

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES
April 26, 2022

A regular meeting of the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) was held on Tuesday, April 12, 2022 at 6:00 pm via remote participation through Zoom. Present were Chair Bart Hoskins, Vice Chair Carole Hamilton, John Boris, Ed Moriarty, Joy Livramento-Bryant, Bob Callahan, Mark Pattison and Deborah Greel. Also present was Jane Guy and Patricia Kelleher of the City of Salem Department of Planning & Community Development.

Mr. Hoskins stated that a Conflict of Interest Disclosure was filed for the following applications for which the members can still vote:

- a. Deborah Greel is a member of the board of the North Shore CDC and has filed the required Conflict of Interest Disclosure stating that she can fairly and impartially vote on the matter.

Mr. Hoskins noted that Ms. Greel's husband has been engaged to work on the St. Peter's Church project, and therefore she will not be able to participate or vote on that application.

Mr. Hoskins stated that because committee members have received and read the applications, the CPC is not inviting applicants to make a presentation or to repeat information in the application. However, if there is new information, the comment period would be the time to provide it and that all speakers shall be limited to no more than 2 minutes.

Public Comment

Courtney Koslow, Beacon Communities, stated that she was present to answer any questions regarding the Leefort Terrace application.

Linda Jenkins, representing the Pickering Foundation, stated that she was present to answer any questions regarding the Pickering House application.

Rick Hagis of Sail Salem, Inc. stated that he was present to answer any questions regarding the Floating Docks application.

Cathy Hoog of the Salem Housing Authority, stated that she was present to answer any questions regarding the Pickering House application.

Barbara Warren, Executive Director of Salem Sound Coastwatch, stated that she was present to answer any questions regarding the Volunteer Bridge application.

Jen Kolodziej of North Shore Community Development Coalition stated that she was present to answer any questions regarding the Residences at St. James application.

Reverend Nathan Ives of the Parish of St. Peter's Church stated that he was present to answer any questions regarding the St. Peter's Church application.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she is available to answer any questions regarding the Salem Deed and the Dickson Memorial Chapel applications.

Tom Devine, Senior Planner, stated that he was present to answer any questions regarding the Palmer Cove Park application.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Moriarty made a motion to close the public hearing portion of the meeting. Mr. Boris seconded the motion, all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Approval of Minutes

MOTION/VOTE: Ms. Greel made a motion to approve the minutes of April 12, 2022 as amended. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion, all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Development of Funding Recommendations

Leefort Terrace housing – BC Leefort Terrace LLC c/o Beacon Communities & Salem Housing Authority – replace 50 obsolete state public housing units with 124 unit, 100% affordable, regenerative and climate resilient development

MOTION: Mr. Moriarty made a motion to fund Lee Fort Terrace at \$200,000, under Community Housing: Creation, with \$106,650 from the FY23 Housing Reserve, and \$93,350 from the Fund Balance. Approval is conditional that a Affordable Housing Restriction that has been approved by the MA Department of Housing and Community Development be executed and filed at the Registry of Deeds. Approval is conditional that signage be installed as provided in the CPC's sign policy. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion.

Ms. Greel stated that it might be possible to fund all the applications, if a little was taken from each. She noted that sometimes the CPC has grouped several award recommendations into one motion.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he would like to fund the full amount for this project, noting that it is comprehensive, environmentally sound, outstanding project that includes funds from other sources. He stated that it is a home run in all regards.

Mr. Callahan stated that he agreed it was a great project, but noted that he had an issue with public money going to a for-profit company to construct the buildings. He stated that the company will still be making money off the project and even though it will be affordable rents.

Ms. Greel agreed it was a great project and added it is a \$69million project. She stated that CPA funding shows community support, but a smaller amount, such as \$195,000, would still show community support without making a difference to the project, and while leaving a few extra dollars for another project non-profit organization to be funded.

