

**City of Salem Massachusetts  
Public Meeting Minutes**

<b>Board or Committee:</b>	<b>Redevelopment Authority, Regular Meeting</b>
<b>Date and Time:</b>	<b>Wednesday, February 12, 2020 at 6:00 PM</b>
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	<b>98 Washington Street, First Floor Conference Room</b>
<b>SRA Members Present:</b>	<b>Chair Grace Napolitano, David Guarino, Dean Rubin</b>
<b>SRA Members Absent:</b>	<b>Russ Vickers</b>
<b>Others Present:</b>	<b>Tom Daniel – Director of Planning and Community Development</b>
	<b>Kathryn Newhall-Smith – Principal Planner</b>
<b>Recorder:</b>	<b>Colleen Brewster</b>

Chair Napolitano calls the meeting to order. Roll call was taken.

### **Annual Meeting**

---

#### **Annual Report and Financial Report – Executive Director**

Mr. Daniel stated that the fall annual meeting was missed, and the fiscal year ended on 6/30/2019;

1. The projects as listed in the Annual Report for the 2018-2019 year included;
  - a. District Court building: Currently under construction
  - b. County Commissioners & Superior Court buildings: The RFP will be sent out soon. Preservation Planner – Patti Kelleher, the Historic Commission and the preservation community has been engaged, and the City is continuing with engagement with the broader community.
  - c. 5 Broad Street: The SRA managed this building for City. The Developer is negotiating the LDA but it was delayed due to regulatory framework being put into place by the City Council. Another tool utilized with the HDIP and the boundary was expanded to include other properties, but they haven't filed their application.
  - d. Hampton Inn: Will open this year.
  - e. PEM expansion: Will open this year. Their former offices are now apartments and commercial space.
  - f. Casa Tequila: Required multiple meetings.
  - g. Lynde, Federal & Summer Streets: Several residential projects are undergoing renovations
  - h. Signs: They've approved signs for existing business and new.
  - i. Café Permits: They have reviewed and approved several café permits for new and existing businesses.
  - j. Numerous projects underwent façade improvements and modifications with the DRB as the SRA's advisory board.
  - k. Charlotte Fortin Park and Old Town Hall (OTH): Both are City assets within the Urban Renewal Area. Julie Barry the Arts and Culture Planner, is managing a study of building needs and how to keep the spaces active, as well as a business plan so that OTH continues to have an active role in the community. Julie Barry took over managing the Public Art Program that Kate Luchini was managing.

- l. Staff and Board changes: Some Board members have stepped down and new ones have joined. Kate Newhall-Smith took over for Matt Coogan.
- m. Financial status: An account and some expenditures were tied to Utile who worked on the downtown public input process.
- n. Mr. Rubin noted that Kakawa Chocolate Company was missing from the list of recent projects.

## 2. Election of Officers: Chair, Vice Chair, Treasurer

Current Positions:

Chair: Grace Napolitano, Vice Chair: Russ Vickers, Treasurer: David Guarino

Rubin: Motion to approve the Grace Napolitano as the Chair, Russ Vickers as Vice Chair and David Guarino as Treasurer.

Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 3-0

## 3. Signatories for Eastern Bank Accounts

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that she opened an account for the sale of the Charlotte Fortin Park property. Robert Currier is a former account manager, and she needs signatories for old and new account. They wanted to keep the money from the easement separate, because its ear marked for planning and public improvements, and keeping those items separate makes them easier to track.

Rubin: Motion for Chair Napolitano and David Guarino as signatories of the SRA's bank account.

Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 3-0.

## 4. Adjournment

Rubin: Motion to adjourn Annual Meeting.

Seconded by: Guarino. Passes:3-0.

Start of Regular Meeting

## **Projects Under Review**

---

### **Executive Director's Report:**

1. No Executive Director's Report

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

---

1. **217-221 Essex Street:** Review of design modifications per Historical Tax Credits conditions of approval

Vu Alexander, Architect at Sousa Design Architects, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Alexander stated that he last presented in June. They've worked with the MHC on tax credits, incorporated their comments, and received approval for the plans. Mr. Alexander's clients are proposing to increase the scope of work, by removing the fire escape and freeing up interior space

within the units. They needed to add a second means of egress to the building and are proposing an exterior stair to connect the two buildings from the 5<sup>th</sup> floor of the 221 building with a switch-back stair with a sloped roof, onto the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the 217 building. They will present those changes when they receive their official approval.

