

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

Board or Committee: Redevelopment Authority, Regular Meeting
Date and Time: Wednesday, April 10, 2024, at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location: Virtual Zoom Meeting
SRA Members Present: Christopher Dunn, Chair Grace Napolitano, Christine Madore, Dean Rubin
SRA Members Absent: Cynthia Nina-Soto
Others Present: Kate Newhall-Smith, Principal Planner
Others Absent: Tom Daniel, Executive Director
Recorder: Kate Newhall-Smith

Executive Director's Report

Mr. Daniel stated that he will forego the Executive Director's Report given the length of the agenda.

Design Review Board Membership

1. **Reappointment:** Catherine Miller

Ms. Newhall-Smith shared that DRB member, Catherine Miller's term expired on March 1, 2024. She spoke to Ms. Miller who would like to continue to serve on the DRB for another term. Ms. Newhall-Smith requests the Authority consider reappointing Ms. Miller to a three-year term with an expiration date of March 1, 2027.

Ms. Miller thanked the board for the opportunity to serve on the DRB, believes the board is doing great work, and is looking forward to continuing on the board.

VOTE: Madore made a motion to reappoint Catherine Miller to another three-year term to expire on March 1, 2027. Seconded by: Rubin.

Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

Projects in the Urban Renewal Area

Chair Napolitano announces that her husband is employed by the firm that is the registered lobbyist for WinnDevelopment. She filed a disclosure regarding the appearance of a conflict of interest as advised by the State Ethics Commission. The disclosure was filed with the Mayor's Office. She is making the announcement at this public meeting also upon the advice of the Ethics Commission.

1. **93 Washington Street:** Small Project Review – Installation of exterior security camera on rear addition of City Hall

Stavroula Orfanos, Building Commissioner, City of Salem, was present to discuss the project.

Commissioner Orfanos stated that they have been working to install cameras on the city buildings. She has received approval from the Massachusetts Historical Commission for the project. The structure of the camera will match the color on the trim of the building.

Mr. Rubin asked if this camera is the same as those that have been approved in the other locations. Commissioner Orfanos confirms they are the same.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to approve. Seconded by: Madore.
Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

2. 289 Derby Street: Small Project Review – Review of DRB Recommendation for the construction and installation of seasonal shade structure at Charlotte Forten Park

Kate Newhall-Smith was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Newhall-Smith presented the updated design to the Authority. Design changes included: changing the shape of the support beams from rectangular to circular; adjusting the purlin so that it is further from the outer edge of the sails, and color-matching the support beams to the support structure of the existing pergola. She noted that the DRB would also like to see decorative lighting on the support beams during the off season when the shades are down.

Mr. Rubin asked if through the moving of the purlin back the shades will act like sails in the wind. Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that it's pushed back a minimal amount, likely because of this and the need to maintain structural integrity.

Ms. Madore asks when the shades are removed. Ms. Newhall-Smith responds that they will be removed in the winter, so they won't get damaged by snow. Ms. Madore asks about electrical in the structure. Ms. Newhall-Smith reviewed the bid plan and its alternates. Ms. Madore asks to see updated renderings showing the new column design. Ms. Newhall-Smith states that the renderings won't be a part of the bid, only the plan set, and she is not planning on updating the renderings to reflect the design changes recommended by the DRB. Ms. Madore asks about the impact on programming. Ms. Newhall-Smith confirms it's not going to impact programming or life safety vehicles.

Public Comment:

Jonhathan Berk, 51 Lafayette Street: Asked about programming, impact of shade, is investment worth it and will it help activate the plaza?

Ms. Newhall-Smith reviews the other initiatives happening at the park. Ms. Madore notes the investment into the electrical systems and appreciates the value-add to the space via the shade.

VOTE: Madore made a motion to approve the revised plans pursuant to the DRB Recommendation. Seconded by: Rubin.
Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

3. 283 Derby Street: Small Project Review – Review of DRB Recommendation for the installation of new rooftop condenser

Chris Lohring of Notch was present to discuss the project.

Lohring stated that in 2016 they installed a glycol chiller used to brew their beer. Due to age, expansion, and climate change, the system needs to be more efficient, so they need to install a rooftop compressor. The original unit is 8.6 feet-high and additional compressor is 6.5 feet-high. It will be spaced out due to structural requirements, however; the new compressor is 25% smaller in height and 50% smaller in width.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Rubin acknowledges the lack of significant visual impact.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to approve pursuant to the DRB Recommendation. Seconded by: Madore.

Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

4. 208 Essex Street: Small Project Review – Review of DRB Recommendation for the installation of new windows on the east elevation of Salem Five

Samuel Clement of Jones Architecture was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Clement stated that they are proposing to add 9 new windows along the east elevation, six on the third floor and three on the second floor, as part of an interior renovation of the corporate headquarters. Their desire was for more lighting in the center of the floor plate within this more modern addition to 210 Essex Street, the original historic bank structure. The east façade is over the CVS roof, but it is not visible from many locations and the photo provided was taken from the Museum Place garage. The existing east elevation has two-foot-wide cement panels and no windows, and the proposed window configuration is due to existing structural elements and fire protection requirements. They are also trying to limit the amount of demolition required, so they will selectively remove panels to install windows where they can, while blending in using a fiber cement panel to match as closely as possible. The new windows will be a close match, using a similar dark bronze aluminum framed system, and they will be installing an energy efficient window to meet the new code.

Mr. Rubin applauds the bank for thinking of their employees and taking this project on that will bring more natural light into the workplace.

Ms. Madore asks about the structural study and asks why the windows are narrow. Mr. Clement reviews the structural study and the limitations on how much of that façade can be removed for windows.

Ms. Madore asks about construction staging and asks that the bank work to maintain a clear walkway between the bank and City Hall. Mr. Clement discusses likely staging and will share her concern/preference with the client.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to approve pursuant to the DRB Recommendation and with the understanding that the applicant will work with the contractor to ensure that the walkway as discussed remains free of construction staging, vehicles, and dumpsters. Seconded by: Madore. Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

5. **9 Crombie Street:** Small Project Review – Façade changes to single family home, including restoring the existing masonry, adding a second door, and installing new windows.

Dan Ricciarelli, Seger Architects, and Robert Rogers, the owner, were present to discuss the project.

The applicant is seeking to change the existing façade of the home by:

1. Repointing and restoring exterior masonry.
2. Removing masonry infill of former window on the right side of the front elevation to install matching double hung window.
3. Installing an entry door on the left side of the front elevation in the existing window location.
4. Adding a new canopy over the facade width for the covered entry. "Freedom Gray" standing seam roof with composite wood fascia and corbels.
5. Installing replacement windows to match the existing with dual glazed, SDL, double hung aluminum clad windows (Andersen or equal).
6. Painting the existing trim and Palladian transoms.
7. Retaining all gutters, downspouts, and shingles.

Mr. Rubin asks why they need a second door. Mr. Ricciarelli and Mr. Rogers respond that they want flexibility for the space – guests, office/business, apartment for family members, etc. Mr. Rubin understands reasons, though not in favor of the aesthetics presented.

Ms. Madore asks if the applicant can provide precedent images in Salem that show two doors side by side that are not townhouses. Mr. Ricciarelli does not have anything in mind right now. Ms. Madore asks if there is permitting associated with an ADU.

Mr. Rubin asks about the ADU permitting process. Mr. Daniel confirms that there isn't a special process, the Building Inspector will talk to the owner about it.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to refer to the DRB. Seconded by: Madore. Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

Ms. Newhall-Smith shares that she received a comment letter regarding all outdoor dining applications, without singling out a particular establishment from Jone Sienkiewicz, 51 Lafayette Street.

6. 76 Lafayette Street: Outdoor Dining – Review of proposed outdoor dining for Couch Dog

Adam Shoemaker, co-owner, was present to discuss the project.

The owners are seeking to continue the outdoor dining area as it existed last year. The dining area is at street grade in the two parking spaces in front of the business on New Derby Street at the corner of Lafayette. There is a ramp to access the area from the sidewalk. There will be five tables with a total of 20 seats and protection from vehicles via jersey barriers.

Mr. Rubin asks about Howling Wolf customers sitting in their space and vice versa. Mr. Shoemaker said that they need to keep the two spaces separate.

Public Comment:

Jonathan Berk, 51 Lafayette Street: In support of outdoor dining and strong support of this application. It enlivens the streetscape.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to approve pending DRB approval. Seconded by: Dunn.
Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

7. 232 Essex Street: Outdoor Dining – Review of proposed outdoor dining for Fountain Place

Tom Moore, the owner, was present to discuss the project though was having technical difficulties so Ms. Newhall-Smith presented the information on his behalf.

Mr. Moore is seeking to continue the outdoor dining area that has been in use for the past three years. The dining area is on the pedestrian mall immediately adjacent to the business frontage. There is space between the building and the dining area for pedestrians to pass. The dining area extends toward the fountain. There will be eleven tables with a total of 34 seats.

