

**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, July 14, 2021 at 6:00 pm</b>
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	<b>Virtual Zoom Meeting</b>
<b>SRA Members Present:</b>	<b>Chair Grace Napolitano David Guarino, Dean Rubin, Cynthia Nina-Soto</b>
<b>SRA Members Absent:</b>	<b>Russ Vickers</b>
<b>Others Present:</b>	<b>Tom Daniel – Director of Planning and Community Development Kate Newhall-Smith – Principal Planner</b>
<b>Recorder:</b>	<b>Colleen Brewster</b>

**Regular Meeting**

---

**Executive Director's Report**

Mr. Daniel stated:

1. Remote Meetings: The new rules we are operating under allow remote meetings until April 2022 and the city will transition to a hybrid platform and the city's IT department will outfit the meeting rooms with equipment to make hybrid meetings possible.
2. Downtown Business Report: The downtown businesses are doing well, there is a lot of activity including shopping, dining at restaurants, and increased hotel capacity, although the issue continues to be employment as all of the businesses are stretched with the little staff they have, and some businesses have limited their hours to allow themselves a break without additional staff to take on additional shifts. The Northshore Workforce Board and City of Salem have partnered on an incentive that focuses on the tourism sector jobs to an up to \$400 incentive for working a minimum number of weeks in the summer and \$400 for working up through the month of October. There are many job opportunities in other sectors in Salem and across the region.
3. Programming: The Arts Festival in June was successful and other events are in the works. It's been great to see the downtown area alive with activity, as we are accustomed to seeing.
4. Economic Development Recovery and Revitalization Task Force: The task force continues to meet. Main Streets received a grant from the state for local response and recovery plans, and they will map out action items for themselves and their collective partners. The action report will be available in late July or early August, and guidance will be provided.

**Projects in the Urban Renewal Area**

---

1. **38 Norman Street:** Schematic Design Review – Construction of a new mixed-use building with commercial uses on the ground floor and residential uses above, continued from 4/14/21

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti and Navins P.C., Ryan Wittig and Matt Moore of Kinvarra Capital, Annie Raftery, The Morin-Cameron Group - Civil Engineers, Philip Sima, Balance Architects, were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the applicants were present on April 14, 2021, when there were height and parking concerns. They have since reduced the height, completed a shadow study, and reduced the number of units, which has increased the proposed parking ratio to 1.25.

Atty. Grover stated that the original project was for 5 stories total, 1 level of commercial and 4 levels of residential. It did comply with the regulations; however, many felt the building was too large and they were encouraged to eliminate a floor, which reduced the unit counts and parking needs. The applicants met with Tom Daniel and Amanda Chiancola of the City of Salem, who discussed tax incentives and the decision was made to develop a 4-story structure with 20 units.

Mr. Wittig noted that he understood the concerns at the last meeting, discussed the HDIP that will allow the project to proceed with fewer units and they now have a path to make the project viable by eliminating the mansard roof to reduce massing and reduce shadows. The current configuration calls for eleven – 1 bedroom and nine 2-bedrooms and 1.25 parking spaces per unit. The development will be transit oriented and geared towards young professionals and empty nesters. The design will make it easy for ride-share access and the details will be refined during the DRB review process.

Mr. Sima noted that they have also added vegetative screening from the neighboring future development, but their landscape plan is the same and includes street trees, outdoor seating at ground floor retail, and a strong corner of Crombie and Norman Streets, and rear vegetation at the rear that steps back from both direct abutters, and native vegetation will separate the commercial from the residential entry. The shadow study shows the reduction of the proposed shadow with minimal shadows cast throughout the year.

They received feedback questioning the garage entry placement on Crombie Street. They noted that an entry on Norman Street would create a backup to traffic, so an entry is still proposed on Crombie Street and away from the prominent boulevard, so it's less of an eye sore. They see cars being just one mode of travel and will provide long-term covered parking since the structure will be on a bike trail. Atty. Grover added that they proposed project complies with zoning, he believes its consistent with the design criteria of the urban renewal plan, and they are not seeking any variances.