Mr. Alexander noted that they are adding a new residential entry after negotiating with the 221 building tenant for a portion of their space. The Planning Board also requested that trash is removed from the rear of the building at the left side closest to the alleyway. MHC made several requests; that the metal paneling have a bronze color to make it look for historic, the removal of the digital clock, widening the rear trash room door for the bins, restoring the rear metal service doors, and lastly, that they retain the wood arched windows at the 217 building, but they need to determine if they are still functional because if more than 50% aren't the windows would need to be changed.

Mr. Rubin applauded their efforts to complete project with historical accuracy and added that the rear door seems narrow, but it may be widened. Mr. Alexander replied that they would need to extend the granite lintel to the right by adding another piece of granite.

Chair Napolitano asked if they could reuse the other doorway. Mr. Alexander replied that it's the tenants' space that they wanted to use and they couldn't continue waiting for an approval to use it.

Mr. Rubin asked if there were any unforeseen construction issues. Mr. Alexander replied that fencing in the previously landscaped area gave them a staging area they needed to remove and bring in construction materials, and the 221 building is being abated.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

*Chair Napolitano closes public comment.*

Rubin: Motion to approve as modified with MHC's approval of the changes.

Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 3-0

**2. 1 Derby Street:** Review of DRB recommendations for the installation of barrel dormers and new, second floor replacement windows

David Jaquith, Architect, and John Spinale – Owner, were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Jaquith stated that the skylights were eliminated but ventilation is needed to cool the attic so half-round windows are now proposed. They are proposed on this wall because of an existing brick party-wall that runs through the entire building. The windows were partially changed by the previous owner and the new owner continued to make the same window change, but they will be changed to wood single pane windows within the next 2 years. The owner, John Spinale presented old photos of the building and noted a major renovation completed in 1972. Mr. Rubin appreciated his effort to maintain the historical look to the building and requested a date of when the window installation will be complete. Mr. Spinale replied within 6-months.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

*Chair Napolitano closes public comment.*

Guarino: Motion to approve as amended with the stipulation that the windows be replaced by the end of the calendar year.

Seconded by: Rubin. Passes: 3-0

**3. 9-11 Dodge Street, 217-219 and 231-251 Washington Street, Hampton Inn/Mixed Use Development:** Review of DRB recommended for Hampton Inn Blade Sign

Mr. Ken McClure, Owner's Project Manager, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. McClure stated that at the last meeting they discussed the placement of the sign and he returned to the DRB for comments on sign placement. Two schemes were created; Option 1 was higher on the building and Option 2 was in line with the head of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows. The DRB wanted to move it below the protrusion of the upper wall and suggested that it be relocated to where the restaurant sign would be. The DRB recommended that Hampton Inn install a sign outside their standard branding, such as the one in in Portland, OR. Hampton Inn said there was extenuating circumstances and they weren't willing to do it on this sign or change their branding.

Mr. Guarino asked for specific corporate team comments. Mr. McClure replied that there was a precedent that corporate would not elaborate on. Mr. Guarino noted that the DRB was specific that they preferred Option 1 over Option 2, although they preferred the block lettering sign in the Portland, OR example. They do like the panel sign with the halo lighting; however, the block lettering looked more urban for Salem, in this size and location and eliminating the script text. Chair Napolitano stated that the block lettering reads down and not sideways and is a better look. Mr. Daniel added that it's their brand identity and he too prefers the Portland sign. Mr. McClure noted that the signage was originally approved as a corporate hotel with the standard signage.

Mr. Rubin agreed with Mr. Daniel and noted that the regulations have been in place prior to their construction of the building. The SRA gets the final say, other properties make the necessary changes, so why should the SRA bend to them when they knew the sign regulations when the process started. People will know it by their brand name and a precedent was made for the Salem Jail for other reasons. Mr. Daniel stated that alternatives were presented in the past and a wall sign was suggested, and its placement was questioned, which lead to a blade sign being the preferred approach but then it's size and location were questioned.

