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Introduction

Commissioned by the City of Salem, Salem State University (SSU), and the Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance (DCAMM) for the State of Massachusetts, the purpose of the study is to create a vision to guide the future use and development of Salem State University’s South Campus. The study is in anticipation of an eventual sale of the South Campus by DCAMM on behalf of SSU.

The project spanned a three-month period and included a series of stakeholder meetings and two public meetings to solicit input from community members. In addition to in-person meetings and events, an on-line survey was distributed to capture the public’s feedback. This document summarizes the material shared at each of those meetings, as well as the feedback received.

PROJECT SCOPE

The scope of this study was to analyze the site opportunities and constraints, understand and document the ideas and vision for future development that align with community values, and explore tradeoffs associated with varying uses and degrees of density. It was not to provide a single option or recommendation for the future development of South Campus. It will ultimately be the responsibility of the selected developer(s) to propose a project that the City can permit given this context.

PROJECT GOALS

The following project goals articulate the purpose and emphasis of the planning study:

- Work with stakeholders to determine a long-term vision for South Campus, consistent with community goals. South Campus represents one of the few large development opportunities in South Salem and therefore presents a tremendous opportunity to transform the neighborhood and engage neighbors and the broader Salem community.

- Determine compatible future uses that best realize this vision in alignment with market opportunities. Compatible uses include those that are contextually appropriate, leverage site-specific opportunities, align with community values and needs, and attract the interest of development partners.

- Build upon previous planning efforts. Salem recently completed Imagine Salem, a vision for Salem’s future and focused on community priorities and opportunities for improvement.

- The sale of the South Campus will provide funds for Salem State University to invest in its remaining physical plant to ensure long-term viability and success for the university.
Site Analysis

The study team analyzed the South Campus site itself, as well as the surrounding context to understand the opportunities and constraints associated with future development. The following diagrams summarize those findings.
Located in South Salem approximately 2.5 miles from downtown. The site has significant topographic variation. Access from the Upper Campus to the Lower Campus is challenging due to steep grade. The largest natural amenity proximate to the site is the Forest River Conservation area.
Loring Avenue abuts South Campus to the south and east, and serves as the primary artery from which access is provided to the site, albeit indirectly (via Harrison Avenue) for Lower Campus and directly for Upper Campus. Further south and east, as well as to the west, the Forest River Conservation area serves as an ecological buffer as well as an amenity providing natural areas, streams, and walking paths. The areas north of the site contain primarily single-family residential neighborhoods.
The site is generally divided between Lower Campus and Upper Campus, which are distinguished from each other by significant topographic variation. In particular, access between Lower Campus and Upper Campus is challenging due to steep grade. The central portion of Lower Campus, currently occupied by surface parking, is mostly flat and offers the land most easily developed for future use. Significant topographic change, as well as a ledge condition, also characterizes the area north of the existing Bates housing complex, constraining future development potential of this area.
The Forest River Conservation Area abuts the site to the west and south and serves as the primary natural amenity for the site. In addition to ecological benefit, it contains a number of trails used by the community for recreation.
The Forest River waterway runs along the site in the south. The site contains areas within both the FEMA flood zone and the 200' Riverfront Area.*

*The 200’ river front area is a jurisdictional area under the Wetlands (and Rivers) Protection Act(s).
In addition to the Forest River waterway itself, the wetlands and their buffers serve as potential constraints to future development.
UPPER SOUTH CAMPUS

Views of Upper South Campus taken from Upper South Campus:

1. View looking west to Loring Villa and Saint Chretienne Convent
2. View looking southeast to the Forest River Conservation Area
3. View looking northwest to Saint Chretienne School
HARRINGTON BUILDING
Views of Harrington Building from Upper South Campus.
1. View looking west to Harrington
2. View looking north-west to Harrington
3. View looking south towards the Forest River Conservation Area
Site Analysis
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HARRINGTON BUILDING
Views of Harrington Building taken from Lower South Campus:
1. View looking west from Harrison Avenue
2. View looking east from Bates Housing Complex
3. View looking southeast from Bates Housing Complex
Views of the existing footpath to and along Loring Avenue. This area represents a potential connection point, bike, pedestrian, or vehicular, from Lower South Campus to Loring Avenue that could be explored in future development scenarios.

