

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

Board or Committee:	Redevelopment Authority, Regular Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, April 10, 2019 at 6:00 PM
Meeting Location:	98 Washington Street, First Floor Conference Room
SRA Members Present:	Chair Grace Napolitano, Gary Barrett, David Guarino, Dean Rubin
SRA Members Absent:	Russ Vickers
Others Present:	Tom Daniel – Director of Planning and Community Development, Kathryn Newhall-Smith
Recorder:	Colleen Brewster

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

Projects Under Review

Executive Directors Report:

Daniel stated that;

1. Salem District Court: The developer is waiting on National Grid to disconnect the electrical services and they hope to begin demolition in early June.
2. Superior Court and County Commissioners Buildings: He and Ms. Newhall-Smith are working on the RFQ draft and they meet with DCAMM every 2 weeks. The RFQ should be out later this month.
3. Witch City Mall: Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the sign maker Concept Signs sent ideas to Mr. Marley that he didn't like so they are working on new proposed sign designs. Chair Napolitano asked if the Owner was flexible on the location. Ms. Newhall-Smith replied no, Mr. Marley wants the sign on the lower brick façade of Essex Street where it can be easily seen and not higher up on the garage façade. Mr. Rubin asked if the process can be sped up. Mr. Daniel replied no.

Old Business

1. 5 Broad Street (former Salem Senior Center): Update on developer selection

Mr. Daniel stated that Mr. Luster from Charing Cross has been revising his proposal since late November. The key point is that the purchase price and the City Ordinance requires that the appraised value be the minimum purchase price, and they have to figure out how to make it work.

Mr. Luster stated that they made a series of final amendments;

1. Increase the bid price to meet the minimum bid price of \$1.35M.
2. Increase the number of units from 12 to 16. They have done a redesign to include the lower basement level and added 4 single bedroom lower level units. They will be able to provide two spaces per unit for 16 units with their existing parking plan.
3. Lower the 3rd floor and add a 4th floor.

4. Use the HDIP program which was their previous suggestion. The amount of the HDIP that would come back to the developer as a tax credit is close to the difference in the original bid. This will now be a requirement to fill the gap in the appraisal cost.
5. They originally committed \$125-150K to removing, restoring and reinstalling the cupola. They now want the SRA to support the application for CPA funding to allow them to restore the cupola.
6. There are two existing easements behind the building would allow them to improve their parking plan and add some amenity space. They want to work with their neighbors at 1 and 3 Broad Street to move the easements.

This is their final offer and their preferred approach was to reopen the appraiser about some of their ideas related to amending the appraisal which was deemed infeasible.

Mr. Rubin stated that the HDIP is out of the SRA's control and the bid is contingent upon a future decision, which concerns him. Also, the ordinance declares that the appraisal can't be re-opened. The density and whether it will fit in with the neighborhood is a sensitive topic for the neighbors, abutters, and the SRA that will require some discussion. The revised proposal is substantially different and the SRA needs to know the neighbor's thoughts before they can commit to this new unit count. Mr. Luster replied that he would be happy to meet with the neighbors. The amount of state tax credit they hope to receive is similar to what other projects received. He would like help from the SRA and the administration. Mr. Guarino asked if they've received any feedback neighbors on the increased unit count. Mr. Luster replied no.

Mr. Daniel asked about the added budget for a parking wall. Mr. Luster replied that they want to shield the parking from the neighbors with landscaping or a low wall along Broad Street, although the design is unknown at this time. Mr. Daniel asked if the original proposal items remain a part of their proposal. Mr. Luster replied yes.

Mr. Daniel asked about the 12.5% state credit for the HDIP. Mr. Luster replied that it is the total development cost not including acquisition. Mr. Daniel replied that he believed they can do 25% of qualified expenditures for market rate units. Mr. Luster replied that he believes they can be approved for less than 25%. It is eligible for between \$1.2 or 1.3M but they believe a smaller number will be more competitive.

Mr. Luster added that some of the square footage numbers are incorrect and need to be revised.

Public Comment:

Lou Sirianni, 6 Botts Court. When the proposal was accepted the neighbors were supportive, the two adjacent neighbors are enthusiastic about this project, and he is aware of the proposal for additional units.