Mr. Guarino was concerned with the process and suggested other horizontal signs even though it's not what Hampton Inn corporate does. These are also extenuating circumstances and it's frustrating that they aren't willing to do it. People will know it by the brand. He asked what will happen if it's denied. Mr. McClure replied that he would need to go back to corporate. Chair Napolitano agreed and added that the SRA needs to protect their district, it's shouldn't be all or nothing. Mr. Rubin stated that if granted, the language needs to be clear because specifics on blade sign is precedent setting and others will want it. Mr. Daniel noted that a blade sign is allowed, SF enlargement has been allowed; however, the deviation from the sign manual is the vertical script lettering.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the ZBA needs to approve the size of sign and installation height which is proposed higher than standard. The ZBA will request the SRA's input on approval of this sign, but McClure requires SRA approval to move forward with the ZBA including the sign dimensions. Mr. Daniel noted that the size was approved with the sign in December. Mr. Guarino suggested Mr. McClure return with an explanation or rep from Hampton Inn on why the lettering couldn't be horizontal. Mr. McClure replied that the horizontal sign on Dodge Street and vertical sign will become different looking signs; however, the location and size are most critical because the electrical and arm brackets locations need to be determined. Mr. Daniel noted that the ZBA needs to know the elements of the sign not just location and height. The proposed sign size is 2'-4" W x 16'L. Mr. Guarino stated that new information was found by the DRB and not presented by the applicant. Mr. McClure noted that the Portland hotel doesn't have an identity clash with different

types of letter on different signs. Ms. Newhall-Smith suggested that the SRA could approve a sign that meets the regulation, a horizontal blade sign or wall sign. Chair Napolitano stated that Hampton Inn could have dealt with this earlier.

Mr. Rubin stated that the applicant's signage should match their logo.

Rubin: Motion to approve with the changes to the verticality with language that it's a national brand that uses this vertical script text, and contingent upon ZBA approval.

Seconded by: No one. Motion does not pass.

Guarino: Motion to table the motion until they hear back from Hampton Inn corporate on why they open to providing a more appropriate sign.

Seconded by: No one. Motion does not pass.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

Councilor Christine Madore. Suggested the SRA use their power to deny the application to compel Hampton Inn to respond and to provide appropriate signage. Tabling is no action and denying forces the hotel to start over. She asked whether the public suggested precedents for other hotel signage. Mr. Daniel replied that they've had discussions about alternative signage.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

*Chair Napolitano closes public comment.*

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that there is no financial ramifications associated with starting the process over since there are no fees or abutter notifications to send out, only the applicant filing a new application.

Mr. Daniel noted that the DRB has gone through the vetting process. The size and location are okay, just the direction and type of lettering are being questioned. Mr. Guarino stated that he would support a wall sign. Chair Napolitano suggested continuing the application since the DRB made their recommendation and it needs to be communicated to corporate. Mr. McClure noted that if they approve rotating the text it would require another meeting so he could go before the ZBA sooner. Ms. Newhall-Smith suggested that matter be handled administratively – if the applicant can provide a rendering of the sign that meets the SRA's decision, then he can move forward with the ZBA process.

Guarino: Motion to approve the DRB's recommendation of Option 1, subject to an administrative review.

Seconded by: Chair Napolitano Grace. Rubin opposed. Motion passes.

**4. 30 Federal Street:** Development Project Review – Construction of a mixed-use addition with retail space, four residential units, and six parking spaces

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti, Quinn, Grover & Frey representing the Owner, Dan Ricciarelli of Seger Architects, Michael Becker – Owner, were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Grover stated that this application first came to the board in June of 2019. The Board was supportive of the concept and referred them to the DRB for design review. A ruling by the Building Inspector relating to the parking required them to change the design. The original proposal was for 5 residential units, 2 on-site parking spots and 3 spaces in the commuter station garage, to satisfy the 5 parking space requirements. The Building Inspector stated that the new units in the addition means the new spaces were required on site. They reduced the parking by 1 by reducing the unit count

from 5 to 4, with retail on the first floor, 4 parking spaces are beneath the building and 2 are in the courtyard on the Federal Street side of the property. They've had numerous meetings with the neighbors, additional changes were made, and neighbors with concerns were present at the December SRA meeting.