VOTE: The motion was voted on. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Residences at St. James, 160 Federal Street – North Shore CDC – Adaptive reuse of St. James School into 33 units of mixed-income housing for those aged 62 and older

MOTION: Ms. Hamilton made a motion to fund the Residences at St. James at \$250,000, under Community Housing: Creation, with \$166,553.66 from the Fund Balance and \$83,446.34 from the FY23 Budgeted Reserve. Approval is conditional that an Affordable Housing Restriction that has been approved by the MA Department of Housing and Community Development be executed and filed at the Registry of Deeds. Approval is conditional that signage be installed as provided in the CPC's sign policy. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion.

Ms. Greel noted that the applicant is a non-profit organization that builds affordable housing.

Mr. Moriarty stated that the project meets many needs and there will be a restriction recorded. It is a piece of property that has been vacant and blighted for a substantial period of time and it will improve the entire neighborhood.

Ms. Greel stated that North Shore CDC projects are usually deed restricted for a period of 99 years.

VOTE: The motion was voted on, all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Salem Willows Pier replacement, Willows Park, 200 Fort Ave. – City of Salem

MOTION/VOTE: Mr. Callahan made a motion to fund the Salem Willows Pier project at \$250,000, under Recreational Land: Rehabilitation/Restoration, with \$106,650 from the FY23 Open Space/Recreation Reserve and \$143,350 from the FY23 Budgeted Reserve. Approval is conditional that signage be installed as provided in the CPC's sign policy. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion, all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Palmer Cove Park Renovation Phase II, 30 Leavitt St. – City of Salem – Final phase of construction of improvements to Palmer Cove Park, including a second basketball court, new multiuse field, water access, trees, furnishings and public art

MOTION/VOTE: Mr. Callahan made a motion to fund the Palmer Cove Park project at \$115,000, under Recreational Land: Rehabilitation/Restoration, with \$115,000 from the FY23 Budgeted Reserve. Approval is conditional that signage be installed as provided in the CPC's sign policy. Ms. Greel seconded the motion, all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Salem Deed Conservation – City of Salem City Clerk's Office – Undertake conservation of the Salem Deed, a 1686 parchment, and rehouse document in an archival frame

MOTION: Ms. Hamilton made a motion to fund the Salem Deed Conservation at \$15,430 under Historic Resources: Preservation, with \$15,430 from the FY23 Historic Reserve. Ms. Greel seconded the motion.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he did not believe the deed should be funded with CPA funds. He stated that he did not see any historic value per se in saving the document and felt that it is reflective of a very sad and established pattern of Colonists taking advantage of a power position against

Native Americans and, in this instance, using a common law document to somehow justify the purchase a vast swath of land for minimal value. He stated that it is simply a deed, not a constitutional document, and that he felt it has no value other than recording a transaction that is unfair, unjust and it is a commencement of the trail of tears history, the way America has treated Native peoples.

VOTE: The motion was voted on. Mr. Hoskins, Ms. Hamilton, Ms. Greel, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Pattison and Mr. Boris voted in favor. Voting in opposition was Mr. Moriarty and Ms. Livramento-Bryant. The motion so carried.

Replacement of Floating Docks off Winter Island – Sail Salem & Salem Park & Recreation Commission – Design and construct replacement wooden floats used to staging and summer storage of Opti and 420 sailboats for youth sailing program

MOTION/VOTE: Mr. Callahan made a motion to fund the Replacement of Floating Docks off Winter Island at \$96,500, under Recreational Land: Rehabilitation/Restoration, with \$96,500 from the FY23 Budgeted Reserve. Approval is conditional that signage be installed as provided in the CPC's sign policy. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion, all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Front Façade Replacement, Pickering House, 18 Broad Street – Pickering Foundation – Complete replacement of south-facing Gothic Revival matched board siding & related trim and details

MOTION/VOTE: Mr. Moriarty made a motion to fund the Pickering House Front Façade Replacement at \$80,000, under Historic Resources: Rehabilitation/Restoration, with \$80,000 from the FY23 Budgeted Reserve. Approval is conditional that a Preservation Restriction be executed and filed at the Registry of Deeds and that all work adheres to the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties. Approval is conditional that signage be installed as provided in the CPC's sign policy. Mr. Boris seconded the motion, all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Dickson Memorial Chapel Stained Glass Window Restoration, Greenlawn Cemetery, 57 Orne Street – City of Salem -