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

1. 281 Derby Street (Waters & Brown): Discussion of proposed façade renovations

Richard Griffin, Architect, was present to discuss the project. Russ Tanzer of Waters & Brown of Waters & Brown was also present.

Mr. Griffin stated that they met with the DRB twice, their main comment was to use steel rather than wood for the rear pergola entry with a standing seam ZCC roof which will keep rain away from the rear entry. Mr. Tanzer noted that he is excited to make the changes to the building and a new rear

entry to will people know they are there. Mr. Rubin and Mr. Guarino were in favor of the proposed plans.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

No one else wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Rubin: Motion to approve and presented and any material changes must go back to the DRB for review and approval.

Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 4-0

2. 163-189 Washington Street (The Derby Restaurant): Review and approval of patio improvements and café permit

Attorney Joseph Correnti, of Serafini, Darling & Correnti, L.L.P., Mark Morris, Principal and Manager of New Derby, and Travis Blake of Sousa Architects were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Blake stated that the DRB approved the revised plan. They are still working on the fire pit selection with the Salem Fire Department and are hoping for approval from them soon. Mr. Daniel stated that the Fire Chief sent him an e-mail about the fire pits and the SRA can approve the application subject to the Fire Chief's approval.

Chair Napolitano asked if a permit is required. Mr. Morris replied no. Safety is the Fire Department's concern and they will go in a safe direction. The fire pits may be installed higher and with safety valves. A letter from their insurance company is also needed.

Mr. Rubin asked if the DRB's suggestions for the locks were included in the revised design. Mr. Blake replied yes, the gates will be moved closer together and accessible picnic tables will be used on the patio.

Mr. Daniel stated that only modifications to satisfy the Fire Chief are required. Atty. Correnti replied that they will file the approval by the Fire Department with the DRB as a courtesy.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Rubin: Motion to approved per the DRB recommended changes and the applicant shall return to the DRB with substantial changes, the landscape plan and fire pit agreement.

Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 4-0

3. 300 Derby Square (Casa Tequila): Review and approval of Central Street façade modifications
(Review of a portion of a larger project; additional elements are under review by the Design Review Board)

Attorney Chad Colarusso and Gilberto Reyes (Owner) were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Colarusso stated that their designed was approved by the DRB. They changed the roof from a pitched terra cotta to a pergola. They reduced the number of stucco archways and light fixtures. They've also thinned out the columns and toned down the colors.

Mr. Guarino asked if there was anything behind the faux windows. Atty. Colarusso replied no, only the brick façade.

Mr. Rubin asked about the retention wall and associated patio design. Atty. Colarusso replied that they will meet with the cemetery maintenance department and they won't do any work without assurances from a structural engineer. Leveling the grade at the patio won't compromise the cemetery.

Chair Napolitano asked if the structure was two floors. Atty. Colarusso replied three floors, but the third is a mezzanine level that can be used for private parties.

Mr. Daniel asked when the restaurant will open. Mr. Reyes replied this weekend.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Barrett: Motion to approve with the DRB's conditions.
Seconded by: Rubin. Passes: 4-0

4. 3 Dodge Street (Seagrass): Review of façade modifications and signage

Don Weiss (Principal of Seagrass), and Chris Silva (General Manager), were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Weiss stated that they met with the DRB who were supportive. The DRB wanted them to meet with the SRA to discuss the building's façades. The building Owner, Hank DeChamps, the CDC, and the Public Art Commission will all be involved in the future murals. He added that they hope to open mid-summer. Chair Napolitano asked if the applicant would need to return to the SRA for approval of the future murals. Mr. Daniel replied no.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Rubin: Motion to approve with changes proposed by the DRB.
Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 4-0

5. 25 Dodge Street (The Lobster Shanty): Discussion of deck awning

Diane Wolf and Lee Wolf of The Lobster Shanty were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Wolf stated that looking for approval on the awning over their 3-season deck. The DRB has approved it with color "Greige" which will let in natural light shine through the awning.

Chair Napolitano asked if the deck will be open every season except winter. Ms. Wolf replied yes, the seasonal cover will be removed during the winter, reinstalled in the spring, and they will also use colored lighting.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Rubin: Motion to approve with the color Greige.

Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 4-0

6. Congress, Peabody, Ward Streets: Discussion of sculpture plaza

David Valecillos and Ruben Ceron (Project Manager and Architect) were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Valecillos stated that this is collaboration of the goal for the action plan for this neighborhood to make this area more pedestrian friendly. Some interventions have been done in the neighborhood, three areas are proposed and one is within the SRA's Urban Renewal area. This area was rehabbed by the City in 2009 but is a dangerous intersection. They are proposing to install three stacked shipping containers for public artists to paint and two areas for sculptures. They also want to eliminate the left turn from Peabody Street to make it more pedestrian friendly, and to activate the Peabody Street park. They've met with Salem Public Art Commission, and Point Neighborhood Association (PNA), who are supportive.

Mr. Ceron stated that traffic is a concern at this area and the proposed will send vehicles back to Lafayette Street. Mr. Valecillos stated that they met with DPW, Parking Department, Traffic & Transit. They also ordered a traffic study and the traffic count numbers are being tested. Mr. Daniel noted that the Salem Police and Fire Department are also involved. The SRA is one small piece of this approval.

Mr. Ceron inquired about their vision for Congress Street. Mr. Valecillos replied that they are basing this on Complete Streets which provide safe and accessible options for pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles. At the heart of this idea are three main assets; Shetland Park, The Point neighborhood and the Downtown. This area is not comfortable to walk down now, and this will create a parklet. They may conduct a survey for a long-term vision of this area; however, the changes will always be a community process. They could also add protected bike lanes, widen the sidewalks, better lighting, etc. Mr. Rubin asked if other projects in the works. Mr. Valecillos replied that they are working with MassDevelopment for a source to pay for these ideas.

Mr. Rubin asked if Shetland was sold for residential use. Mr. Daniel replied that residential isn't allowed and the future of Shetland Park is an unknown for the neighborhood.

Mr. Rubin asked if the Zagster bike rack will remain. Mr. Valecillos replied yes.

Chair Napolitano asked if Traffic, Parking, Fire, Police, City Engineer, and the Tree Commission all need to approve this proposal. Mr. Valecillos replied that they've met with the Tree Commission and they've altered the design based on the Tree Commission's feedback. They will replace four small trees in the front. The DPW will define the areas to replant the trees. The Conservation Commission will also work with the Tree Commission

Mr. Guarino stated that he is in favor of this, but it won't work unless the traffic plan is approved, and the City needs to weigh-in on this. Mr. Valecillos asked if the City does not approve the street closure and traffic patterns, may they continue to move forward with the public art plans on that corner. Mr. Daniel noted that this would be possible so long as the City entities determine that the artwork will not be a hazard for pedestrians or vehicles through the impacting of sight lines.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Guarino: Motion to approve pending approval by City Departments.
Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 4-0

7. 10 Lynde Street: Discussion of restoration of residential structure

John Seger of Seger Architects, was representing the Owner, The Crescent Trust, and was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Seger stated that the building suffered a fire in November 2018, its interior has been stripped down to the studs, and the owner has hired environmental engineers Epsilon Associates. The building was constructed in 1858 and has a two-story 1910 rear addition. It is the William Hunt Double House and housed 12 studio units. The owner would like to create 9 units and to utilize the basement space. The site is the same, the driveway that extends beyond the rear of the building will be repaved, and a wrought iron fence will be added along the right side of the property to conceal the trash area. Utilities will be placed at the rear of the building. For egress purposes there were only two front doors, but two new rear entries with small decks will provide second means of egresses for the rear first floor units. They will remove the 4-foot high concrete planter and will add new landscaping surrounded by a small granite curb.

Mr. Seger noted that they are still working on the historic color selection and will present it to the DRB. They want to use historic tax credits to restore the entire building; the clapboards, install new simulated divided lite wood windows with a pre-finished alum exterior, replace the asphalt roof shingles, and repoint the brick foundation. They will replace an existing side window with a door and a transom window above to match the header height of the other windows. They will leave the frame of the upper level window and fill it in with clapboards, which is required for the use of historic tax credits.

Mr. Seger noted that the two bulkheads that lead to the basement will be removed and the areas will become planting beds. Those bulkheads were added on later and aren't original to the building. The massing of the building will remain and only two new porches will be added. The building is being restored.

