Salem State South Campus

Public Meeting 2
December 9, 2019
Project Scope & Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kick Off</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Workshop 1</td>
<td>Workshop 2</td>
<td>Concept Deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick-off Meeting</td>
<td>Working Group Meeting 1</td>
<td>Public Open House 1</td>
<td>Working Group Meeting 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Establish project goals**
  - Kick-off Meeting
- **Site-level existing conditions analysis**
  - Summary of existing building use
  - Workshop Visioning with City Workgroup
  - Public Meeting #1
- **Analyze input from Visioning Workshop**
  - Develop High-Level Concepts
  - Workshop with same City Workgroup to explore South Campus concepts
  - Discuss pros and cons of each concept
  - Public Meeting #2
- **Refine concepts**
  - Phasing considerations
  - Regulatory considerations
Meeting Agenda

1. Project Principles and Values
2. Site Context
3. Market Scan of Area Developments
4. Site Framework
5. Typology Concepts
6. Open House Discussion
Open House

VALUES

(ordered by priority of participants)

1. Affordable
2. Sustainable
3. Safe \(\text{equal ranking}\)
4. Diverse \(\text{equal ranking}\)
5. Creative
6. Vibrant
7. Equitable
8. Inclusive
9. Connected
10. Historic

PARTICIPANT PRIORITIES

- Senior Housing
- Affordable Housing
- Veterans Housing
- Community Spaces
- Neighborhood Retail
- Public School Opportunities (including childcare)
- Environmentally friendly construction
- Traffic solutions and pedestrian safety
- Connection to the natural amenities
- Maintain open space
Community Survey Responses

VALUES

(ordered by priority of participants)
1. Sustainable
2. Safe
3. Affordable
4. Inclusive
5. Connected
6. Equitable
7. Diverse
8. Creative
9. Vibrant
10. Historic

PARTICIPANT PRIORITIES

- Affordable Housing: 19%
- Senior Housing: 11%
- Veterans Housing: 11%
- Family Housing: 11%
- Community Center: 10%
- Neighborhood Retail: 10%
- Market Rate Housing: 11%
- Commercial Retail: 11%
- Office: 5%

Other priorities included: a school, open space, access to the conservation area, arts focused programming, recreation & fitness component, museum, childcare, medical care center
Site Planning Priorities

- Public access to natural amenities
- Views to the conservation areas
- Place-making features
- Amenities (community space, café, etc.)
- Reuse of Mansion
- Sensitivity to Scale
- Additional connection to Loring Avenue
Existing Site

Views of Harrington from the hill
Existing Site
Existing Site

Views of the conservation area trail
Existing Site

Views of existing footpath to and along Loring Ave.
Loring Villa and Saint Chretienne Convent

Loring Villa
- Constructed 1870
- Historically significant, Italianate style
- Meets criteria A and C for listing on National Register
- Oldest extant house in this area of South Salem

Saint Chretienne Convent
- Constructed 1918
- Second Empire style of building

Saint Chretienne School
- Constructed in 1936 with two more stories added in 1948
- Less historic significance in terms of age and architectural style

Due to historic significance, Loring Villa and Saint Chretienne Convent likely to be prioritized for preservation; Saint Chretienne School unlikely to be prioritized for preservation
REUSE POTENTIAL

Harrington Building

• Former Catholic School
• Purchased for use by Salem State in 1972

PROS:
• Offers some large, flexible spaces (cafeteria and gymnasium) that could serve community needs
• Building typology lends itself to adaptive reuse

CONS:
• Likely much larger than is necessary for community programming
• Building configuration/height limits flexibility for placement of other buildings

Limited scenarios where this building is likely to be prioritized for preservation
REUSE POTENTIAL

Bates

- Houses 360 juniors and seniors in 60 six-person apartments
- Mix of “flats” and townhouses

PROS:
- A housing typology is likely compatible with potential future development
- Scale aligns with likely future development

CONS:
- Mechanical systems failing at a more rapid pace than expected
- Lack of accessibility
- No historic value
- Building configuration limits future development potential of site

Unlikely to be prioritized for preservation
MARKET SCAN OF AREA DEVELOPMENTS
Local Development

North River Apartments
- 4-Story wood frame
- Retail at 1st floor
- “Luxury” rental
- 100% surface parking (~25% within building footprint)

The Landing at Vinnin Square, Swampscott
- 4-Story wood frame
- Rental
- All surface parking

The Residence at Vinnin Square, Swampscott
- 3-Story wood frame
- Assisted Living
- All surface parking (limited provision)

135 Lafayette
- 4-Story brick clad
- Rental
- All surface parking
Local Development

135 Lafayette
Local Development

The Residence at Vinnin Square, Swampscott (Assisted Living)
Steep Slopes (>20%)
Environmental Constraints