MOTION/VOTE: Ms. Greel made a motion to fund the Dickson Memorial Chapel Stained Glass Window Restoration at \$60,000, under Historic Resources: Rehabilitation/Restoration, with \$11,220 from the FY23 Historic Reserve and \$48,780 from the FY23 Budgeted Reserve. Approval is conditional that the work adheres to the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties. Approval is conditional that signage be installed as provided in the CPC's sign policy. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he felt it is a valuable historic resource, but did not feel it metamorphized appropriately into the 21st century to fit 21st century uses. He did not feel CPA funds should be spent at this time, for this structure, for its current or any of its immediately projected uses.

Ms. Greel stated that there is a precedent of support by the CPC for this building. She noted that the Friends of Greenlawn is an amazingly dedicated group of people involved in this project and noted that the stained glass is a piece of artwork.

Mr. Hoskins stated that he does not have good sense of the to-do list overall for this building. He noted that previously, CPA funds were used to take care of certain parts of the exterior that were endanger of leaking water.

Ms. Kelleher stated that overall price tag was estimated at more than \$1million to do a full exterior restoration and interior work, so the City is looking at a phased approach. The first phase looked at emergency items, to make building safe. This phase is to restore the windows, which are also now in danger of failing. She noted that the Friends group has raised \$10,000 towards this effort. For the next phase, the hope is to secure funds to do an elevation at a time until the building is restored. The City is also looking at available capital funding to apply for preservation grants. She noted that the first phase received a Massachusetts Preservation Projects Fund grant that was augmented by the CPA funds.

Mr. Callahan asked if all phases have been planned.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the City will be hiring an architect to complete design drawings for next phase. There are not current drawings for the full restorations because the longer the wait, the more conditions change, so at this time it is a phase approach.

Ms. Greel stated that it is also a work of art and, if it is gone, it is lost. She noted that it does not have iconography on it. It has a value in terms of aesthetic.

Mr. Hoskins stated that there have been projects with big total price tags that have been undertaken in phases. He stated that he felt it important to find other funding sources and that he did not know if support will remain for multiple future phases for one building. He agreed that windows are a special feature of the building and also part of keeping the exterior integrity of the building. He noted that public access is limited, so there was concern about chipping away at this every year with just CPA.

Ms. Greel asked if CPA funds will leverage other funding.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she is hopeful that CPA funds requested and the funds raised by the Friends group will be enough to do all the windows, but other funds may be needed to complete the project. For the next phase of exterior restoration for the masonry, the City will be looking at apply for other preservation grants, through the State or other resources they can find.

Ms. Greel asked if CPA funds help when applying for other grants and to leverage more funding.

Ms. Kelleher replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Guy stated that similar to the local match for the housing projects, any local match is helpful to leverage the larger pots of money.

Mr. Hoskins stated that the CPC has often considered if a private group has raised a substantial amount of money prior to coming for CPA, which is helpful. This shows the investment from the local community for the project.

Mr. Moriarty stated that past performance is not an indication of future results. He stated that CPA awards are always a case by case basis and that funding in the past is not a guarantee of future funding. He stated that the issue remains as to the extent to which the chapel has 21st century and continuing value to an ever-changing community.

VOTE: Mr. Hoskins, Ms. Hamilton, Ms. Greel, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Moriarty, Ms. Livramento-Bryant, Mr. Pattison and Mr. Boris voted in favor. Voting in opposition was Mr. Moriarty and Ms. Livramento-Bryant. The motion so carried.

Ms. Greel left the virtual meeting during the following application review.