Mr. Ricciarelli stated that building abuts a series of condominiums and the proposed is for a rear addition approximately 40-feet deep with the building over the new parking. They met with the Tree Warden and proposed replacing street trees but there is a cost and a process involved, so the current plan to keep the existing trees and maybe add a few more. They will also no longer add landscaping to help screen the parking from Washington Street due to the Tree Ordinance regulations. They will add a different paving material to delineate the path, either pavers or granite steps, something other than the asphalt paving.

Mr. Ricciarelli noted that the basement will be storage, trash and recycling with pick-up days to be determined. The first-floor office space will become retail with storefront glass, new elevator and lobby, 2 flats with two means of egress and an existing office. The second floor will be the start of townhouses with recessed decks and a transparent rail that has been made solid. There will be a first-floor canopy to unify the two buildings, masonry will be refurbished possibly painted, and the new façade will be cementitious siding and metal clapboard. They want to use similar materials and details from the existing condominium for synergy, which will be reviewed by the DRB. The tower element is a play off the Washington Street chimney. They will include an undetermined screening to shield parking from Washington Street and the existing landscaping will remain. The top floor dormer was also moved further back, and the roof will have matching asphalt shingles. The proposed façade consists of; metal siding in a vertical running bond pattern for visual interest, cementitious siding, Hardie board, Cedar screening, clapboard siding at the base, and aluminum storefront at the commercial space. Soffit panels will be used above the parking and at the overhangs. The building will sit in shadow of courts building and in December the new building will casts a small shadow on the neighboring condominiums in June. Atty. Grover stated that proposed was 4 stories and a roof, but one story was removed, and they will match the ridge height, but the dormer is new.

Mr. Daniel requested more information on the tower element. Mr. Ricciarelli replied that it's upper space from the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor and it will be a play off the chimney.

Mr. Guarino stated that this application was sent to the DRB in June, and the neighbors were supportive but there was a lot of recent opposition and threats of litigation by some neighbors. He asked if the access for retail to parking lot been address. Mr. Ricciarelli replied that all retail will be directed to the Washington Street entrance. The rear exit is for residential use only. Deliveries can be timed to not affect the traffic.

Mr. Rubin stated that 30+ letters were received from neighbors not in favor, and he asked how have things changed. The builders have rights to develop the property but this is emotional for neighbors. Atty. Grover replied that they've had several group and individual meetings to receive neighborhood input, and they've listened and responded. The massing was a concern, so they reduced the size, matched the ridge lines, and eliminating a unit. The walkway to access the neighboring complexes will be relocated around the building. Shadow & light studies were completed, and trash will be located within the building. Mr. Ricciarelli added that snow plowing will be done by the developer and snow won't be piled into other spaces. Mr. Rubin asked if there will be snow removal off site. Mr. Ricciarelli replied that they are building on top of their own property. Mr. Becker added that they are eliminating 3 ½ parking spaces worth of snow since it will be on their roof, and snow storage will remain. Snow falling off the roof will be addressed. He volunteered to replace the tress at \$150 per inch of tree truck, but he shouldn't be penalized to replace them as well as pay to removal. The Birch tree can been cut off, but it will cost \$2,500 to remove it and its two trunks make it a double tree, but they will still plant 2 new shade trees. Mr. Ricciarelli replied that the Tree

Warden wants the existing trees to remain, they will still plan two new shade trees, activate the courtyard, and existing landscaping will conceal the parking.

