

**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, November 13, 2019 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, Gary Barrett, 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 Kathryn Newhall-Smith – Principal Planner Colleen Brewster</b>
<b>Recorder:</b>	

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

---

**Projects Under Review**

**Executive Director's Report:**

Mr. Daniel stated that:

1. Hampton Inn sign: They are meeting with them next week and the applicant will return in December.
2. Mr. Rubin shared an e-mail about the Lobster Shanty, whose seasonal covering was supposed to be installed for 3-seasons. The SRA needs to define the meaning of "seasonal" and that those dates be incorporated with future seasonal coverings.

---

**Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review**

**1. 2 Lynde Street (Settlers Restaurant): Small Project Review**

Aaron Chambers, Owner, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Chambers stated that the DRB approved most items but not the windows, which they thought, given the lite configuration, were too small for the space. He wanted to use mullions to give a cozy feel as opposed to windows that allow a lot of light that come into the space. Ms. Newhall-Smith noted that the DRB thought it was a good window but not appropriate with the space. The existing windows are horizontal ribbon style and the four double-hung windows in a 6x6 pattern seemed too squished for the space, so the DRB asked for a different window. Mr. Chambers noted that the windows were already ordered, which he did so due to the lead time for the windows. He wants to be open before Christmas. If the SRA doesn't approve the proposed window, he will keep the existing window.

Mr. Guarino asked for the DRB's specific concern, if they don't look good or if they didn't fit within the district. Ms. Newhall-Smith replied that the DRB felt that the window read as residential. Mr. Chambers noted that he wanted to be in keeping with the architecture of the city. The new track system provides more space between the windows. The existing windows aren't designed to keep

the cold out. Ms. Newhall-Smith noted that the DRB didn't recommend a specific window, only something simpler, and not a 6x6. Mr. Rubin asked for the DRB's concern. Ms. Newhall-Smith replied that members believed it was not appropriate for this façade, it's more residential in style and not suitable on a commercial building. Mr. Daniel restated that Mr. Chambers said it's a cozy restaurant and Mr. Chambers felt it would be appropriate his establishment. Chair Napolitano, Mr. Guarino & Mr. Barrett agreed that they both prefer the 6x6 looks. Mr. Rubin noted that if there was a historic reasoning, he would have more sympathy for the DRB's opinion, but they should have clarified their reasoning. Mr. Barrett and Mr. Guarino agreed. Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the DRB's vote was five votes agreeing not to allow the windows and one abstention.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

Mark Meche, Winter Street Architects. Agreed with the DRB that it's a compositional issue. The DRB had a real problem saying no because the windows were purchased. It was a careful design decision. It looks like someone took out the old window and a 1x1 arrangement would be better. It's not a historical façade or a historic composition and would look awkward. The window performance is important. Mr. Rubin asked if the applicant could get that from any Andersen window, from a design perspective if it's not violating an historic ordinance. He is having trouble understanding why the DRB did not approve the proposed window. Mr. Meche replied that it's about historic look and it was tough decision for the DRB to make. Mr. Chambers noted that his architect had recommended the window.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

*Chair Napolitano closes public comment.*

Barrett: Motion to approve the window as originally submitted.

Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 4-0

Guarino: Motion to approve all other items.

Seconded by: Rubin: Passes 4-0

Mr. Guarino requested that a letter accompany the DRB's recommendation when they say no to items, as well as recommendations for what should be there.

## **2. 285 Derby Street: Review of Development Project**

Mark Meche of Winter Street Architects and Russ Tanzer of South Harbor Holdings were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Tanzer stated that they met with DRB last week for change to proposal, to incorporate a passage door and an accordion style door. Mr. Rubin asked if the passage door will remain on the right as well as the top panel. Mr. Tanzer replied yes, and that the top window is fixed. Mr. Meche added that the combination between the doors and glass will be seamless and presented proposed open and closed images. The passage door will be the same scale as the front door. Mr. Tanzer noted that the accordion-style door isn't considered a second means of egress so there needs to be a passage door. Mr. Rubin asked why the passage door is not the same size as the accordion panel door. Mr. Meche replied that the accordion panels are 9-feet-high, it could happen and would be easier design-wise.

Mr. Rubin noted that typically the entire accordion door system would all go to one side, but he understands why the main door is separate, so someone wouldn't be able to walk into. It's a hybrid design. Mr. Daniel asked about a combination where the doors and accordion panels don't split to each side. Mr. Meche replied that the accordion will stack left so all moveable doors go in one direction.

Mr. Tanzer stated that Rover Bagel will open in the space on March 1<sup>st</sup>

Mr. Guarino asked if outdoor seating would be proposed. Mr. Meche replied yes. Mr. Tanzer noted that outdoor seating will be proposed along the side of the building and businesses will flow into the park. Each business that wants outdoor seating will submit its own café permit.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

*Chair Napolitano closes public comment.*

Rubin: Motion to approve the changes as proposed.

Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 4-0

---

## New / Old Business

### **1. 289 Derby Street (Charlotte Forten Park): Acceptance of Deed from City**

Mr. Daniel stated that the SRA accepted the deed for the strip of land in October and this is the next step. The vision for Charlotte Forten Park is to activate the space and this strip of land at 285 Derby Street, Mr. Clarke's property, runs along the building. The sum of \$218,958.00 for the granting of the easement is based on the appraisal and discussions that happened between the Owner and the City. This space will be good for programming and activation. Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that she forwarded the plan that references the deed and lot 2 is the easement area that ends 13-feet from the river's edge; it directly abuts 285 Derby Street and is 20-feet wide.