Ms. Nina-Soto thanked the team for answering her parking related questions and asked if the parking will be exclusive for the residential, if it included commercial, and if the direct abutter Ms. Hussey at 18 Crombie Street has been approached. Mr. Wittig replied that parking will be available as needed, they may give the commercial area 1 parking space, but the remaining will be resident only. The site currently has two curb cuts on Norman Street, and they discussed adding street parking but there is a bike lane in place, but the entrances could be reconfigured. He met with Ms. Hussey prior to the previous meeting only but not before this meeting.

Mr. Guarino thanked the applicant for the improvements made today and asked how the neighbors have responded to the elimination of one story. Mr. Wittig replied that they met with Councilors Madore and Hapworth two weeks ago but didn't receive much feedback due to the July 4<sup>th</sup> holiday.

HSI responded and noted that the massing was more appropriate with buildings within a block of this site and provided examples, but he felt that anything below feels punitive and wouldn't make it a viable project. Atty. Grover noted that they also stepped the building back where it abuts residential properties the required 10-feet as stated in the urban renewal plan. Mr. Guarino agreed that HSI's letter had some design issues and included helpful photos. Mr. Wittig noted that HSI's feedback was helpful, and they will review it for changes to incorporate if/when the project advances to the DRB. Mr. Guarino asked how vehicular cut-throughs of the adjacent parking lot would be addressed. Atty. Grover replied that their traffic consultant will determine how to prevent cut-throughs.

Mr. Rubin thanked the applicants for the revisions and for providing answers to some of their questions. He asked how much taller this building will be compared to the 18 Crombie Street neighbor. Mr. Sima replied that their third story matches the height of the 18 Crombie Street roof, but their roofline will be another 10 – 10 ½ feet above the neighboring roof line.

Mr. Rubin asked why with a 1.25 parking ratio their entry was not on Norman Street and where a moving truck would park. Mr. Sima replied that they will look at the streetscape to determine where it is most appropriate for a temporary loading zone for moving trucks though noted that the garage is preferred since they have a high garage door. Temporary parking cones could also be used through city permits near the residential entry. Mr. Rubin recommended 2-3 spaces for commercial vendors also be included on site.

Mr. Rubin stated that the shadow study provided only appears to impact 18 Crombie in the winter and not the neighboring property on Norman Street.

Mr. Rubin asked if trash pick-up will be on Norman or Crombie Street. Mr. Sima replied that they will use wheelies, they may need to have a conversation with the City, but Norman Street has more capacity for trash barrels. Ms. Raftery agreed that Norman Street is the presumed location.

Ms. Nina-Soto reiterated her concern with parking and suggested moving the entry as far away from the intersection as possible on Norman Street rather than Crombie Street, or at the corner. Mr. Wittig replied that their ratio was related to the demographic they presume will occupy the building. As a Planned Unit Development (PUD), the first floor needs a beneficial public use and putting the parking entry along this façade would disrupt the flow of making Norman attractive and a green space; a corner vehicular entry would also disrupt the flow. Ms. Nina-Soto suggested placing another small retail space at the opposite corner of the building. Mr. Sima replied that the site is tight, a double loaded corridor is the best arrangement for parking and introducing another retail on Crombie means losing 4 spaces while a center entrance means losing 2 more spaces. There are many variables to consider, and they want to maximize the number of spaces. Ms. Nina-Soto requested a clearer understanding of why they chose their parking layout to ensure that Crombie Street is the best option. Mr. Wittig replied that 1.25 parking spaces is proposed and 1.5 is required by zoning and the SRA requested more parking at their last meeting. They don't want to disrupt the retail and it would be difficult to achieve the same parking ratio. Ms. Raftery added that Norman Street is a state route and main artery and removing one of the existing curb cuts will help with traffic flow. Atty. Grover noted that this project will be reviewed by the Planning Board, and if the members feel differently they have the authority to move it.