Mr. Rubin asked about the proposed parking on Federal Street. Mr. Becker replied that they could have added 2 spots to Federal Street, which they consider the side of the building and not a garage door on Washington Street, and they have the right to install a curb cut. The corner lot has two fronts but Federal is the side. Mr. Daniel noted that parking on Federal Street is a deviation of the parking standards in the Urban Renewal Plan and the original proposal didn't have parking on Federal Street. Mr. Rubin asked the applicant if he was aware of this stipulation. Mr. Becker replied that he would ask the ZBA if they could get one spot per unit, like 65 Washington Street. Atty. Grover suggested the neighboring parking lots as an option. Mr. Daniel supported the 1 spot per unit approach. Mr. Becker stated that they could move units to the original building and have four parking spots on site, but don't want to renovate existing office space to eliminate parking. Mr. Guarino asked why they aren't proposing a project without the two spots. Atty. Grover replied that they could obtain a variance from the ZBA, but it revolved around the zoning interpretation of new vs. old building and adding commercial space to the new building. Chair Napolitano stated that they could approve it without the two spaces on Federal and the applicant would need to plan for off-site parking. Mr. Becker replied that he has no issue with that option. Atty. Grover added that they would still need to go to the ZBA and return to the SRA for a final approval.

Mr. Rubin stated that some letters addressed the specificity of the lot around the building and suggested the applicant provide dimensions of where adjacent properties are located. Mr. Ricciarelli replied that they discussed that at their meetings with the neighbors and they can add the neighboring properties on their sketches and plans for clarification.

Mr. Rubin questioned whether the proposed design would fit in with the look of this downtown block. Mr. Daniel replied that the selection of proposed materials was discussed in December and the materials should be compatible and complimentary. Numerous meetings were held to discuss the materials and detail of 65 Washington Street and the materials can always be changed. Mr. Guarino agreed that the new materials should fit in. Ms. Newhall-Smith added that some materials reference the other condominiums on the block and as a corner lot they face three other buildings. The corner could be more of a nod to the surrounding materials of the other corner properties. She will send her staff memo to the applicant. Mr. Ricciarelli noted that the DRB offered their suggestions too. The pre patinaed metal would have flat seams to match the courthouse roof across the street.

Mr. Rubin stated that all the letters they received were helpful, but developers do have the right to build even if abutters are immediately affected by it.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

Joan Hopper, 28 Federal Street. Asked if common sewage was shared between the buildings, because the system is already stressed. Mr. Becker replied that his building has its own water bill but can confirm it.

Sarah Morneau, 28 Federal Street. Questioned trucks making deliveries being parked on Washington Street in mornings. The earlier train leave at 5:30AM and the area is pedestrian heavy. One person was killed at this location on a Saturday several years ago, and this is one more thing to add.

Steve Immerman, 20 Federal Street. Appreciates the role of the SRA and their attention to detail. This is the expertise of condominium owners and their response to developers and he feels their response is practical not emotional. He's pro development and transient oriented development, but good design is important. A developer's need to respond to cost make sense but cramming in a development to maximize the money to the developer doesn't make sense, and neither does leaving a dead tree because it reduces the developers cost. Efforts should be made to make the exterior façade

fit in with the neighborhood, but what's proposed is currently neither a good design nor a good fit. It's also not practical in terms of loading for Washington because there is a loading zone on Federal Street.

Atty. Roy Gelineau. Sent letter on behalf of Church Court and New Salem 2 Condominiums. He looked at parking issue today and believes there is a misunderstanding on what the regulations require. An urban renewal plan made 10 references to parking; behind a building, sheltered from public, behind landscape, behind screening, etc. but parking on Federal Street shouldn't be proposed like on the other side of Federal Street and this would be a complete change to the urban renewal district regulation. The building was too big before and it's still too big and has too many units. They are including parking to make it work and would ask for a variance to make a building that is already too big. The right lane of this end of Washington Street is a turn lane that efficiently moves vehicles out of downtown Salem. Trucks parking there will have a big impact on traffic because it's not a loading area.

Pam Broderick, 28 Federal Street. Façade facing the train station hasn't changed much but there is a disconnect from the rest of the neighborhood. The proposed design is inappropriate and doesn't speak to the building it's attached to, the County Commission building across the street, or 65 Federal Street. This is the commuter entrance corridor that will be the first thing many seen when they enter Salem, unlike what visitors see in historic cities like Plymouth, Lexington, etc. Economics may drive the design, but this design isn't incompatible, and it lacks human scale. This is the fourth set of plans and the elevations and they haven't changed much.