1. View looking east towards Loring Avenue
2. View looking north along Loring Avenue
3. View looking west towards the site
FOREST RIVER
CONSERVATION AREA APPROACH

Views of the Forest River Conservation Area and hiking trails, taken from Lower South Campus.

1. View of the approach to the trail within the site
2. View of the trail
3. View looking north to Bates from the forested area
LOWER SOUTH CAMPUS
Views of Lower South Campus taken from high point behind Bates Housing Complex

FOREST RIVER
CONSERVATION AREA
Views of the Forest River and surrounding conservation area, just west of Lower South Campus.
HISTORIC CONSIDERATIONS

Both Lower and Upper South campuses include several existing facilities. In considering future development scenarios, it is important to understand which buildings may carry historic significance and which lend themselves to redevelopment. The following summarizes some of those considerations; however, further study is recommended depending on future development scenarios.

SAINT CHRETIENNE CONVENT

The Saint Chretienne Convent was constructed in 1918 in the Second Empire style of building. It, along with the Loring Villa after its sale to Saint Chretienne in 1914, served as a convent until acquired by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in 1972 by then-Salem State College for $3.65 million. It is likely to be prioritized for preservation by advocates and/or regulatory bodies.

LORING VILLA

The Loring Villa was constructed in 1870 in the historically significant Italianate Style. It represents the oldest extant house in this area of South Salem. The Loring Villa meets Criteria A and C for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The relevant Criteria are:

- Criterion A, "Event", the property must make a contribution to the major pattern of American history.
- Criterion C, "Design/Construction", concerns the distinctive characteristics of the building by its architecture and construction, including having great artistic value or being the work of a master.
SAINT CHRETIENNE SCHOOL

The Saint Chretienne School was constructed in 1936. In 1948, an additional two stories were added to the structure. This building is less significant than the Loring Villa and the Convent in terms of both age and architectural style. It is unlikely to be prioritized for preservation by advocates and/or regulatory bodies.
The Harrington Building is a former Catholic School that was purchased for use by Salem State in 1972. It currently serves several of Salem State’s academic programs, including Nursing. Re-use options for the Harrington Building should consider the following advantages and disadvantages.

**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

These considerations show that there are legitimate if limited adaptive re-use scenarios for this building but its retention will likely not be prioritized as a preservation priority by advocates/regulatory agencies.
BATES HOUSING COMPLEX

The Bates Housing Complex currently houses 360 juniors and seniors in 60 six-person apartments, a mix of “flats” and townhouse-style units. Re-use options for the Bates Housing should consider the following advantages and disadvantages.

PROS

- A housing typology is likely compatible with potential future development
- Building 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

These factors make Bates an unlikely candidate to be prioritized for preservation by advocates and/or regulatory bodies.
Market Scan

The specific site design, massing, and density will be determined subsequent to this study; however, area precedents provide clues on the types of area development that align with market demand. The following examples demonstrate the range of styles, building heights, amenities, program mix, and parking at recent, nearby development parcels. While none of these is likely to be an exact prototype for South Campus, they can be useful for understanding potential scenarios and trade-offs.
North River Apartments

- 4-Story wood frame
- Retail at 1st floor
- "Luxury" rental
- 100% surface parking (~25% within building footprint)
- 10% of units are restricted to 80% AMI
135 Lafayette

- 4-Story brick clad
- Rental
- All surface parking
- All units are affordable with a mix of project-based Section 8 vouchers and units restricted to 50% and 60% AMI
The Landing at Vinnin Square

- Located in Swampscott
- 4-Story wood frame
- Rental
- All surface parking
- All units are market rate
The Residence at Vinnin Square

- Located in Swampscott
- 3-Story wood frame
- Assisted Living
- All surface parking (limited provision)
- All units are market rate
Engagement

The three-month planning process relied upon extensive stakeholder engagement, including online surveys, two meetings with the working group, and two open house sessions for any and all community members. The purpose of these sessions was twofold: first, to share information about the sale of South Campus and the considerations associated with potential future development scenarios and; second, to gauge the priorities and vision that community members have for the site.

