

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

Board or Committee: Redevelopment Authority, Regular Meeting
Date and Time: Wednesday, May 11, 2022, at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location: Virtual Zoom Meeting
SRA Members Present: Chair Grace Napolitano, Christine Madore, Cynthia Nina-Soto, Dean Rubin
SRA Members Absent: David Guarino
Others Present: Tom Daniel – Director of Planning and Community Development
Recorder: Colleen Brewster

Regular Meeting

Executive Director's Report

Mr. Daniel stated:

1. The downtown is coming alive with activity, and the city's consultant, Culture House, is testing different uses and programming at Old Town Hall. Systems and structural changes are being determined at Old Town Hall that will allow the building to best serve the community as an art and cultural hub downtown.
2. Virtual meetings will continue until July, at which time they will go hybrid. A quorum of board members must be physically present with the remaining remote with the permission of the Chair and guidelines will be circulated in advance. Mr. Rubin asked whether the Chair or Vice-Chair must be present. Mr. Daniel replied that the Chair must designate an Acting-Chair to proceed with the meeting, even if the Chair is the one who is remote.

City Initiatives

1. 252 Bridge Street: Crescent Lot Restriping

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

Mr. Devine stated that the city is still managing the parking lot, which is poorly striped and lacks legitimate parking spaces. The parking lot will be restriped to formalize the parking and HC parking spaces will be added, for a total of 69 legal spaces. A bike station would be in the south-east corner of the lot.

Ms. Madore arrived.

2. 252 Bridge Street: Blue Bikes Station

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

Mr. Devine stated that the city is coordinating with WinnDevelopment for a temporary Blue Bike Station, knowing they will have to move it when construction starts at the crescent lot. He noted that an existing station at Washington and Federal Streets didn't go before the SRA last year before it was installed, but a new bike station is proposed. It will be 36-feet x 6-feet and have 13 docking stations. He noted that this is their most used station and a third could potentially be added at 285 Derby Street where there previously was a Zagster Station. The city wants to have as many as 15 stations this summer but could do more depending on grant funding. At the Derby Street location, they don't to conflict with the outdoor seating proposed at Lulu's Bakery and they will take direction from the Tree Warden on how to treat an existing tree pit.

Ms. Nina-Soto suggested the docking station be placed in the park where it wouldn't interfere with the flow of pedestrian traffic. Mr. Devine replied that they would need to find a space to accommodate it and there are concerns that it could interfere with other park uses.

Mr. Rubin suggested the docking station be placed across the three, which might interfere with parking spaces. He also asked about any early reaction to Blue Bike vs. Zagster. Mr. Devine replied that the industry keeps changing and this is the fourth iteration for bike sharing in Salem. Zagster was nicely scaled and less expensive, included free bikes and stations, but their app was failing. The scooters had more growth but were causing problems in the city. Blue Bike currently has eight stations in Salem, which is comparable to the seven Zagster stations. The advantage of Blue Bike is the reliable technology, its recognizable to what is used in Boston, annual memberships can also be used anywhere, so it's better than Zagster in some ways, even though it's less flexible when it comes to docking station locations.

Ms. Madore didn't see an issue with the proposed Derby Street location since it's been tested before with Zagster, believed it's the safest area for a bicyclist to get on and drop off their bike since its next to a bike lane and a person must slow down and stop to get off the bike. She disagreed with an in the park location which would encourage people to ride through there and hasn't heard any complaints about the biking program.

Public Comment:

Dick Pabich, 15 Summer Street. It will be a great addition to the city.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano recognized that Christine Madore, the newest SRA member, was present.

Ms. Nina-Soto left the meeting.

Projects in the Urban Renewal Area

1. 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, continued from 4/13/22. – Request to continue to 6/8/22.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the applicant requested a continuance as they continue to work out the details with their abutters.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to continue. Seconded by: Madore.
Roll Call: Rubin, Madore, Napolitano. 3-0 in favor.

2. **304 Essex Street:** Small Project Review - Review of DRB Recommendation to repair/replace and paint existing façade's wood trim components and install window boxes.

Ashley Tina, owner, was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the applicant started their review with the DRB in April and they issued a positive recommendation.

Ms. Tina stated that at the DRB meeting she proposed to paint the existing dark brown trim a bright white, and the DRB recommended a muted white which she is now proposing. Some of the painted wood trim is chipping and damaged, and if any rotted wood is found she would replace it with a PT wood to match. She would also like to add a flower box to each window that would be painted pink to match the signage. The DRB recommended boards be added to the sides of each flower box that extend to the ground to make them ADA compliant. The flower boxes would also be level with the sill of the windows.