Mr. Daniel noted that the applicant will present the project to the Historic Commission next week to ask for a letter of support for the tax credits.

Mr. Rubin stated the floor plans submitted don't show bedrooms. Mr. Seger replied that some units are garden level reverse townhomes, and flats are on the upper floor. Mr. Rubin noted that he is in favor of restoring the structure as it once was.

Mr. Guarino asked if all parking spaces will be kept. Mr. Seger replied yes.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

Jessica Herbert, Chair of the Salem Historic Commission, stated that she is excited about this project.

Tim Jenkins, Historic Salem, Inc. Thanked the owners for restoring this structure.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Rubin: Motion to refer to the DRB.

Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 4-0.

8. 133 Washington Street (Boston Burger Company): Discussion on café permit application

Colin McGuire, Manager of Boston Burger Company was present to discuss the project.

Mr. McGuire stated that they are looking to re-open the 400 SF outdoor café. They opened four tables at the rear entrance and two tables at the front entrance sidewalk, which was successful. It will provide 16 additional seats. They submitted moveable garden boxes on wheels to beautify the space and will use a cable tie to lock up the furniture and stackable chairs.

Mr. Rubin noted that since last year the Higginson Square Alley is more inviting now with the addition of the overhead lights. There is an existing planter at this end of the alley. The outdoor seating will create an additional barrier for people continuing through the alley and the added people will interrupt their proposed dining area. This area gets used regularly by people walking through the space and tables will be a hinderance for traffic. Residents also need to be notified that this could occur outside their homes again. Mr. McGuire replied that there were no complaints from residents and they get along with the neighbors. Their General Manager can approach the neighbors to discuss this year's plan and the rear outdoor seating can be shut it down at 10PM again. The proposed tables are small and seating can be adjusted. Mr. Daniel stated that Café Graciano had tables to activate the space and the DRB needs to review it.

Chair Napolitano asked who owns the outdoor property and suggested their dining area be roped off. Mr. Daniel replied that its public property. Mr. Rubin noted that the DRB should focus on the clearances. Mr. McGuire noted that the walkway behind their building is 10-feet wide and they will maintain the sidewalk width in that area.

Mr. Daniel noted that establishments serving alcohol need to be roped off and the applicant needs to map out where the chain will go. Mr. Guarino added that they also need to provide dimensions.

Mr. Daniel asked about their trash removal process. Mr. McGuire replied that they share the dumpster with Ledger in their fenced in area. Trash from the outdoor seating will be bagged inside the restaurant before being brought to the exterior receptacle.

Chair Napolitano asked if the rear stairwell behind the building will be roped off. A resident of the residential condos replied that those stairs belong to a commercial unit on Front Street.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

Kathleen Lique, 141 Washington Street, Unit 6. Boston Burger has been receptive and responsive and they've agreed to their closing times in the past.

Mike Houlihan, 141 Washington Street, Unit 5. His homes windows are above the square and the stair to the second-floor unit is his. He had no patio concerns but they were previously only open Oct 1st and on. The applicant should be limited to the hours that were initially agreed upon. He has concerns with the pedestrian traffic flow and music. He asked if umbrellas will be used, and if so, how many?

Jody Salasny, 141 Washington Street, Unit 7. Their units back to the alleyway. They were happy with Boston Burger last year, when they had no music, trash or smokers allowed in the back. They are getting more pedestrian traffic in that area and adjusting the seating will push the people closer to their windows. She asked where umbrellas will be placed and requested more dialog on their proposed plan.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Mr. McGuire stated that they would have 4 or 5-feet on each side of the table area. Mr. Rubin replied that the applicant needs to show a plan of the tables and asked which side will be used or if both side will be used. The DRB will also need to review it. Mr. McGuire replied that the tables are 2-feet x 2-feet and the area is a total is 20-feet wide.