Public Comment:

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that as of 4PM on July 14, 2021, she received the following public comments:

- HSI, July 10, 2021
- Ana Gordan, 12 Crombie Street, July 13, 2021 – created a series of shadow study videos
- Bill Raye, 2 Chestnut Street, July 13, 2021
- Donna Seger, 7 Chestnut Street, July 14, 2021

Nathan Ritsko, 24 Chestnut Street (McIntire Neighborhood Assoc.) representing himself only. He stated that the changes are reflective the neighbor's feedback. He asked if there are alternative to the flat roof proposed since abutters have peaked roof. Mr. Sim replied that they will improve upon the design based on feedback once they advance beyond the schematic design phase. Mr. Ritsko asked if the façade materials could be in keeping with the historic neighborhood. Mr. Sima replied that there are a mix of materials; masonry above base that will not resemble historic brick, a wood base, clapboard siding, and masonry lintels and sills. No details have been finalized, leaning toward red brick at the upper floors.

Ana Gordan, 12 Crombie Street. Thanked the applicant for wanting to develop the lot, noted that parking will have a big impact on Crombie, the entrance will be congested from drivers waiting for the garage door to open, and the corner spots will be hard to get into. She noted that retail customers may want to park at the retail across the street. She voiced concerns with blocking of natural light for her neighbors and created her own shadow studies where the work case is winter when you'd want the daylight. In her opinion, the design and aesthetic of a mansard roof would work at 4 stories in her opinion, and she asked if there are private roof gardens.

Andy Lippman, (President of Chestnut Street Neighborhood Association), but speaking for himself only. He congratulated the SRA and the developers for being responsive and the streetscape improvements. He questioned how a long and narrow retail space, approximately 20-feet-deep, could survive and asked what kind of establishment could be placed there. He asked if there was a plan for a kitchen exhaust or plumbing. Mr. Rubin replied that all questions need to be directed to the Board not the applicant and the applicant is early in the design process and may not have answers to such questions. Mr. Wittig replied that the first-floor commercial space will have a basement that could be used for back-of-the-house operations, a kitchen, or storage.

Caroline Watson-Felt, President of HSI. Reiterated that the design team has been responsive to everyone's feedback, she complimented the applicant for speaking to both abutters and encouraged them to keep that engagement going. She looks forward to the details of the design and noted that they provided ideas to the applicant.

Mike Becker, owner of 23 and 27 Summer Street. Spoke with the developer several times, he is in favor of their adjustments and is looking forward to seeing how the project progresses.

Steve Fox, 4 Chestnut Street. Commended the revisions to the design and working with the Summer Street project owner. He was troubled by the disposition of the area of land at the corner of Norman

and Summer Streets. Mr. Wittig replied that they don't own that lot, it belongs to the Summer Street property, and they will alter their design as necessary around it. Mr. Becker noted that he is a percentage owner of 27 Summer Street, the images he provided the applicant to show in their rendering has been slightly modified but what's shown is mostly accurate. Mr. Fox questioned how that area of land will be developed since no plan has been presented that shows how that corner relates to 38 Normal Street, but it should be addressed.

Atty. Grover stated that once they've progressed beyond the Schematic Design phase they would return to the SRA for final review and approval.

Guarino: Motion to refer to the DRB.

Seconded by: Nina-Soto

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin. 3-0 in favor.

2. **278 Derby Street:** Small Project Review – Review of DRB Recommendation for façade modifications including installation of LED lighting, accent paint, and exterior gas-flame wall sconces

Gideon Coltof was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Coltof stated that they will move to this new location from their current location at the Old Salem Jail, 50 Saint Peter's Street. The DRB reviewed their proposed application in June, which includes adding metallic copper accent paint on either side of the entry door, wrapping the interior perimeter of the entry doors and windows in teal LED strip lighting, metallic copper accent paint on the web of the steel trellis, and adding gas lights on either side of the entry door. The red awnings above each entry will be removed. Teal LED strip lighting will be added to the three panels above their secondary entrance.