OPEN HOUSES
The format of the October open house was created to solicit information about priorities, values, and ideas, and was consistent with some of the strategies employed for the Imagine Salem plan. For the December open house, the consultant team made a presentation to summarize key analysis findings, the market scan of area developments, a site framework, and potential development scenarios. After the presentation, the team collected additional comments at a series of feedback stations.
WORKING GROUP MEETING 1

Sasaki led a presentation focused on project goals and schedule, site analysis, and preliminary opportunities. The Sasaki team then facilitated a discussion with the Working Group regarding project goals, values, observations, and opportunities. The following notes are an outcome of that discussion.

ENVIRONMENT & OPEN SPACE

- Members voiced support for preserving public access to adjacent conservation areas, including the trail. One consideration is a potential sub-division of the easement to the Conservation Commission.

- Currently, the site area immediately north of Bates serves as a buffer to the abutting neighborhood. Some neighbors expressed preference to maintain this portion of the site as undeveloped.

- Given this area has significant wetlands, the design should consider the potential of flooding.

TRANSPORTATION

- There is concern that Harrison Road will become more congested with the addition of any new development. There should be consideration for another exit from the site in order to mitigate future issues.

- There is an opportunity to connect to the bike path via Lincoln Ave.

- This project has the potential to improve Loring Ave for bikes and pedestrians. Consider “placemaking” opportunities along Loring for pedestrians to linger and enjoy views to the adjacent conservation areas.

- Traffic impacts along Loring Ave should be considered.

- Neighbors expressed a desire for better public transportation, such as buses or shuttles; this is particularly important for seniors. There is also an opportunity to provide better bus amenities for people waiting for the 455 bus line.

HOUSING

- The neighbors would like to see affordable housing for seniors, veterans, and others with low income. A mix of seniors, young families, veterans, and others will enrich the neighborhood. Within this subset, preference for senior housing was most strongly expressed.

- Affordable housing should be considered for the site because there is a shortage in the city. A suggestion was made to consider the potential to reuse Bates for affordable housing, although this would limit the overall redevelopment potential of the site and the Bates buildings themselves lack accessibility and pose many other challenges.

  - The current zoning for the site is a mix of single family and residential conservation, therefore, there will likely be zoning changes to accommodate the desired development.

  - There may be potential for assisted living on the site given that Salem has very limited assisted living.

AMENITIES

- Amenities, such as a café, could serve to invite the abutting neighbors and broader community into the site.

- As a historic building, the Loring Mansion is an asset that should be celebrated.

- There should be a consideration for athletics and rec fields, as well as playgrounds, given that Ward 7 is currently underserved.

DIRECT EMAIL FEEDBACK

Several community members provided direct feedback in the form of emails. Key comments from that feedback include:

- The desire for affordable multi-generational housing with a variety of types of units to create a community.

- A focus on sustainable use of the land and current built assets.

- A desire for the river bank to be preserved as public land and a significant set back from the river to be restored as green space and planted with appropriate native trees.

- Pedestrian access to the Loring Villa given the historic landscape and incredible views.

- Areas of land open for passive recreation such as biking and walking to provide a greenway connection from existing trails to Loring Avenue.

- Health and fitness programs offered in conjunction with the Salem Park and Recreation Department, the North Shore YMCA and the Salem Board of Health.
Imagine Salem

“Imagine Salem is a citywide conversation to identify what kind of city Salem should be in 2026—the year we’ll be celebrating our 400th!”