Ms. Madore stated that the proposed changes look great and asked if scaffolding would be installed to do the trim work. Ms. Tina replied most likely, but she hasn't asked. Ms. Madore noted that scaffolding should comply with HC requirements by adding tap boards to the sides so people with visual impairments can navigate around the scaffolding.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to approve with DRB recommendations. Seconded by: Madore.
Roll Call: Madore, Rubin, Napolitano. 3-0 in favor.

3. **28 Federal Street:** Small Project Review – Installation of ductless A/C units with associated conduits.

Charles Anzalone and Bill Yuhas were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Anzalone stated that three units are seeking approval, they are all upper units on floors 2 and 3, Units 28B #4, Unit 28B #3, and Uni 28C #4. Three additional units are also looking for retroactive approval since they were installed last year; the units themselves aren't visible because they are concealed by shrubbery, though the conduit can be seen. They are also seeking a blanket approval for residents seeking install these units in the future. New piping would be straight with right angles and painted the color of the clapboards. The piping and units are minimally visible from Federal Street and would be painted, and the lower units are behind fences and are not visible.

Mr. Yuhas stated that the original units were approved by the condo association and the requirement is that 66% of owners and 100% of abutters approve. The association's building committee prepared conditions of approval, including placing the conduits with right angles only

on the clapboard and painting them to match the color of the clapboards. Conduits at the North façade were made the same width as the clapboards to better conceal them. The condenser units are behind the hedges. Unit C3's installation is one of the votes the condo board held off on until the association has a vote, and they don't anticipate a disapproval. There are three units seeking a retroactive approval, Units A3, A4 and C3. Unit C3 received approval for their lower unit only. Going forward, the contractor agreed to do what is required by the association and the SRA. Additionally, the association hired Mark Wilhelm, who was the original architect for the building, to assist in this project. Mr. Yuhas noted that as a retired architect himself, he worked on the conditions for the removal of the old A/C units and installation of new mini-split units.

Chair Napolitano asked if the installation for unit B3 was approved. Mr. Anzalone replied that the owner only did his living room which is not visible from Federal Street. He noted that the Board stopped the installation at Unit B3 mid-installation. Unit C2 did their own without approval but did paint the conduit to match the clapboard.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the Board could refer the project to the DRB to determine if there were additional design considerations.

Public Comment:

Pam Broderick, 28 Federal Street, Unit B2. Clarified that the installation was halted for Unit C3 and B4 was due to concern of the layout of the conduit which has 45-degree angles. They had an on-site meeting and only an informal approval from the condo association, and their installation was also the most visible and it needed to be well thought out. The owner agreed to adjust the conduit to use right angles only and conduit on the horizontal matching the width of the clapboard. The Board may not have voted on it that yet, but all were present, and agreed to a standard method of installation. They have 12 units in this complex and owners seeking to do their entire unit would require conduit being installed on both the north and south sides of the building.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Rubin appreciated the comments since he was concerned with the use of 45-degree angles and would prefer 90-degree angles only. He noted that the request for a blanket approval is concerning but would prefer that the ruling become guidelines moving forward for other units in the building. He would ask that fencing or screening be required if the shrubby were damaged and the units became visible. Chair Napolitano added that she would want to see the condo association conditions after the association board votes on them before the SRA vote moves forward. If the association standard changes they would need to return to the SRA. She questioned putting parameters on the units they want to install now.

Mr. Daniel requested the date of the association meeting as it may be in line with the DRB schedule and noted that SRA decisions are active for two years. Mr. Anzalone replied that the next association meeting is scheduled for May 21, 2022.

Mr. Yuhas asked if retroactive approval would also include what the association approves in the future.

Ms. Madore stated that she is an abutter but holds no financial interest so there are no conflicts of interest. She was not comfortable with a blanket approval due to the scale of the project and this setting a precedent for other buildings in the urban renewal area. There are conditions to add to the exterior appearance relative to the mini-splits and design guidelines should be incorporated and referred to. She suggested the blanket approval go to the DRB and the SRA should approve it if the DRB approves. Mr. Rubin stated that each project is evaluated based on its own merit and on an individual basis and sending this application to the DRB doesn't change that. Ms. Madore noted that the ordinance doesn't specify mini-splits and reiterated that design guidelines should be created and included.

Chair Napolitano stated that they can approve those in this application. Mr. Rubin suggested sending the application to the DRB subject to the approval by the homeowner's association. Ms. Newhall-Smith suggested a motion to recommend approval based on documents that have been submitted, sending it to the DRB subject to HOA voting to approve the documents submitted to the SRA. Ms. Madore stated that she trusts the HOA will do the right thing for the building.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to recommend approval for the retroactive and current application based on documents that have been submitted, and to forward to DRB subject to HOA voting to approve the documents submitted to the SRA. Seconded by: Madore.
Roll Call: Madore, Rubin, Napolitano. 3-0 in favor.