Bill Yuhas, 28 Federal Street. The applicant started having neighborhood meetings two months prior and at the last meeting he requested the shadow study. They recessed the 4<sup>th</sup> floor porch and matched the ridge line, but it has same effect on the shadow even without the top floor. They will lose a lot of sunshine in this area, but they do get some shade. The applicant hasn't stated the proposed use of the plaza that the windows from their neighboring condominiums will look down on. Generators and transformers are also proposed outside their windows which the current plans don't show. The retail space is currently undetermined, but the neighbors want to know what will go there. This block was created by the SRA over 30 years ago for the purpose of downtown housing. Retail for this area isn't compatible and he questioned the length of this lease. Mr. Becker replied that retail rentals won't be short-term. The previously proposed exterior material was copper, which is expensive, but it was redesigned based on the neighbor feedback. He clarified that a condenser not a transformer is proposed for the courtyard and they eliminated 10-12 feet from the roof height.

Jane Stocker, 1 Washington Street. The SRA designed this area 40 years ago, it's a desirable area of downtown that doesn't need the vitality the developer is suggesting. She hopes the SRA turns this request down.

Mason Derring, 28 Federal Street. Questioned the addition of a retail establishment that requires an exhaust fan and dumpster that will interfere with the proposed use. Believes it's within the SRA's purview to prescribe certain commercial uses. Approving this will ruin their neighborhood when there are 20-30 neighboring restaurants for people to go.

Sarah Morneau, 28 Federal Street. She added that their plans don't show the front of the neighboring condo building in their proposed drawings.

Mr. Becker replied that the parking will face their building only, trash will be kept in the basement and they have the right to put a café in their 846 SF of retail in their existing building on Washington Street given the zoning regulations for the district.

Barbara Cleary, 104 Federal Street. The abutters' issues also relate to the walkway used by hundreds of commuters. Is relocating the walkway really allowed by-right?



Atty. Grover stated that in a B5 Zoning district, much large buildings are allowed in this district with 100% lot coverage and the proposed is not incompatible. Mr. Becker noted that the adjacent properties will soon be redeveloped, and his four unit proposed development is tiny in comparison, particularly the 75-foot tall proposed structure at 65 Washington Street.

Steve Bissin, 1 Washington Street. Redevelopment doesn't mean adding insult to injury and practically building another structure on top of their existing condominium. The proposed design is basically unchanged since December. A significant amount of time was spent discussing a sign for the new hotel on Washington Street, and what's proposed is a completely new building that's intrusive on their neighbors, and what's constructed will be permanent. Mr. Becker replied that what's proposed is an addition on an existing building not a new building.

Councilor Madore stated that this building needs as much time and consideration as the efforts put towards 65 Washington Street, and that process is an important one to follow because it's one of the first buildings you see off the train. Buildings should speak to the pedestrian and the images of the proposed building doesn't say much. The metal finishing needs work because it doesn't fit, it resembles the Old Salem Jail and that wasn't a suitable façade material. The proposed doesn't look compatible to 28 Federal Street but the DRB will review the design. The loading zoning is on Federal Street and delivery and service trucks should only park there. The parking design is being changed in response to the parking requirements. She asked if the building could be smaller to reduce it's massing if more relief is given for the parking. Future changes should be done to accommodate the parking and giving parking relief isn't the answer because it creates a less desirable outcome like with 65 Washington Street, where they lost some retail space to add parking.

Mr. Becker replied that they could add more retail space, but they can't determine who will lease the space before the building has been approved. Input welcome from other architects regarding material changes or reducing the tower. The commercial space works as is and the elevator will make it ADA compliant.

An abutter asked if there was an evaluation mechanism to determine if they are at the maximum for retail space in the City. Mr. Daniel replied not specifically, there is a monitoring of ground floor vacancies and why they are vacant. Long standing vacancies are because some owners don't execute the lease and some property owners, many don't take anyone because they want the right fit for their building. He hopes the current applicant would have high standards for who they lease too. Ms. Newhall-Smith noted that there is a lot of interest in other retail spaces, but some owners are very selective. She receives business inquiries a couple times a week.