VISION

In 2026 we are a sustainable and livable city where we celebrate our diverse histories and where people of all backgrounds and means participate and thrive.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

COMMUNITY
Salem believes in growing and supporting a diverse community, where people have equal opportunity and access to social and economic resources.

HOUSING
Salem recognizes the community’s right to safe, affordable, and life-enriching housing.

TRANSPORTATION
Salem believes in an accessible local and regional transportation system that provides alternative modes of transportation and choices.

EMPLOYMENT
Salem’s economy should be a system that contributes to opportunity, a high quality of life, and a sense of community.

CLIMATE & ENERGY
Salem believes in decreasing its impact on the climate and its natural resources through sustainable, clean, and efficient practices.
OPEN HOUSE 1

During the first open house, community members provided feedback relative to the following three categories: Values, Program Priorities, and Ideas.

VALUES

At the “Values” station participants were asked to select from a list their highest priority values. These values are a result of the Imagine Salem visioning process.

Affordability was the value most selected by the participants. This priority was also apparent in discussions, with many residents expressing concerns about the lack of affordable housing in Salem, especially for seniors and families. Residents were clear that they would like any new development to include at least some form of affordable housing.

Sustainability emerged as the next highest-ranked priority on the value board, and was also identified by many residents as an important consideration. Participants requested that new developments use sustainable construction techniques, and that the wetlands near the site be preserved.

Safety and diversity came in tied as the third priority value for the community. Safety is a concern with residents in regards to Loring Avenue, and a segment of that street that abuts South Campus that is deemed particularly hazardous to many residents. Participants requested that this section of road be made safer before any new development occurs. The diversity value refers to two aspects: building typology diversity and community diversity. Many residents discussed their preference for a building style that is contextual and varied, rather than uniform. Regarding community diversity, participants feel that housing should accommodate diverse family types, incomes, ages, and abilities. Some mentioned that creating a community center could especially benefit the youth and senior populations of the community.
SURVEY RESPONSE

The on-line survey response was similar to the feedback collected during the open house, with the top four values as: sustainable, safe, affordable, inclusive.

(ordered by priority of participants)

- Sustainable
- Safe
- Affordable
- Inclusive
- Connected
- Equitable
- Diverse
- Creative
- Vibrant
- Historic

PROGRAM PRIORITIES

At the “Program Priorities” station participants were asked to write down their priorities for use of the site. Roughly one-third of the written comments addressed the need for senior housing. Additional written comments added that the senior housing should be affordable, and should include a community space for seniors to gather. Affordable housing for everyone was identified as another top priority. Residents wrote that they would like affordable housing for families and seniors, and especially veterans. There were multiple suggestions for housing that would include a diversity of pricing rates.

As far as amenities, participants identified a lack of retail currently located in the area, and many suggested that retail would increase foot traffic and livelihood of the area. Other community members worried that the presence of retail would lead to more traffic.
Residents requested that the connection to nature trails be kept in future designs, and that more connections to natural spaces be created if possible. Multiple comments mentioned the lack of public schools in the area, and suggested infrastructure be set up to promote the creation of a school, and potential future connections to the school.

Residents have a strong desire for any new construction to minimize environmental impact, and for designs to consider the existing landscapes and how they can best be preserved and supported. Written comments suggested considering making buildings net zero.

Traffic was identified as an issue in the area. Residents feel that the traffic can be dangerous for both drivers and pedestrians, and that it is important that new designs provide a solution that makes the street safer for everyone.

In summary, the primary program priorities include:
- Senior Housing*
- Affordable Housing
- Veterans Housing
- Community Spaces
- Neighborhood Retail
- Early Childhood & Public School Opportunities
- Environmentally friendly construction
- Traffic solutions and pedestrian safety
- Connection to the natural amenities

*No specificity on the type of senior housing was identified, the range of which can include age-restricted, subsidized, affordable, market rate, and/or assisted living, all of which have different implications for design, financing, and permitting.