Chair Napolitano suggested continuing the blanket approval until after the DRB reviews the application.

Additional Public Comment:

Pam Broderick, 28 Federal Street, Unit B2. Thanked the SRA and noted the existing support documents drafted by an architect that specifies the requirements for all existing 12 units.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano asked the association to return to the SRA after the HOA votes and to provide all final conditions for approval for the remaining units to be listed by unit number, to provide more specificity.

Mr. Daniel suggested residents investigate Mass Save for incentives to install mini-splits.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to continue the discussion of the blanket request until the next meeting. Seconded by: Napolitano. Roll Call: Madore, Rubin, Napolitano. 3-0 in favor.

- 4. 15 Summer Street:** Small Project Review – Removal of slate roof on upper portion of mansard roof and install up to 38 solar panels on roof.

Dick Pabich, 15 Summer Street, and A.J. Reis, Future Energy were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the applicant went before the DRB to install solar panels on the top peaks of the gambrel roof. The DRB requested a 1-foot setback from the sides and bottom of the roofline and to make sure the panels are oriented in the same direction. During the DRB review, there were questions about the slate roof at the peak with solar installers have difficulty

working with slate roofs. The applicant is now seeking to remove the upper slate roof to install the panels. Mr. Daniel added that the plan is the same and the only difference is the removal of the slate roof at the highest points of the roof, and it is difficult to see the top roof from the public way.

Mr. Reis clarified that the panels would be added at the entire rear roof and not along the front. He hoped that no setbacks would be required.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to approve as presented following DRB recommendations.

Seconded by: Madore.

Roll Call: Madore, Rubin, Napolitano. 3-0 in favor.

- 5. 301 Essex Street:** Final Design Review – Erect a 3 ½ story addition above the existing building (known as Jerry’s Army & Navy Store) with ten (10) residential units and twelve (12) onsite parking spaces located inside the building at the first-floor rear with retail space fronting on Essex Street, continued from 4/13/22 – Request to continue to June 8, 2022

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to continue to the June 8, 2022, regular meeting. Seconded by: Madore.

Roll Call: Madore, Rubin, Napolitano. 3-0 in favor.

New / Old Business

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

Mr. Daniel stated that they made progress and the purchase and sale agreement (P&S) with the MBTA for the remnant parcel should be completed this week and executed shortly. The 300 sq. ft. front parcel has been recorded so WinnDevelopment can file with the Planning Board in June for the crescent lot. It is being permitted with the PB as a Planned Unit Development (PUD) in two phases, the crescent lot and then the courthouses. They need the PB decision this year so they can apply for tax credits, but it is unknown when they will come before the SRA for a final design review. The city continues to work with DCAMM and the MBTA. They are also working on a study of the windows and masonry.

The servicing agreement with Salem Five is a contract between the City and the SRA for the bank to handle the administrative work associated with the proposed \$2M sellers note from the SRA to Winn. The original agreement from the early 1990s with Salem Five was recently updated. The bank will charge a monthly \$5 fee per loan it is servicing for the SRA and/or the City.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to accept the terms and conditions of the Servicing Agreement between the City of Salem, the Salem Redevelopment Authority, and Salem Five Bank.

Seconded by: Madore.

Roll Call: Madore, Rubin, Napolitano. 3-0 in favor.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to authorize the Executive Director to execute the Servicing Agreement on behalf of the Salem Redevelopment Authority. Seconded by: Madore.
Roll Call: Madore, Rubin, Napolitano. 3-0 in favor.

2. SRA By-Law Review: Project Update

Ms. Nina-Soto stated, prior to her leaving the meeting, that she had no issues with the revised By-Law's but still had concerns with Roberts Rules not being followed exactly. Mr. Rubin suggested the review be pushed to the June meeting so missing members can finish reviewing them and be a part of the discussion, members agreed.

3. SRA Financials

Approval of Minutes

1. Review of April 13, 2022, meeting minutes

The minutes of the April 13, 2022, meeting minutes were continued to the June 8, 2022, meeting.

Mr. Rubin welcomed Christine Madore back to the SRA. Chair Napolitano stated that this is the first time there has ever been a female majority on the SRA. Mr. Daniel noted the SRA's 60+ years of existence.

Adjournment

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by: Madore.
Roll Call: Madore, Rubin, Napolitano. 3-0 in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00PM.

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