Councilor Madore suggested that Atty. Grover listen to the neighborhood retail establishment desires. This space should be built for a need that is not being met, because it will result in a much better project.

Mr. Daniel asked if no parking was needed on site, what would the design become. Mr. Becker replied that he would be open to revising the parking if they had relief, but he wants a residential component which requires parking. Atty. Grover noted that all are opposed to the two Federal Street parking spaces, they can adjust the building design to comply with zoning.

Pam Broderick, 28 Federal Street. Added that the parcel was designed as rented office suites and idea that your development didn't proceed until you had your commercial partner must have been their original business model.

Mason Derring, 28 Federal Street. Added that she understands the developer having the right to commercial but asked that they limit the use of the retail to business that don't require deliveries. Chair Napolitano replied that the SRA doesn't have the authority to limit the use. This meeting is

only to send it to the DRB for review and the applicant will return for SRA approval. Mr. Daniel added that other departments regulate the use as a food establishment.

Barbara Cleary, 104 Federal Street. Replied that the ZBA can regulate the use and the Building Inspector should provide input on the new addition.

Atty. Grover stated that an addition becomes a new building if it's larger than the existing building and they've determined that the addition is smaller and therefore they comply. The addition would completely comply if they made some minor changes, eliminated the need for parking, and move the residential units to the old building and not in the new addition. Mr. Daniel added that Mr. Becker's Lynde Street was determined to be a new building, so he reduced the size and it became an addition, but it would be good to confirm this structure with the Building Inspector again. Atty. Gelineau replied that the problem his client has is that there is no formal ruling from the Building Inspector, it's all based on conversations. The applicant would have a confirmation prior to moving forward. The applicant is changing the plan and it's hard for the neighbors to keep up.

Mr. Daniel stated that the applicant can get that determination from the Building Inspector prior to the next SRA meeting. Mr. Becker noted that they've adjusted the plans and they are currently only slightly over the lot coverage amount. Mr. Daniel stated that they would eliminate the 2 parking spaces on Federal Street and could incorporate some options to create a very different design. Atty. Grover noted that no parking can included that puts a burden on the neighborhood. Councilor Madore noted that eliminating the two parking spaces would create a better building, as would only providing three spaces and not four below the building. Mr. Guarino added that eliminating the two parking spaces on Federal Street would only create more open space for the courtyard.

Mr. Rubin stated that the DRB can help with the design changes, to improve the building and refresh the neighborhood. Mr. Becker replied that he is open to design input and changes.

Pam Broderick, 28 Federal Street. Added that zoning is an important matter to confirm by Mr. St. Pierre. Atty. Grover explained the proposed Floor Area Ratio. Mr. Becker replied that they will comply with zoning.

Mr. Guarino requested they send DRB their minutes or concerns in a formal way to explain the SRA's concerns. Eliminating the two parking spaces on Federal Street, design materials, compatibility issue with the neighborhood, massing, window fenestration, neighborhood developments, etc.

Bill Yuhas, 28 Federal Street. Added that the height of building, how it fits into the neighborhood, and the scale of the building are their major concerns.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

*Chair Napolitano closes public comment.*

Guarino: Motion to refer to DRB and receive Tom St. Pierre's formal response.  
Seconded by: Rubin. Passes: 3-0

5. **49 Federal Street:** Review of proposed façade restoration project and construction of rear 10'x22', two story addition.

Sanir Lutfija of Seger Architects and Mike Becker, Owner, were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Lutfija stated the building was built in 1873 and is of a Second Empire style. They will remove the aluminum siding, open the enclosed porch on the North elevation, fire escape, an existing gable

dormer and door, aluminum storefront doors, and aluminum window shutters. An existing bulkhead at the rear (South) and side (East) have been enclosed. A rear 10-foot x 22-foot addition is proposed, the enclosed porch will fit more with the building style, make the entrance more prominent, install a solid panel door in place of the aluminum storefront, add a granite planter, bring back the cornice line once they removed the door and dormer. The porch will be in same location; however, the steps will face the driveway. They will remove aluminum siding, restore the presumed clapboard siding, refurbish the existing 2 over 2 windows and storms, and replace the decorative trim and brackets. Any new clapboards will match what's existing and they will expand the dormers to provide deck access for the two third floor units. They will add a skylight to the East roof.