Mr. Guarino noted the items that the DRB was concerned about and how they are being rectified. Mr. Coltof replied that two items are still outstanding with the DRB. The first is the painting of the patio wall along the sidewalk which the owners want to paint their trademark teal, but the DRB discussed painting the wall black or copper, but they settled upon creating a framed look to the wall. The second item related to reusing the existing uplighting on the brick façade, which the DRB is still discussing.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Guarino: Motion to approve elements approved by the DRB and to grant conditional approval to the remaining items that meet DRB recommendations.

Seconded by: Nina-Soto.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, and Rubin. 3-0 in favor.

3. **285 Derby Street:** Small Project Review – Review of DRB Recommendation for façade modifications to rear tenant space, including creating new entry doors facing Charlotte Forten Park, installing access doors on the alley façade, and construction of a paved walkway along the side of the building in the easement area of Charlotte Forten Park.

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti & Navins, P.C., Steve Livermore, Livermore Architecture, Inc., Bill Golden, Real Pirates, LLC, and Russel Tanzer, representing the property owner, were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Grover stated that this museum will be located at the rear of 285 Derby Street as well as face the Charlotte Forten Park. Openings will be created in the building's façade along the park and alleyway, and lighting is proposed on all sides. Mr. McTague of Concept Signs previously present their sign concept. These proposed changes will activate the park which was one of the goals of the SRA. They presented their proposal to the DRB on June 23<sup>rd</sup> which voted to recommend most of the design aspects including: the door openings and door material on the park side, exit door locations on the alleyway, but not the stucco material proposed to enclose the larger building openings on the alleyway, the light fixtures finish, quantity, and location. Alternatives to the wall material and lighting will be presented to the DRB on July 28<sup>th</sup>. They are requesting an approval of items reviewed by the DRB and conditional approval of the lighting and building materials to close the alleyway openings in the façade. Lastly, they are also seeking approval of the design of the walkway within the easement along the façade of the building. They will return for approval of the ramp design once it's been peer reviewed.

Mr. Livermore stated that the front façade will remain as is, the park façade has had their two new entrances approved although the lighting location and fixture types is still under review by the DRB, the rear façade facing the river was generally approved except for light fixtures, and at the alleyway the exit door locations were approved, however; the façade materials at the building openings and lighting is still under review. The site plan highlights the proposed concrete walkway along the building façade will match the design of the rear park walkway along the South River. The proposed ramp will be discussed with the DRB and Planning Department and will also be peer reviewed with the designers of the Charlotte Forten Park.

Mr. Rubin asked if the details of the ramp were discussed with the city staff. Mr. Daniel replied that he and Ms. Newhall-Smith met with the business owner and architect to discuss the inclined walkway that will not require handrails but will require more detail and the peer review will be paid for by the building owner. The SRA will review the walkway after the peer review has been completed. Mr. Livermore added that they originally designed a handicapped ramp with railings on both sides and the recommendation was to modify the pitch to be 1:20 or shallower so handrails are not required.

Mr. Rubin asked if they anticipate the DRB making comments to give them pause. Atty. Grover replied no, the DRB has already made suggestions regarding lighting and façade materials along the alleyway, and the owners of Real Pirates, LLC were receptive and willing to accommodate the DRB's recommendations. Mr. Livermore noted that the DRB recommended mimicking the in-fill materials used at Notch Brewery, MDO plywood painted dark bronze to match the storefront along that façade.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Nina-Soto: Motion to approve the design already approved by the DRB and conditional approval of the two remaining items – light fixtures and façade treatment.

Seconded by: Guarino

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin. 3-0 in favor.

4. **300-302 Essex Street:** Small Project Review – Façade modifications including repairs to the brick façade and stone/concrete landings, removal and replacement of windows and doors, installation of new exterior lighting, and new signage.