Ms. Madore mentions the broken planter at the corner of the restaurant and would like to see that removed/repaired.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to approve pending DRB approval. Seconded by: Madore.
Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

8. 120 Washington Street: Outdoor Dining - Review of proposed outdoor dining for O'Neill's

William Anderson of O'Neill's was present to discuss the project.

The applicant is proposing to continue the outdoor dining area as it has been during the past few seasons. The dining area consists of decking, 8' x 32' (256 sf) that meets the curb, four tables, each with four seats, and an L-shaped couch. The applicant is proposing to place three umbrellas in the area. He shares a photo of the space from last year and confirms that the planters shown on the sidewalk will be removed so that the sidewalk remains clear. He would like to install jersey barriers on both ends to protect the space from parking drivers.

Ms. Newhall-Smith asks about the ivy screening. Mr. Anderson confirms that they will keep it since it provides some privacy for customers.

Ms. Napolitano confirms that this will be the same set up. Mr. Anderson confirms he will install new plain umbrellas and maybe new tables/chairs to freshen the space.

Ms. Madore asked about ADA accessibility. Ms. Newhall-Smith confirms that all applicants need to go before the Commission on Disabilities.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to approve pending DRB review. Seconded by: Madore.
Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

9. 133 Washington Street: Outdoor Dining – Review of proposed outdoor dining for Boston Burger Company

Darky Perez, General Manager at Boston Burger Company was present to discuss the project.

The applicant is proposing to continue the outdoor dining area as it has been during the past few seasons. The dining area is located at the rear of the restaurant tucked among existing planting beds. The area includes nine tables with a total of 34 chairs. The applicant will also be using plain red umbrellas.

Mr. Rubin mentions the uneven brick walkway that passes through the area and challenges it presents to those who have mobility concerns. Mr. Perez responds that he will work with the space and the table layout to find a more even pathway around the dining area.

Ms. Madore asks why they are using the chain link and not the planters. Mr. Perez discusses the former gardening company and their work to find a new gardening company to do the planting in this area. Plantings will not change the spacing shown.

Mr. Dunn asks about the DRB review of these areas. Ms. Napolitano and Ms. Newhall-Smith review the process and how it could work with this applicant. Board members continue to discuss the stanchions/chains and the plantings, their preferences, and the review process.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Madore made a motion to approve pending DRB review and sharing their preference for vegetation and plantings in the area with the DRB. Seconded by: Rubin.
Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

10. 2 East India Square: Outdoor Dining – Review of DRB Recommendation for proposed outdoor dining for Village Tavern

Andrew Ingemi of Village Tavern was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Newhall-Smith reviews the proposal changes the DRB would like to see:

- The existing white lattice fencing shall be painted black.
- Rather than fencing along the edges bordering the fountain, the applicant shall install chains between the posts rather than lattice fencing. The applicant may install black lattice fencing with flowerpot bases along the outer edge of the dining area.
- The boundary of the outdoor dining area that directly borders the fountain shall be offset from the fountain by at least four (4) feet to allow for pedestrian movement around the entire fountain.
- Signs related to the boundaries for alcohol consumption shall be installed pursuant to requirements from the Salem Licensing Board, the Salem Police Department, or any other official, department, or entity enforcing liquor license requirements.

Ms. Madore is not in support of dining next to the fountain due to standards regarding public park space for public use. The COVID era restrictions are no longer in effect. She is ok with an extended patio next to the existing patio, but not extending up the side of the fountain. Mr. Rubin agrees.

Public Comment:

Jonathan Berk, 51 Lafayette Street: Adhere to DRB that pulled tables away from the fountain; he is in support of a slight extension.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Public Comment is closed.

Mr. Dunn asks clarifying questions regarding space and Ms. Madore's stance on its footprint. Members discuss existing conditions and proposed conditions. Mr. Rubin supports existing seating parallel to the existing space. He does not want tables extending toward the PEM. Ms. Madore does not want to see tables extend toward the PEM beyond the back edge of the fountain.

Mr. Rubin discusses the busy season and the crowds around the fountain.

Ms. Madore asks about dimensions around the fountain. Ms. Newhall-Smith locates a map that includes dimensions and confirms that it's 4-feet from the edge of the fountain to the first cement band and bollard.

Mr. Dunn confirms that once this is approved, they won't see an application next year. He wants to support the business via an approval for one year and then revisit the space. Ms. Newhall-Smith isn't sure if there is a way to require the applicant to come back via the permit.

Ms. Madore confirms her support for the business and wants to balance private use and the need to preserve public space for the public.