Mr. Guarino stated that the City Solicitor wrote the language. Tim Clarke of South Harbor Holdings stated that this is the one part that they've been working on in the neighborhood that started with Notch Brewing. Mayor Driscoll had this vision and they are 100% supportive of it. In addition, it required filing Ch. 91 licenses for 285 and 289 Derby Street Harbor Walk. With permitting and engineering these three factors are a private investment of \$700,000. This will help complete the neighborhood and the connection to the park and will be good for their investment and future tenants. The easement will help with that too. Mr. Meche presented a proposed image and an elevation of 285 that faces the park at 289. This provides over 8,000 SF at the rear for future tenants and it's all coming together well. Mr. Guarino thanked them for their investment. Ms. Newhall-Smith asked if the paving has already been permitted. Mr. Clarke replied that it's been approved through Ch 91. Mr. Meche noted that the DRB review has been sketches not a design.

Guarino: Motion to grant the easement as written.

Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 4-0

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

Mr. Daniel stated that the soil conditions report was distributed to the teams and the remnant parcel owned by the MBTA has undergone multiple reviews by the agency and is in process and he'd made another call to them today. There is a MOA that will be entered. When the developer is selected it will be conveyed to the developer. The pro rata share would go to the MBTA but the SRA will get some payment too. They will continue to meet with DCAMM regarding the question about the timing of the conveyance of the courthouses to the SRA. He believes it should follow the model of

the district court and DCAMM noted that it's costing them a lot to take care of and they are still in conversation about that. In terms of legislation, there is an effort to consider the Registry of Deeds being housed in the buildings and they've met with all development teams to discuss the matter. Sec. Galvin's office needs to provide all of the specifications (rental rate, length of lease, required tenant improvements, etc.). If the Secretary's office cannot provide this information, then including the Registry may not be feasible.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that she organized two-days of tours for development teams and everyone appreciated the walk-through opportunity. The photographer was also taking photographs of the building that will accompany the RFP. The Preservation Consultant is close to having a draft ready for internal review and review with the Preservation Planner. They want a draft that the Mass Historic Commission as well as the local community partners agree to. She also gave them a basic list of what they are looking to preserve; ceilings, staircases, tile mosaic in the Superior Court building, the Law Library in its entirety, as well as some ornate window moldings and trim. Mr. Daniel added that the selected team will be bound to the Secretary of the Interior Standards, including Mass Historical Commission and local review, and the National Parks Service in Washington D.C. Satisfying these requirements is a part of the historic tax credit program. The tax credit program mandates that certain features be preserved for at least five years. The Preservation Restriction, once recorded, will ensure preservation of those features listed within in perpetuity.

Compliance with the historic tax credit program is challenging. Mr. Daniel stated that when the Old Salem Jail went through this process, National Park Service said the jail cells were being removed which is part of the historic status of the property, but they couldn't build apartments while keeping the jail cells, which was a big concern. Other modifications were made, cells were removed, and other accommodations were small but significant. The restaurant entrance was moved from the courtyard to the back of the building – the Bridge Street elevation – which was an unfortunate change because the new entrance is hard to see and access. Another example showing the challenges with the Historic Tax Credit program is with the redevelopment of St. Joseph's rectory. Planning Department staff is currently working with developers of the rectory; the second floor has a stage and seating space and to comply with tax credits they maintained the volume of the space, but it wasn't deemed adequate, so two units were eliminated, and the large open space has no real use now.

Mr. Daniel stated that he's planned a Council meeting update in November or December; however, both agendas are full so it may get bumped to January

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the RFP draft will be discussed in the Executive Session.

### **3. Meeting Schedule for 2020**

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the dates are the same, but the November meeting can be rescheduled to the night before Veteran's Day. Mr. Daniel noted that the Courthouse meetings will be scheduled separately in April or May of 2020.

Mr. Rubin suggested another joint meeting with City Council be added to the schedule. Mr. Guarino suggested in March of 2020 because of the Courthouse RFP.

---

## **Minutes**

Guarino: Motion to approve the September 30, 2019 regular (open session) meeting minutes.  
Seconded by: Rubin. Passes: 4-0

Guarino: Motion to approve the October 9, 2019 regular (open session) meeting minutes with Daniel's edits.

Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 4-0

### **Executive Session**

---

1. To review the submittals to the Request for Qualifications for the redevelopment of real property located at 32-34 Federal Street and 252 Bridge Street, Salem, MA because an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the public body.

Rubin: Motion to request an Executive Session.

Barrett, Guarino, Chair Napolitano, Rubin. Passes:4-0.

The SRA entered executive session at 6:50PM.

Guarino: Motion to adjourn the Executive Session.

Barrett, Guarino, Chair Napolitano, Rubin. Passes: 4-0.

The SRA adjourned the Executive Session at 7:15PM.

Chair states that the Open Session will reconvene at the conclusion of the Executive Session.

### **Other Business**

Mr. Barrett resigned from SRA, noted that this will be his last meeting, as he will now become Chair of the Licensing Board.

### **Adjournment**

Guarino: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Rubin. Passes 4-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 7:20PM.

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