SURVEY RESPONSE

The on-line survey response was similar to the feedback collected during the open house, with the percentage share of responses shown in the accompanying pie chart:

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

290 community members participated in the on-line survey.
IDEAS

At the “Ideas” station participants were asked to consider potential uses and overall design. Using chips to represent different programmatic ideas, community members placed their preferences on the South Campus site. Analysis maps provided an understanding of context, such as wetlands, rivers, conservation land, and any associated buffers, topography, circulation, and overall development potential.

Many discussions revolved around the conservation area and open space. Participants felt it was important to maintain, or even expand, the current conservation land, and continue to provide public access to it through the site. Community members expressed a preference for redeveloping the central portion of South Campus, where existing parking and structures already exist, rather than encroaching onto the existing open space.
Framework

Based on the findings from the analysis phase of work, the team developed a likely framework to guide future development of the South Campus site. This framework is not meant to be prescriptive; rather, it documents a reasonable assumption for how and where future development of the site may occur when taking into account issues relating to topography, slope, and wetlands. The Framework takes into consideration several site planning priorities that emerged during the initial phase of the project and that underlie the emerging framework plan. Those site planning priorities include:

- Public access to natural amenities
- Views to the conservation areas
- Place-making features
- Amenities (community space, café, etc.)
- Reuse of the Loring Villa and Saint Chretienne Convent
- Sensitivity to scale
- Additional connection to Loring Avenue
- Maintain open space

The following maps document the underlying factors that contribute to the formation of the framework plan.
PROPERTY EXTENT

South Campus occupies a total site area of 21.5 acres, bounded to the south and east by the Forest River Conservation Area.
ECOLOGICAL AREAS

The wetlands and riverfront area pose potential constraints to development. As a precaution this study avoids developing in those protection zones. Any development within these areas would require ConCom review.
STEEP SLOPES

South Campus contains many steep slopes greater than 20%. These areas, marked in red on the map, are largely undevelopable without significant disruption. For the purposes of the study, we have excluded these areas from consideration for future development.
BUILDABLE AREA

Taking into consideration the ecological constraints – waterways, wetlands, and buffers – as well as the steep slopes greater than 20%, we determine a likely developable area of 11.3 acres, roughly 52.5% of the total site. For the purpose of this study, areas labeled C and D were excluded from the developable area calculations due to the topography of the site. The concepts that follow in this study only consider the areas labeled A and B for development which includes 9.1 acres or 42.3% of the site.

Site Area: 21.5 Acres
Developable Area*: 9.1 Acres
42.3% of the total site area

Building Foot Prints:
Loring Villa & Saint Chretienne Convent: 9,000 SF
Harrington Hall: 39,500 SF

Site Areas*:
A: 87,000 SF
B: 310,000 SF

*Excludes Loring Villa and Saint Chretienne Convent footprint. Includes Harrington which accounts for appx 1 acre of land.
POTENTIAL CIRCULATION FRAMEWORK

The potential future circulation framework is not wholly different from that which exists on campus today. Primary access to Lower Campus is still provided via Harrison Road, with access to Upper Campus provided via Loring Avenue. A circulation loop provides access throughout the site, and is pushed close to the steep slopes around the perimeter of the site. One potential future opportunity is to provide access between Lower and Upper Campus via an interior slip road. Further consideration and study can be given to an egress point from the southern portion of Lower Campus to Loring Avenue. As this access would traverse a wetland buffer, feasibility would need to be explored with regulatory bodies. If vehicular access through this area is not feasible or desirable, connection can be achieved through bicycle and pedestrian routes.
POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ZONES

A logical organization to handle parking is to locate it abutting the circulation loop. This area is shown in purple on the accompanying diagram. This sets up the opportunity for several development zones within the site, shown in orange. Limiting development to the typologies discussed below within these buildable areas results in a Floor Area Ratio (measurement of a building’s floor area in relation to the size of the lot/parcel that the building is located on) of well under 1.0. It is worth noting that this is a significantly lower density than one might otherwise expect from a large multi-family development and is due to the fact that much of the site was considered non-buildable due to topographic and wetland characteristics. Developers might propose a greater FAR in keeping with market expectations but will need to be mindful of site characteristics and community context.
Typology Concepts

The typology concepts represent a range of different strategies for site development. For the purposes of comparison, each concept assumes a developable area of 9.1 acres and relies on housing as the primary program component. As well, each considers housing density trade-offs and their impact on parking demand and open space.