Rubin: Motion to refer to the DRB, and for the applicant to pay attention to traffic flow, roping for serving of alcohol, and the use of umbrellas, and to return to the SRA for a final review.
Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 4-0

9. 25 Lynde Street: Discussion of residential redevelopment of existing structure

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti, Quinn, Grover & Frey, Architect Tom Mayo, of Tom Mayo Associates Architects, and Michael Becker and his associate Carissa Vedus (Principals) were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Grover stated that they received input from the Salem Historic Commission and HSI. They also addressed the parking adequacy and the 5 units with 4 on-site parking spaces and can't place the 5th spot at the Museum Plan garage, but can use a spot at another parking facility within 1,000 ft. using an easement or long-term lease. There is a 5th space is by an easement that wasn't being counted but already has a recorded easement. There will be 3 parking space under West side of the building and one space on the East side. Mr. Daniel stated that the 5th space doesn't appear to have the correct dimensions. Mr. Becker replied that it is used by Unit 2, has been recorded with the Registry, and Tom St. Pierre recognized it as an adequate parking space. Atty. Grover added that that space is 19-feet deep and 9-feet wide which meets the standard for a parking space. Mr. Becker noted that they weren't aware until recently that they could uses other than what they were providing in the garage.

Mr. Mayo stated that on the Site Plan, they moved the addition back 2-feet and the front addition will match the gambrel roof but will be lowered by 1-foot. They will add a planter to the front recessed area framed with granite blocks and are proposing dormers on the original building only. After meeting with SHC and HSI they will add a trellis over the East garage door at each end of the East facing garage door. They will also replicate the shape of a small entry towards the rear, will add an oval window at each end of the East facing addition. The existing 1x1 windows will be replaced with 6x6 windows, new doghouse dormers will be casement to meet egress requirements but they can replicate a double hung window. The West garage door will face the church parking lot and the East garage is hidden by 25 Rear Lynde and also recessed under a 2nd level overhang.

Mr. Becker stated that there have been changes since the previous meeting and the addition was pushed inward to make it less visible from Lynde Street. Mr. Daniel asked what will be placed in the space beyond the garage. Mr. Mayo replied trash and condensers for AC units. They do have two 10-foot wide rights-of-way on either side of the building.

Mr. Daniel stated that Mr. St. Pierre was concerned with the turning radius and requested a turning radius template from the applicant. Mr. Mayo stated that they will eliminate the wall between the garages so a vehicle could pull their vehicle through the garage if need be. Mr. Daniel asked for the turning radius. Mr. Becker replied that making 1 big door increased the turning radius. Mr. Mayo noted that removing the wall and widening the door eliminating the turning radius issues.

Mr. Mayo stated that HSI gave them good feedback. Mr. Daniel noted that the SRA received a letter from the SHC in favor of this project along with the changes made and their concerns with scale and massing. They also acknowledged that the garages are a departure for this area but this is a constrained site for a project this size looking to have this many units. Mr. Mayo noted that they also changed the windows from 1x1 to 6x6 windows as they also requested.

Mr. Daniel stated that this project is unique to the SRA, and the SRA must decide if it's appropriate or not. It's not for the DRB to figure it out and make modifications and possibly some additional details that the other Boards haven't found yet. Mr. Rubin asked if the applicant had reviewed the letter. Mr. Becker replied that they've met with SHC and HSI numerous times and there have been multiple iterations and the design has improved over time.

Chair Napolitano noted that the SHC has concerns about the massing. Mr. Becker replied that they are demolishing the old addition and rebuilding it to nearly the same size. Mr. Mayo stated that the proposed addition has been made subservient and is setback. The West elevation will have the same look as the East and the East garage door will be hidden by the trellis and plantings. Mr. Becker noted that the cars next door and the trees will help conceal the parking garage. Atty. Grover noted that the new addition has an approximate 3,400 square-foot footprint, and a 6,500 square-foot addition.

Mr. Guarino stated that the proposal needs work and asked if there is a plan B. Mr. Becker replied that there is no plan B at this time and noted that no zoning relief being requested and the lot size is bigger than it seems. At 50-60% lot coverage on a B5 property isn't out of the ordinary. The building length is only being extending by 4-feet and the addition will be the same 3-story Georgian style structure with dormers.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

Jessica Herbert, Chair of the Salem Historic Commission. Stated the front elevation of the East garage has been stepped back. The North side will look the same but with aligned window. The volume also isn't apparent since it's nearly the same size as the existing addition. On a small lot, cars under the building isn't preferred, it would have been in a separate barn but this is an unusual situation that is also downtown. The garages should disappear or be less pronounced. The SHC spent a lot of time on the redesign.