Eli Albanese and Walter Jacob of Walter Jacob Architects, representing Bill Levin, were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Albanese stated that the owner is seeking to refresh the storefront façades of the commercial units of Moon Baby and Witch City Wicks. They were drawn to the darker colors of the first-floor commercial space at 304 Essex Street so the storefronts would engage more with the street. The proposal is to replace the existing windows and doors, repoint and repaint the lower brick façade, replace and paint the trim, replace the blade and wall signs for the two businesses, replace the gooseneck lighting above, and to install address numbers. The use of darker trim establishes the commercial block from the residential units above and to the right.

Chair Napolitano arrived.

Mr. Jacob stated that the proposed design distinguishes the two retail units from the residential units above, the commercial unit to the left, and the residential unit to the right. The tenants were before the Board recently seeking new doors and the proposed design with simplify the design.

Ms. Nina-Soto noted her concern with the steel beam at the neighboring unit transitioning to a flat piece of trim and her desire to see the steel detail be carried over to the next two units and maintain that harmony in the building. She asked if that material was considered in their proposed design. Mr. Jacob replied that they wanted to distinguish them since they are separate owners and separate buildings. They wanted to give the end unit more prominence while they maintained subtler banding detail. Ms. Nina-Soto noted her preference for maintaining harmony in the building's façade. Mr. Jacob replied that they would also paint the lower portion of brick below the new banding grey to distinguish the retail area.

Mr. Rubin agreed with Ms. Nina-Soto, recalled the tenants requesting to upgrade their entry doors, but noted that the public will perceive the structure as one building. He noted his preference for a harmonious design and asked them to consider it since shop owners can distinguish themselves from their individual units. Mr. Jacob replied that they can investigate continuing the upper trim detail.

Mr. Guarino noted that although he doesn't love the idea of brick being painted, he is glad to see it be retained.

Mr. Daniel requested confirmation that the blade signage would be reinstalled not new since the images presented show a contemporary look. He asked if the tenants are required to have wall signage. Mr. Jacob replied that historically the black band would have had signage and they also preferred the look. Mr. Daniel noted that the hanging signs exist and don't fit the aesthetic of what has been proposed and it's an added expense for the business owners unless the building owner is covering those costs. Mr. Jacob replied that they will confirm the signage with the tenants, but they may have assumed a cohesive design at the lower level was preferred.

Mr. Daniel stated that the DRB will address the painting of the brick although he is not in favor of the idea. Ms. Newhall-Smith agreed with Mr. Daniel and added that once brick is painted it will not go

back to its natural finish. Referring this to the DRB will tell them that the SRA is satisfied with painted brick. Mr. Jacob replied that he thought the painted brick was a good direction, but they will reconsider it although he does think there is precedent for it.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Ms. Nina-Soto stated that there are too many unanswered questions and she's having difficulty visualizing the proposed design with the changes they've suggested. Mr. Guarino and Chair Napolitano agreed. Mr. Jacob noted that a continuation will allow them to speak to the tenants and building owner.

Nina-Soto: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting.

Seconded by: Guarino

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

5. **140 Washington Street:** Small Project Review – Façade modifications including new paint, exterior lighting, and signage.

Marnie Greenhut, business owner, was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Greenhut stated that she will open a candy store and is proposing to refresh the existing paint color, Ken McTague of Concept Signs will install 1-inch-thick black PVC letters on the sign bands with studs to match the rest of the building, with the edges of the letters would be painted different colors. The front window would be a vinyl decal of the proposed logo with white letters which will stand out better on the window. A 1-inch-thick 32-inch-diameter PVC blade sign with a hanging PVC arrow is proposed to lead customers to the side entrance, where a "CANDY SHOP" sign with 1-inch-thick black PVC letters with colored sides is proposed in the paneling above. Yellow paint is proposed for the side entry door to draw the eye from Fountain Plaza at Essex Street. The double entry doors further up Barton Square is also proposed as yellow with a second "CANDY SHOP" blade sign and arrow although the panels are proposed as all white rather than the parchment color for a crisper appearance against the color door. The gooseneck lighting will remain above, and two new fixtures are proposed next to the double door. The three half circle windows frames along Barton Square would be painted yellow.