ASSUMPTIONS

The following set of assumptions guide the typology concepts, and have been benchmarked against current local development practices:

- Maximum height of buildings at five 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 gross square feet, with an average of three people per unit. This accounts for a range of unit types from studio to 3 or 4 bedrooms all with a variety of sizes and people per unit.
- Parking ratio of 1.5 per unit, per the City of Salem regulations.
- Upper Campus development concepts assume approximately three-story condo or assisted living with reuse of Loring Villa and Saint Chretienne Convent.
MID-RISE MULTI-FAMILY APARTMENTS/CONDOS EXAMPLES

Fenwick| Silver Springs, MD | SK+I Architecture

Princeton North Andover | North Andover, MA | Princeton Properties

350 E. Locust St | Des Moines, IA | Neumann Monson Architects

Watertown Mews | Watertown, MA | TAT Architects
TOWNHOMES & CLUSTERED LOW-RISE APARTMENTS/CONDOS

Emerson Rowhouse | Denver, CO | Meridian 105 Architecture
Concord Avenue Residences | Cambridge, MA | Peter Quinn Architects

Juniper Gardens Apartments | Forest Grove, OR | Scott Edwards Architecture
University Place Townhouse | Cleveland, OH | Dimit Architects
SCENARIO 1:
2 TO 4-STORY MULTIFAMILY

The first scenario considers that Lower Campus is redeveloped entirely with multi-family units that range from two- to four-stories across the site. This approach yields an approximate density of 400 units, with a total of 400,000 gross square feet of new development. The total population is estimated at roughly 1,200 people, resulting in a parking demand of 600 spaces. To meet these program targets, Lower Campus would have approximately one-third of the site devoted to multifamily units, one-third to surface parking and road infrastructure, and one-third to open space. Pros and cons of this scenario are summarized below:

Pros

- Potentially higher affordability opportunities due to density of development
- Higher efficiency due to unit yield

Cons

- Less open space
- Potential for increased traffic given the number of residents
SCENARIO 2:
2 TO 4- STORY MULTIFAMILY
(RETAINING HARRINGTON)

This scenario is similar to Scenario 1; however, it considers the preservation and reuse of the existing Harrington Building. In this scenario, Harrington could support community-oriented uses such as meeting space, a senior center, etc. as well as contain some residential use in approximately 50 percent of the building. In maintaining Harrington, the unit yield is decreased to 330 units, for a total of 330,000 gross square feet of new development. This results in a population of approximately 1,020 people with a parking demand of 495 spaces. When compared to Scenario 1, new development and open space would occupy about 30 percent each of the site, and the remaining 40 percent would support parking and road infrastructure. Pros and cons of this scenario are summarized below:

**Pros**
- Moderate/high unit density
- Reuse of existing building promotes sustainability and could support community-oriented programming

**Cons**
- Less open space
- Potential for increased traffic
- Existing building may be expensive to renovate and unsuitable to repurpose depending on desired program
SCENARIO 3:
MIX OF 2 TO 4- STORY MULTIFAMILY
AND TOWNHOMES

Scenario 3 considers a mix of 2 to 4-story multi-family units, like in Scenarios 1 and 2, but also with townhomes. This approach provides greater variety in the housing typologies offered, and can potentially result in a more diverse residential mix. A reasonable assumption is 350 total units resulting in 350,000 gross square feet of new development, roughly 27% of the Lower Campus, to support a population of 1,050 people. The parking demand is calculated at approximately 525 spaces, or 33% of Lower Campus. This means that approximately 40% of the site can be dedicated to open space and public realm improvements. Pros and cons of this scenario are summarized below:

Pros

• Moderate unit density
• More open space
• Mix of housing typology offerings

Cons

• Lower unit count may translate into higher prices (less economy of scale)
SCENARIO 4: TOWNHOMES ONLY

Scenario 4 considers the lowest-density option of townhomes only. At an average of 2-3 stories, this yields approximately 250 units for a total of 250,000 gross square feet of new development. This would support a population of 750 people with a resulting parking demand of 375 spaces. Pros and cons of this scenario are summarized below:

Pros

• Increased open space potential
• High percentage of low rise units
• Fits existing neighborhood character

Cons

• Lower unit density does not actualize site's potential
• Less potential to maximize affordability due to lower unit density
• Townhomes designed exclusively with stairs are not accessible and therefore not suitable for housing targeted towards seniors.
WORKING GROUP MEETING 2

TYPOLOGIES

The discussion on typologies focused around what would be most feasible and would result in the greatest amount of housing, most affordability and overall benefit to the community.

Some of the group found that the 2-4 story multifamily typology without Harrington was the most viable because it can provide the most amount of units. Others felt that a mix of typologies would be the best for forming a community, creating a variety of living options for all types of users. Townhomes were recognized as a typology that is not conducive to seniors and often not accessible because of the multi-story nature.

FRAMEWORK

The conversation regarding the framework focused on the conservation area of the site and potential issues of the future parking locations being close, potentially causing environmental issues.

There was discussion on the potential for the upper campus be more focused on higher end housing, but the lower campus oriented more toward senior and community uses given the grade challenges.

The feedback on the potential connection from the site to Loring Avenue was well received, and discussions around its potential revealed that bike and pedestrian connection have a greater possibility of happening over a vehicular connection, though all should be explored further.

OPEN HOUSE 2

OVERVIEW PRESENTATION

Sasaki began Open House 2 by presenting the results of the first Open House and the online survey. The team also presented the site context to establish a common understanding of the existing conditions, and a market scan of area developments to help illustrate the type of developments that are currently happening in the area.

A site framework was presented outlining how the existing conditions and constraints are taken into consideration with development potential and overall vision.
Finally, the consultant team introduced four typology concepts for the site development. Each concept illustrated the impact of density and use on the site, including parking need, number of residential units provided, and open space availability.

FEEDBACK

The discussion portion of the Open House highlighted community member preferences for amenities and characteristics, as well as issues of concern. Many participants expressed that they value sustainability, and would like that incorporated into the design in ways that provide transportation alternatives, green spaces, and natural elements. There was an interest in adding public transit connections to the site, and a mention of a possible bike trail connection from the site towards Boston. Participants also were interested in adding new recreation and nature trails, along with other outdoor greenspace.

The majority of participants agreed that the new design should have characteristics of a neighborhood community, and that scale and massing should be sensitive to those desired characteristics. Many expressed a preference for a mix, of four story buildings with smaller townhomes. Regardless of the final typology mix the density of the site should be managed with good site design.
Implementation

This report serves to document the community feedback received during the visioning phase for South Campus as well as provide a resource to potential developers as they consider the opportunities for redevelopment.

The next step in this process is for the Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance (DCAMM), in consultation with Salem State University, to conduct a competitive process (such as an RFP process) to select a developer (or multiple developers) for the site. Once the selection has been made, the chosen developer(s) will proceed with design and approvals.

There will be extensive review through appropriate regulatory framework for development to proceed on this property. Potential regulatory approaches are summarized on the following pages.
REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

Regardless of the chosen developer, regulatory modifications will likely be needed. A number of regulatory tools may be applied to achieve the desired vision. These tools, as well as any others that may be considered, would be applied through a process requiring local approvals and continued community input.