Lou Sirianni, 6 Botts Court. Worked with them through HIS and the applicants were responsive and HSI is satisfied with the end result.

Tim Jenkins, 18 Broad Street. In terms of length the massing hasn't changed much and will appear the same. The existing is not the best example of a good design. Lou's carriage house has trellising around his garage which help make the garage disappear and the applicant applied the same design to this structure. The old building entrance will be recreated and the rear entrance now makes sense. At the front façade, the scaled down addition reads as an addition as it should and is very well done.

They help hide the garages by recessing both addition facades back. There is more organization to the building now and is interesting to the eye and something they can live with.

Mr. Becker stated that 25R Lynde and YMCA parking lot are higher up making that façades less visible. The front facing garage door has been redesigned and the West elevation above the garage is cantilevered to help conceal the garage the door.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Mr. Rubin stated that the past must meet the future even in an old City. If the garage can be hidden and he can recognize the need for the building rather than the car and make it disappear through design. The history is being preserved and he is in favor of it being reviewed by the DRB.

Rubin: Motion to refer it to the DRB.

Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 4-0

10. 65 Federal Street: Discussion of residential redevelopment of existing structure

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti, Quinn, Grover & Frey, was present to discuss the project. Tom Mayo, of Tom Mayo Associates Architects, and Michael Becker was also present. Dan Botwinick and Mike Becker are co-owners of this property.

Atty. Grover stated were also in dialog with SHC and HIS about this property. Parking was also a concern and it is more than 1,000 linear feet from the Museum Place garage. They will use long term lease at 30 Federal Street lot, which is also owned by the applicant.

Mr. Mayo stated that they were proposing to remove the two rear additions and building a new one to wrap around the building. SHC wanted to maintain the front façade so they will keep the 5 front bays and will add on to the rear with a new rear entrance. The rear tree will remain and impervious pavers will be installed which is good for the tree. The existing addition hits the left edge of the 5th bay of window and they will keep that addition and add a roof instead of the existing flat roof. The two doghouse dormers will remain and be repeated at other elevations. The front entrance will share a porch and will be under the current shed roof. On the West elevation that faces North Street they have added a shed dormer and a new addition. The South façade is the back of the building and they brought back what was the original rear face of the building and the original roof peak is hidden.

Mr. Becker stated that the front of the building was left as is, except for changing the flat roof to a pitched.

Mr. Rubin asked about the density. Mr. Becker replied that the 2 units will become 5.

Mr. Daniel stated that this project has improved. The SHC has questioned the roof pitch on West elevation but the DRB can handle the review of the roof pitch. Mr. Becker replied that they didn't want to replicate what was there in terms of roof pitch. Their original plan matched the pitch but they were told to change it. That massing would not change.

Chair Napolitano opens public comment.

Jessica Herbert, Chair of the Salem Historic Commission. The existing addition has a flat roof and a roof pitch has been proposed. The SHC suggested they pitch the entire roof since it seemed too modern; however, the DRB can review and adjust it. SHC questioned the gable and shed dormer

connection; however, they are okay with it and the DRB can review it too. Both the SHC and HSI made comments and Patti Kelleher from the Planning Department was determined to keep the 5 front facing bays. Mr. Becker replied that he wasn't opposed to their changes.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Napolitano closes public comment.

Barrett: Motion to refer to the DRB.

Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 4-0

Executive Session (if needed)

1. To consider the purchase, exchange, lease or value of real property located at 5 Broad Street, Salem, MA because an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the public body.

Chair Napolitano: Motion to request an Executive Session to discuss considering the revised proposal options for 5 Broad Street.

Barrett, Guarino, Napolitano, Rubin. Passes: 5-0.

The SRA entered executive session at 8:05PM.

Roll call to reconvene to open session at 8:35PM.

Guarino: Recommendation to City Council to move forward with proposal for Charing Cross with a letter to be signed by the SRA Chair. Seconded by: Rubin

All in favor. Passes: 4-0.

Minutes

The Board reviewed the minutes from the regular March 13, 2019 meeting were reviewed.

Rubin: Motion to approve the March 13, 2019 regular meeting minutes with Rubin's edit.

Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 4-0

Adjournment

Guarino: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Barrett. Passes 4-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 8:40PM.

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