Mr. Rubin asked why customers are directed further away from the street rather than to the single entrance door. Ms. Greenhut replied that they've oriented the doors that way to prevent theft, there are two levels to the space and the register will be at the upper level where they can greet people and cash them out. A second register on the lower level will be used during Halloween as well as access through that single door closer to Washington Street and she has the option to make the single door operable from the interior only or from the interior and exterior.

Mr. Rubin congratulated the applicant for selecting such a cheerful color. Ms. Nina-Soto noted that lighting with a satin nickel finish is proposed next to the double entry door, but the gooseneck lights above are black, as are the brackets for the blade signs, and asked if there is a black option for the lower light fixtures. Ms. Greenhut replied that the gooseneck fixtures are dark green, and her hope



was to maintain the dark look above to maintain consistency on the building, but she wanted to lighten up the lower.

Mr. Daniel stated that he's excited for the applicant to open the establishment.

Mr. Rubin requested the applicant received the okay to lock the single entrance door for the standpoint of public safety and emergencies.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Rubin: Motion to recommend to the DRB as proposed.

Seconded by: Guarino

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano in favor. 4-0 in favor.

6. **32-50 Federal Street and 252 Bridge Street:** Schematic Design Review – Restoration of historic courthouses and development of mixed-use structure.

Adam Giordano – Project Director, WinnDevelopment, Adam Stein, Exec. VP of Development, Winn Company, Mike O'Brien, Exec. VP, Winn Companies, Brian O'Connor, Principal, Cube 3, Steve Prestejohn, Design Coordinator, Cube 3, and Daniel Sieger, Senior Project Manager/Senior Site Engineer, VHB were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Daniel stated that on Monday, July 12, WinnDevelopment held a 90-minute neighborhood meeting sponsored by Councillors Madore and Riccardi, that was very well attended and approximately 85 members of the public participated, and 95 questions were submitted. Questions were posted on the Q&A feature on Zoom and WinnDevelopment has committed to publishing all the questions and answers. He and Ms. Newhall-Smith meet with WinnDevelopment weekly and DCAMM every other week. The developer is having on-going discussions with the MBTA, and the SRA's attorney is drafting a P&S agreement. Ms. Newhall-Smith noted that the Q&A can also be posted on the SRA's website.

Mr. Giordano read through the SRA goals and their restoration goals to restoring the court buildings including their interior rehabilitation using in-kind replacement for key features, stonework and upgrades necessary to create commercial and office space as well as the potential for residential development.

Mr. O'Connor stated that they used the feedback they received and worked on site planning and massing but want to interact with as many groups as possible. They've changed their focus to the selection of materials, massing, reducing height by eliminating one floor, refocusing on the public realm and pedestrian connections, reviewed existing pedestrian connections to determine how to get pedestrians from Bridge Street to the lower level and over to North Salem. The grade change is critical and the lowest level at the driveway entrance is a floor or more below Bridge Street, so the connection would be at the lower right, near the Bridge and Washington Street entrance. The challenge is managing the edge, how to provide parking and open space to eliminate the canyon effect. Previously the plaza was along Bridge Street, but they reshaped the building and moved it to the edge of the slip ramp to create a street edge, which is a typical urban response with a meaningful pedestrian connection to the north. Courtyards are proposed behind courthouses and at the east

corner of the crescent lot that connects to the street and a large public space. A bike path is proposed to connect the two levels, with hard and soft spaces and a front face along the northern edge, the commercial space would be closest to the Washington Street corner.

Mr. Prestejohn noted their desire to link the corners to one another, add balconies and wood-like finishes, a variety of colors, as well as a clear base, middle, and top to the proposed building. The pedestrian stairway off North Street would create an additional path to the lower levels and community feedback has helped them develop the connection to the North Street bridge. They want to emphasize the corner and use a darker material to connect to the ground. At the lower Bridge Street entrance, they will maintain the retaining wall, pathway at grade and stairway up to the building. The first gathering space at the top of the stairway with seating next to the building entry that aligns with the masonry edge and benches along the North Street façade.