Coping Stone Reinstallation & Cellar Window Preservation - Parish of St. Peter's Church, 24 St. Peter Street – Reinstall fallen granite coping stones to chapel roof and replace church clear glass windows (4) to historic condition

Mr. Hoskins questioned if there was a way to trim in order to fund both St. Peter's Church and the Volunteer Bridge.

Mr. Moriarty stated that there has been some concern over the expense of the windows and the value to the historic artifice due to being at the rear of the structure, which did not seem to have the same value as the stones. He suggested funding for coping stone work, but excluding the windows.

Ms. Hamilton noted that St. Peter's has been ranked higher than the Volunteer Bridge, although noting that it does not mean it must be fully funded.

Reverend Ives stated that the four windows are front facing – they are on the front façade of the building facing the cemeteries. He stated that the windows will meet preservation standards.

Mr. Hoskins wondered if the Conservation Commission could also help fund the Volunteer Bridge.

Barbara Warren stated that the Volunteer Bridge is real safety hazard and that they would have to rethink bringing school children there, because it is a critical project. She stated that if it went out to bid, it would cost more than \$300,000. She stated that Salem Sound Coastwatch will try to get volunteers and get supply donations from the community. She noted that will work with the Conservation Commission. They will not purchase materials unless they know they can finish the project. The estimate included funds for stone dust in wet areas, but that it might be possible to get that donated. They are also talking with Salem High School about getting shop students to help with bridge. There is a lot of potential to bring in volunteers. Since they are not hiring a contractor, it is hard to know exactly what the cost will be. She believed \$65,000 and working with the Conservation can probably make the project happen.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he was in agreement with Ms. Hamilton that St. Peter's was ranked higher than the Volunteer Bridge and stated that because it is last on the High list, St. Peter's

shouldn't be subsumed within a medium project that has appeal. He suggested funding the St. Peter's project at \$40,000.

MOTION/VOTE: Mr. Moriarty made a motion to fund the St. Peter's Church project at \$40,000, under Historic Resources: Rehabilitation/Restoration, with \$40,000 from the FY23 Budgeted Reserve. Approval is conditional that a Preservation Restriction be executed and filed at the Registry of Deeds. Approval is conditional that the work adheres to the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties. Approval is conditional that signage be installed as provided in the CPC's sign policy. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion. Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Moriarty, Ms. Livramento-Bryant, and Mr. Boris voted in favor. Voting in opposition was Mr. Pattison and Mr. Hoskins. The motion so carried.

Ms. Greel rejoined the meeting.

Volunteer Bridge Rehabilitation, Forest River Conservation Area – Salem Sound Coastwatch & City of Salem Conservation Commission – Rehabilitation of boardwalk, improvements, public access and enhanced outdoor education opportunities

MOTION/VOTE: Ms. Hamilton made a motion to fund the Volunteer Bridge project at \$66,148.66 under Recreational Land: Rehabilitation/Restoration, with \$66,148.66 from the FY23 Budgeted Reserve. Approval is conditional that signage be installed as provided in the CPC's sign policy. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion, all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Installation of Rock Climbing Boulder, Memorial Park – City of Salem Park & Recreation & Mazie Heath

MOTION: Mr. Callahan made a motion to carry over the Rock Climbing Boulder to the next round. Mr. Boris seconded the motion. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he felt it is would be an attractive nuisance that's an inappropriate use of park land and poses a significant, substantial, continuing chronic risk to users especially young children. He stated that without further thought and a whole new approach with additional information regarding usage both national and regional, they should start from ground zero.

Mr. Hoskins stated that he would encourage the applicant to come back with more information on what has been done before and where, as well as the safety standards, and he liked the idea of carrying it over for future consideration.

VOTE: Mr. Hoskins, Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Pattison and Mr. Hoskins, Ms. Livramento-Bryant, and Mr. Boris voted in favor. Voting in opposition was Mr. Moriarty . The motion so carried.

Next Meeting(s):

Ms. Guy stated that the next meeting is scheduled for October, unless a need comes up to have a meeting sooner.

There being no further business, Ms. Greel made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion; all were in favor, and the motion so carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane A. Guy
Administrator