Mr. Becker stated that they will replace the roof to something that resembles slate, replace the basement windows, and the siding will match the addition. The addition is subservient and set back from the main structure, following the Secretary of the Interior Standards. The upper level deck will add outdoors space to 3<sup>rd</sup> floor units. The front door is setback, the existing granite steps will continue, but they will add a granite planter. They will add three windows on side with panels below and a porch above at the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. Doors at the second floor will become symmetrical. In his experience they will only need to be scrape and paint the clapboards once the aluminum siding is removed.

Mr. Rubin asked if the parking requirement was being met. Mr. Becker replied that they will all be on site except one space. The existing parking spot sizes are 9' x 19' and 6 cars squeeze onto the site. Tandem parking can't be counted, and the 4<sup>th</sup> space is on the other side of the structure. Garage parking is 940 feet away from the site and no variance is required.

Mr. Rubin asked if they've sought any comments from either of the historic groups. Mr. Becker replied that he had reached out to Jessica Herbert and Historic Salem.

Mr. Daniel asked what they will do about the shutters. Mr. Becker replied that the existing are plastic and the windows with half molding only have shutters that are 1/3 the height of the window, so they will all be removed. Mr. Daniel added that high ornate structures don't usually have shutters.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that she sent the application to Patti Kelleher for her response. Based on preliminary conversations, Ms. Kelleher indicated that she believed the treatment at the porch to be too ornate for the time period. Mr. Becker replied that he is open to input.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

*Chair Napolitano closes public comment.*

Rubin: Motion to forward to DRB as proposed.  
Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 3-0

## **New / Old Business**

---

### **1. Peabody Essex Museum: Blue Trees Art Installation**

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the Kate Luchini from the PEM is coordinating an art installation to paint the trees along the pedestrian mall that are in front of the museum and those along Axelrod Way blue. The trees on the pedestrian mall are city owned and she's going to the Tree Commission for review. The purpose of the installation is to highlight environmental awareness. The paint is safe, will not damage the trees, and will wash it away over time.

Mr. Rubin stated that this will be a highly visible with a big social impact. Salem has been very open to temporary artistic elements. He expressed concerned with how long it will last.

Public Comment:

Councilor Madore questioned whether there are enough trees downtown to make this impactful or if the recent removal of so many trees will highlight how so few trees are left.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that only the trees in front of the PEM will be painted and she will reach out to Ms. Luchini to determine how long the blue would last.

## **2. Superior Court and Crescent Lot: Update**

Mr. Daniel stated that RFP has been sent out and they are waiting for comments from MHC that resulted in minimal changes and have received some questions from the development team. They've received some questions from the development team and are still working on the remnant parcel with MTBA. Regarding the preservation restrictions, MHC's comments were included as well as their community comments that MHC is now reviewing. They are continuing to speak to DCAMM, and they are interested in conveying the buildings to the SRA sooner rather than later. Commissioner Gladstone spoke with Mayor Driscoll and the Inspections Services group will inspect the buildings to determine the maintenance issues. The mothballing is complete but potential steam pipes leak repairs would require daily walk-throughs, weekly boiler checks and system checks, and annual inspections, despite most of the equipment being less than three years old. The elevator has been decommissioned and only one functional toilet remains. While the needs are minimal, a person must be ready and able to deploy should repair be needed and to manage the properties. They've floated the idea of doing that, so the state doesn't have the burden for maintenance only, and they are working on developing a facilities group that can manage these styles of properties. The expenditures are what the State would like to unburden themselves of and security will cost approximately \$120,000 per year. The Commonwealth would convey the properties with a fund and a manager to be named later, but there would need to be an agreement on how the money would flow and be tracked. People need to be able to quickly respond if something happens related to heat, fire, water, equipment, etc.

Mr. Daniel stated that the SRA reviewed the RFP schedule.

## **Minutes**

---

No minutes to review.

## **Executive Session**

---

No Executive Session was held.

## **Other Business**

## **Adjournment**

Chair Napolitano: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Guarino. Passes 3-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 10:00PM.

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