Mr. Giordano stated that their parking strategy proposes .75 parking spaces per unit for 38 parking spaces at the river level and 60 parking spaces dispersed throughout the 3 local parking lots. The MBTA which has been supporting for leasing parking during off-peak hours, the Museum Place lot that has 914 spaces, and Universal Steel Low with 111 parking spaces. The parking numbers explored were pre-COVID parking numbers. Mr. Stein added that the MBTA is the likely option since Museum Place is overwhelmed.

Mr. Sieger stated that in terms of climate resilience, the site design and building materials to mitigate impacts of flooding, they've proposed floodproof parking, the raised first floor at Bridge Street above flooding elevations, and open space at Bridge Street elevation. They will not preclude additional flood resiliency measures on adjacent properties. The path forward includes stakeholders working together to explore strategies for district scale flood protection measures along North River since the MBTA line and Salem Station are highly vulnerable to flooding over the next 50 years. Their partners in that effort will be the city and state.

Mr. Rubin asked where the applicants stand with the MBTA on the remnant parcel and what that means for the project if the MBTA decides not to sell it. Mr. Stein replied that that parcel has not been included in the current design and it will not be shown until it is confirmed, but they hope to include it.

Mr. Rubin asked if the bike path crosses over the pedestrian path. Mr. O'Connor replied that they will continue to explore the circulation paths.

Mr. Guarino noted that the public meeting held earlier in the week was well attended and asked the applicants to share what they took from it and what areas may change. Mr. O'Connor replied that the building design and materials palette will continue to be fine-tuned, they are happy with the massing changes and site connections, and they are hitting on many critical design points in the overall design. They feel strongly that a masonry base is needed at both the east and west ends at the pedestrian connections, and they will look for a contemporary response to the red brick suggestions.

Mr. Guarino stated that HSI's comment letter mentioned that there be no back side of the new building. Mr. O'Connor replied that the proposed building has no backside and moving the massing of the building closer to the slip ramps feels more urban and more appropriate; it would connect the new building to the city and include a pedestrian connection to the north.

Ms. Nina-Soto thanked the team for being thoughtful and mindful of the public comments and for their public engagements.

Public Comment:

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that as of 4PM on July 14, 2021, she received the following public comments:

- HSI, July 14, 2021
- Richard Lindeman, 113 Federal Street, July 14, 2021
- Anne Sterling, 29 Orchard Street, July 14, 2021

Mike Becker, owned of 30 Federal Street. Supports the development and restoration of the two buildings. He asked if with only 38 cars proposed on-site, have they exhausted all possible alternatives. Mr. Stein replied that connectivity issues brought the proposed parking spaces to 38, they know they need more, and they want to allocate them to the MBTA. Mr. Becker requested the delta between the two levels. Mr. Prestejohn replied 12-feet different and 20-feet to the top of the slip ramp. Mr. Becker asked if they would consider valet parking, adding vehicle stackers or an automotive elevator. Mr. O'Connor replied that they will investigate valet parking, they have used stackers, but they require a minimum of 14-feet clearance, 2-feet more than the height up to Bridge Street. They can investigate it but don't think it's viable and automotive elevators aren't effective due to maintenance requirements.

Pat Murphy, 27 Foster Street. She e-mailed her public comment that afternoon, didn't notice any traffic lights which are important and attended the zoom meeting earlier this week where her questions weren't asked or answered. She finds a parking ratio of .75 is troublesome since there could be more than one vehicle per unit, commuters would be affected if they utilize a large portion of the MBTA lot which are also used by residents during inclement weather, so where will other residents park. She had concerns with the flood plain and a possible moratorium in the works about wetland development and asked what that would do to this project. She's concerned that the developer and city staff may not be as concerned about flood levels as they should be. Mr. Stein replied that they do care about flood rise and mitigation and will be long term owners/stakeholders. They can build a building to manage flood rise and have no residential units within the flood plain. Mr. Sieger noted that the proposed structure meets building code requirements relating to flooding, the residential and public plaza will begin at Bridge Street level, there is a resilience planned for this building and they will partner with the stakeholders to protect the infrastructure. Mr. Stein added that they are comfortable with the parking ratio because it's a true TOD (transit-oriented development) site, a mix of 1- and 2-bedroom units, and they believe residents will want to make use of their proximity to the city and the train. They wouldn't be comfortable with a less than 1 to 1 ratio if they weren't by the MBTA, but they also don't want to impact the MBTA's ridership.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Rubin requested the applicant provide examples of projects that have similar parking ratios as to what they are proposing for this project.