Inclusionary Zoning

Inclusionary Zoning is a tool that municipalities use to create affordable homes. The City Council will be considering an inclusionary zoning ordinance in early 2020. It is expected that the inclusionary zoning ordinance will be adopted by the time a project is proposed at South Campus. If the proposed inclusionary zoning ordinance is adopted, 10% of the units in development will be required to be affordable to households at 60% of the area median income. The proposed ordinance also includes a 25% density bonus and parking waivers as incentives.

Housing Development Incentive Program

The Housing Development Incentive Program (HDIP), established by MGL Chapter 40V, is a development tool that allows for a tax exemption on the increment of the project’s new value. The tax increment exemption is provided to facilitate residential growth, expand the diversity of housing stock, support economic development, and promote neighborhood stabilization in designated areas. The entire City of Salem is within a Housing Development (HD) Zone, which means any multifamily housing development may apply for the program, including South Campus. The tax increment exemption must be reviewed and approved by the City Council for the project to receive a tax exemption.

The HDIP provides two tax incentives to encourage substantial rehabilitation of properties for lease or sale as multi-unit market rate housing:

- A local-option real estate tax exemption (called a Tax Increment Exemption—TIE) on all or part of the increased property value (only the new value) resulting from improvements.
- A state tax credit for Qualified Substantial Rehabilitation Expenditures that is awarded through a rolling application process.

Zoning

The current zoning is R1 and RC, both of which allow for single family homes on lots at least 15,000 and 80,000 square feet respectively. All four scenarios presented would require a zoning process. There are a few zoning processes that could support the types of development presented in the scenarios; including a comprehensive permit, a zoning overlay or a zoning amendment.

Comprehensive Permit

The lightest zoning process would be a comprehensive permit, also known as a “40B”. A comprehensive permit is a state law that allows developers to bypass local zoning regulations if 20 to 25 percent of any housing project is made affordable to low-income residents. If, as in Salem, ten percent or more of a municipality’s total housing units are affordable to households who earn no more than 80% of the area median income, then the Zoning Board of Appeals has the option to deny a comprehensive permit.

Zoning Overlay

Another option is a zoning overlay. An overlay district is a type of land use zoning that goes on top of the existing zoning. It provides a developer the choice to use the underlying zoning or the overlay. The use of an Overlay District would provide an opportunity to meet the unique needs of the project area, it could require higher levels of protection where needed such as along the conservation area and allow for flexibility where needed, i.e. allow for more units per lot area that what the underlying zoning allows. A zoning overlay could also require more affordable units that what is required per the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance.

Community Preservation Act (CPA)

The City of Salem adopted the CPA. The allocation of CPA funds early on in the planning or development process can make the development more competitive for other funds by this demonstration of local support.
40R Smart Growth Overlay District

Chapter 40R of the Massachusetts General Law encourages cities and towns to zone for compact residential and mixed use development in “smart growth” locations by way of a 40R district. A 40R district is a type of overlay. As previously discussed, a developer could choose to use the overlay zoning or base zoning. A 40R is beneficial to a developer in that it allows more homes than what would be allowed under the base zoning through a site plan review process, rather than by special permit. A 40R district is beneficial to the City in that it requires 20% of new units created to be affordable. The City may also include design guidelines to guide the design of new development in a 40R district. In addition, adoption of a 40R District provides the City two financial incentives: the first is an upfront payment that ranges from $10,000 - $600,000 depending on the number new units, the second financial incentive is a set of payments in increments of $3,000 for every unit built in excess of what the base zoning would have allowed.

Zoning Amendment

Another alternative is a zoning amendment. The parcel could be rezoned as a district that already exists in Salem, such as R3 or a new base zoning could be developed. A new base zoning could allow for something tailored to South Campus and would not affect other districts in the City.

Historic Tax Credits

The Loring Villa and Saint Chretienne Convent may be eligible for historic tax credits. Under the Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit program a certified rehabilitation project on an income-producing property is eligible to receive up to 20% of the cost of certified rehabilitation expenditures in state tax credits.