settled their façade concerns. Chair Napolitano, Ms. Nina-Soto agreed with Mr. Guarino. Mr. Evans stated that if the goal of reviewing the peer review analysis is to determine if it is possible to invest in the project while keeping the façade which would not eliminate the 4-5-foot elevation increase of the floor a factor. Mr. Rubin replied that he is not keen on reviewing the peer review because it is obvious that keeping the building will not work. Chair Napolitano replied ~~that while she supports the proposed usage, the SRA is charged with being as~~ stewards of the buildings and the facades. ~~their~~ The concern is with demolishing the building and wanting a thorough analysis so ~~they we~~ feel confident that demolishing the building is the best option. ~~, although she does support the proposed usage.~~ Mr. Northcutt stated that they take historic preservation extremely seriously and would welcome any recommendations because they have vetted all their ~~known~~ options thoroughly. *Atty. Grover suggested an additional scope expansion of the Woodward & Curran. [I don't understand this sentence.]*

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to refer to DRB. Seconded by: Nina-Soto.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

VOTE: Guarino made a motion to request a peer review of the applicant's analysis on demolition and keeping of the existing façade as part of the further analysis of this project. Seconded by: Nina-Soto.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

7. **301 Essex Street:** Final Design Review – Erect a 3 ½ story addition above the existing building (known as Jerry’s Army & Navy Store) with eleven (11) residential units and an on-site parking ratio of .9 vehicles to one unit. Parking will be located inside the building at the first-floor rear with retail space fronting on Essex Street. – Request to continue to May 11, 2022

Mr. Guarino stated that he is happy to see a request to continue because many felt the proposed design was not a good fit for the area.

VOTE: Guarino made a motion to continue to the May 11, 2022, regular meeting. Seconded by: Rubin.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

New / Old Business

1. Redevelopment of the Historic Courthouses and the Crescent Lot: Update on Project Status

Mr. Daniel stated that they have been working with Winn Development and the MBTA on the remnant parcel being conveyed to the SRA to become part of the whole project. An ANR plan was created for the lot will be reviewed by the Planning Board tomorrow, April 14, 2022. They discovered in 2014 that there were a series of easements between the MBTA and City of Salem during the parking garage construction, which were approved by the city and executed by the mayor, that the MBTA did not record. The driveway to the MBTA parking lot extends over the crescent lot which is SRA land. Everyone has agreed to move forward under those same easements, although the SRA is now the owner of the crescent lot and not the city.

VOTE: Nina-Soto made a motion to grant an access easement to the MBTA. Seconded by: Guarino.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano in favor. 4-0 in favor.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to accept an access easement from the MBTA. Seconded by: Nina-Soto.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano in favor. 4-0 in favor.

VOTE: Guarino made a motion to authorize Executive Director to execute easement documents. Seconded by: Rubin.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano in favor. 4-0 in favor.

Mr. Daniel added that there is a P&S agreement with the MBTA, the ANR before the Planning Board ~~tomorrow~~, and these three easements ~~that need~~ to be recorded. They met with the MBTA and WinnDevelopment earlier that day and determined that everything should be completed by May 5, 2022. With the SRA owning this remnant parcel ~~will allow it allows~~ WinnDevelopment to proceed with the application for their PUD special permit and site plan review. If that deadline is not met, it may be due to the need to value engineer the project due to the increase in construction pricing. They continue to work with DCAMM and WinnDevelopment, ~~a~~ A survey is needed on the courthouse windows and masonry for historic tax credit applications and other funding assistances. The shared access driveway by the trial court is also being worked through. The 300 square foot stairway parcel was declared as surplus by the city council in March, ~~but~~ and

the complete order will be reviewed by the council at tomorrow nights meeting on April 14, 2022, where it will be conveyed.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that WinnDevelopemnt has contracted with Graffito to determine through meetings with stakeholders what tenancies would make sense at the courthouses and what the community would want to activate the buildings. They want to meet with herself, Mr. Daniel, and some SRA members on either Monday, April 25, 2022, between 2-4PM or Tuesday, April 26, 2022 between 11:30-1PM, to discuss goals, activation, and to provide guidance.

2. SRA Meetings: Discussion of Remote, Hybrid, and in-Person Meetings.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the governor extended the opportunity to meet remotely until July 15, 2022, so the meetings can continue to meet remotely until August or a hybrid meeting. Mr. Daniel added that if it is not extended there must be a quorum of members present in the meeting room, the Chair must be there but if not, the Vice Chair must be present. Each meeting room can now accommodate the hybrid meetings. He will determine if both the Chair and Vice Chair cannot be present, but three members are able to be present if that counts as a quorum or would that meeting need to be cancelled. Mr. Guarino noted that the authority's vacancy needs to be filled sooner rather than later. The Board agreed to continue with remote meetings.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to continue with meetings in remote format until the August 2022 meeting. Seconded by: Guarino.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

3. SRA By-Law Review: Project Update

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that she, Chair Napolitano, and Mr. Rubin met twice to review the by-laws, with the goal to modernize them since they were first established in the 1960's. A preamble was added to explain the goals of the authority, it was reorganized to include a section for members versus support staff, and updated language and to reflect the Open Meeting Law. There will be one more review before they are shared with the board for comment.

Ms. Newhall-Smith confirmed that most city boards and commissions operate under Roberts Rules of Order, although the City Council uses the Cushings Manual of Parliamentary Practice. Mr. Daniel thanked the group for their review of the by-laws and noted that the reason for acknowledging what operational document is being referenced is to address questions when they arise and clarification is needed for procedural questions. Mr. Guarino noted that the SRA follows the rules of order closely. Ms. Nina-Soto agreed. Chair Napolitano asked if a mistake is made how would that be addressed. Mr. Daniel suggested creating their own rules or implementing what other Redevelopment Authorities **have** do. Ms. Nina-Soto noted technicalities that could be missed but could be corrected, although all Board members should refresh their knowledge of it as a guiding principle. Mr. Guarino questioned what other city boards have done. Mr. Rubin noted his concern with following Roberts Rules of Order **exaeting**, which when amending motions to include specifics could cause confusion when motions need to be separated, and requests to withdrawal motions are needed before new motions can move forward. He suggested that in questions of uncertainty they will refer to Roberts Rules of Order for guidance. Mr. Guarino suggested that control be put in the hands of the board rather than applicants. Chair Napolitano suggested receiving city solicitor input. Ms. Newhall-Smith suggested a concurrent review by the board while seeking answers from the city solicitor.

4. SRA Financials - No comments.

Approval of Minutes

1. February 9, 2022, Regular Meeting Minutes

VOTE: Nina-Soto made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 9, 2022, regular meeting minutes.

Nina-Soto amended her motion to include all edits.

Seconded by: Guarino.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano in favor. 4-0 in favor.

Adjournment

VOTE: Guarino made a motion to adjourn.

Seconded by: Nina-Soto.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano in favor. 4-0 in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45PM.

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 39 §23B and City Ordinance Sections 2-028 through 2-2033.