Rubin: Motion to refer it to DRB.

Seconded by: Guarino

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

### **New/Old Business**

---

1. Redevelopment of the Historic Courthouse and the Crescent Lot: Update on Project Status:

No new update.

2. Discussion: Consideration of including an expiration date on SRA approvals

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that many permitting boards have expiration dates on their approvals and if no work under the approval has begun, the permit would expire unless the applicant had requested and received an extension prior to the expiration date. There is case law and precedent of 2 years for standard approvals and 1 year for variances. It could be good to implement this so if projects are delayed or the dynamics of the approval change, the project may no longer be viable and/or appropriate. She and Mr. Daniel recommend implementing a 2-year time limit on SRA approvals. Chair Napolitano asked how that quantified and who monitors that progress. Mr. Rubin noted that there must be a clear definition and a building permit must have been pulled. Mr. Guarino suggested that it will depend on each project and asked if a staff member would send a letter to the applicant about not seeing progress and let them know if certain things haven't been done it would be revoked. Chair Napolitano questioned the use of the word "progress." Ms. Newhall-Smith replied that the Planning Board says "substantial use or no work has commenced." Ms. Newhall-Smith noted the boiler plate statement she drafted in her staff report. Mr. Guarino suggested that statement include those applicants will be notified within 2 weeks of the next SRA meeting. Ms. Nina-Soto suggested that applicants/development team be responsible for remembering that deadline not city staff who do enough for applicants and would give them something else they have to track. Mr. Daniel agreed that the responsibility is with the applicant, and they need to be responsible, but they can be contacted as a courtesy, and he would not add that language.

#### **Public Comment:**

Mike Becker. Questioned what constitutes progress since progress comes in many forms. Prep work can be time consuming as well as permitting, tax credits application, testing of the site, which could all take a year or more. Conditions change and the cost of building materials have increased due to COVID-19. He asked when the clock starts when there are multiple city entities that must review a project. Mr. Daniel replied that the statement is drafted as 2 years from SRA ruling, and other boards would extend that, however; the progress expressed by Mr. Becker is not included in the language. This is meant to keep a project organized not take away approvals and boards are sympathetic to that.

Mr. Guarino agreed and noted that applicants will more than likely have delays. Mr. Rubin noted that he is in favor of boiler plate statement.

Mr. Becker added that he thinks the clock should start with the last approval needed since board members can change and new members may not be in favor of what was previously approved.

Rubin: Motion to recommended including the boiler plate language for future approvals from this point forward.

Seconded: Nina-Soto

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

### **Meeting Minutes**

The minutes of the April 14, 2021, regular meeting was reviewed.

Vote: Rubin motion to approve with edits from Board members.

Second by: Guarino.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

The minutes of the May 5, 2021, regular meeting was reviewed.

Vote: Rubin motion to approve with edits from the Board edits.

Second by: Guarino.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

The minutes of the May 12, 2021, joint city council meeting was reviewed.

Vote: Rubin motion to approve with edits from the Board edits.

Second by: Guarino.

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

The minutes of the June 9, 2021, regular meeting was reviewed.

Vote: Rubin motion to approve with edits from the Board edits.

Second by: Nina-Soto.

Roll Call: Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. Guarino abstained for not being present. 3-0 in favor.

### **Adjournment**

Rubin: Motion to adjourn.

Seconded by: Nina-Soto

Roll Call: Guarino, Nina-Soto, Rubin, Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

Regular Meeting ended at 9:45PM

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