Forest River Conservation Area

Wetland buffer (100')
River Protection (200')
Steep Slopes (>20%)
Existing Site Conditions

Forest River Conservation Area

Legend:
- Parking within non-developable area
- Buildings within non-development area
- Existing Campus Buildings
- Existing Parking
- Developable area
- Wetland buffer (100')
- River Protection (200')
- Steep Slopes (>20%)
Potential New South Entry/Exit

Connect to Loring Ave if permitted within buffers
Potential to Connect to Hillside

Connect hillside to lower site (maintain existing driveway for emergency/service access)
5

TYPOLOGY CONCEPTS
Assumptions

- Maximum height of buildings at 5 stories to optimize construction typology
- Utilization of surface parking when possible to minimize cost
- For planning purposes, the size of each unit is 1,000 sq. ft. with an average of 3 people per unit
- Parking ratio of 1.5 per unit per the City of Salem regulations
- Assumptions have been benchmarked against current local development practices
Assumptions

Parking strategy places parking along the roads and tucks into the backs of the site.

Development proximate to abutters is explored as lower density townhomes.

Loring Mansion is retained in all concepts.
Examples

Mid-Rise Multi-Family Apartments/Condos
Examples

Townhomes & Clustered Low-Rise Apartments/Condos
1A: 2-4 Story Multifamily

- 32% Building Footprint
- 35% Roadways + Surface Parking
- 33% Sidewalk, Pathways & Open Space
1A: 2-4 Story Multifamily

- 400 Units
- 400,000 sq. ft.
- 1,000 GFA / unit
- 1,200 Population
- 3 ppl / unit

600 Parking Spaces*
- 1.5 parking spaces / unit

*Assumes approx. 1/6th of parking spaces are at-grade, beneath building footprint
1A: 2-4 Story Multifamily
1B: 2-4 Story Multifamily (Retaining Harrington)

30% Building Footprint*

30% Sidewalk, Pathways & Open Space

40% Roadways + Surface Parking

*Assumes 50% of Harrington can be used for residential, over 2 levels
1B: 2-4 Story Multifamily (Retaining Harrington)

330 Units → 1,020 Population
330,000 sq.ft. 3 ppl / unit
1000 GFA / unit

495 Parking Spaces
1.5 parking spaces / unit

*Assumes 50% of Harrington can be used for residential and 2 levels*
1B: 2-4 Story Multifamily (Retaining Harrington)
2: Mix of 2-4 Story Multifamily and Townhomes

- 27% Building Footprint
- 33% Surface Parking
- 40% Sidewalk, Pathways & Open Space
2: Mix of 2-4 Story Multifamily and Townhomes

- 350 Units
- 350,000 sq.ft.
- 1,050 Population
  - 3 ppl / unit
- 525 Parking Spaces
  - 1.5 parking spaces / unit
2: Mix of 2-4 Story Multifamily and Townhomes
3: Townhomes Only

23% Building Footprint

40% Sidewalk, Pathways & Open Space

37% Roadways + Surface Parking
3: Townhomes Only

250 Units
250,000 sq.ft.
1000 GFA / unit

750 Population
3 ppl / unit

375 Parking Spaces
1.5 parking spaces / unit
3: Townhomes
Comparison

2-4 Story Multifamily
- 400 Units
- 1,200 Population
- 600 Parking Spaces

2-4 Story Multifamily (Retaining Harrington)
- 330 Units
- 1,020 Population
- 495 Parking Spaces

Mix of 2-4 Story Multifamily and Townhomes
- 350 Units
- 1,050 Population
- 525 Parking Spaces

Townhomes
- 250 Units
- 750 Population
- 375 Parking Spaces

*All scenarios assume approx. 3 story condo or assisted living on the upper campus with reuse of the Loring Villa & Saint Chretienne Convent.
Comparison

2-4 Story Multifamily

Pros
- Potentially higher affordability
- Higher efficiency

Cons
- Lower open space
- Potential increased traffic

2-4 Story Multifamily (Retaining Harrington)

Pros
- Moderate/High unit density
- Reuse of existing building

Cons
- Lower open space
- Potential increased traffic
- Existing building may not be suitable to purpose

Mix of 2-4 Story Multifamily and Townhomes

Pros
- Moderate unit density
- High open space
- Mix of offerings

Cons
- Lower unit count may translate into higher prices

Townhomes

Pros
- Increased open space
- High percentage of low rise units
- Fits existing neighborhood character

Cons
- Lower unit density
- Lower affordability
Next Steps

• Collect additional feedback from community via this public meeting

• Process and document all feedback

• Compile a report to summarize:
  • Analysis findings
  • Key planning principles
  • Community goals and priorities
  • Framework for South Campus
  • Potential development opportunities and concepts
OPEN HOUSE DISCUSSION
Thank you!