Mr. Ingemi discusses the dining area where people can enjoy the fountain and people watch. He supports the reduction to allow a 4-foot walkway around it. His dining area breathes life into the space. He doesn't understand why the board wants to further restrict the space for outdoor dining. More people will use the area if they have tables out there. He asks the board to reconsider and view the proposal as a positive for the area.

Mr. Rubin confirms his support for the business, it's about magnitude. Will too many tables make it feel too private that pedestrians do not feel welcome and will walk by? he doesn't want the public to feel like they are trespassing into the restaurant space.

Ms. Madore reviews current conditions. Ms. Newhall-Smith describes who was using space during the COVID years, which has informed Mr. Ingemi's footprint.

Members continue to discuss their preferences for the patio footprint. They discuss logistics of line management, dimensions, etc. with the applicant.

Mr. Daniel clarifies members' preferences and intent. Ms. Madore is ok with at least 4-foot clearance from the edge of the fountain and then tables from there to the restaurant. Ms. Madore clarifies her preference for a simple rectangle as does Mr. Rubin who is ok with adding a little more space along the side of the fountain.

Mr. Ingemi reiterates the past four years of use around the fountain. Ms. Napolitano clarifies that they are not excluding this use but putting parameters around it. Mr. Ingemi states that none of the abutters have come out against the proposal.

VOTE: Madore made a motion to approve based on the dimensions as discussed.

Motion is interrupted to review dimensions. There is more discussion among the board members about the dining area footprint. Members discuss the permanency of the outdoor dining area once the permit is approved.

The motion is not seconded.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to continue to the 5/8 meeting with Board members to send questions about this application to Ms. Newhall-Smith so that she may research answers before the meeting. Seconded by: Madore.

Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

11. 231 Essex Street – Project Update: Bay Window at Rockafellas

Discussion is continued to the May meeting.

12. 259 Essex Street: Small Project Review – Painting of Essex Street portion of the exterior façade

Kirstie Phillips of Black Craft Cult was present to discuss the project.

The applicant is proposing to paint the red brick exterior of the former Santander building (the ‘modern’ addition) and the window trim black. Ms. Phillips stated that the black was not just branding, but also in reference to the Twilight House.

Mr. Rubin states that he understands the reason for the proposal. However, it is not consistent with the character of the downtown district. Ms. Phillips references Twilight House and asks how the SRA differentiates between that proposal and this one.

Ms. Napolitano asks about the Twilight House façade material. Mr. Daniel stated that Twilight was a storefront system not an entire façade.

Ms. Phillips reviews the investments Black Craft has made to the building.

Mr. Daniel reviews brick restoration work that could help to improve the façade.

Ms. Madore believes the contrast of the black is overpowering as it covers the entire façade. She references the design standards in the Downtown Renewal Plan and the SHC Notebook. It sounds like there is restoration that is needed to the brick that paint would only exacerbate. She offers alternatives to the full façade paint.

Public Comment:

Susan Moulton, 98 Washington Square East: Does not want the black building since it is not historic.

Polly Wilbert, 7 Ceder Street: Context of historic downtown, compatibility/complementary to surrounding area and continuity to adjacent facades.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Public Comment is closed.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to deny the application. Seconded by: Madore.

Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor to deny the application.

13. 252 Bridge Street: Design Drawing Review – Review of 75% design drawings for The Exchange

Ramie Schneider, Winn Development and Steve Prestejohn, Cube 3, were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Schneider reviews the current status of the project. She shares that the materials for the wall mock-up as required by the SRA decision, have been ordered and she will let staff know when it is ready for viewing by the SRA, DRB, and general public. She reiterates that all changes made

were made to honor the design intent as the design evolved. She introduces Steve Prestejohn who will run through the design changes.

Mr. Prestejohn reviews the submitted documents. Revisions include:

- Parking Level: New three-level stairway to MBTA access drive; expanded area for utilities based on conversations with National Grid.
- Bridge Street Level: slight shift in location of three access points from Bridge Street to align with grade and with the building; addition of intermediate rail on monumental stair for code compliance; further refinement of where the building meets the existing overpass retaining wall; adjustments to curtain wall facing Bridge Street as a result of building to passive house standards.
- Roof Plan: refinements to equipment and its layout; some areas now have safety rails for code compliance but are not visible from grade.
- Elevations: Refined metal reveal at each level as they worked through how the panels and window heights interact; roof height adjusted for insulation, 2” increase; bike storage openings adjusted for open air requirements; flood proof walls designed to 13’ rather than code required 11’; roof deck access removed, and doors were replaced with windows; eliminated the red panels that were on the west elevation facing North Street.
- Facade Color Patterning: 7 panels per floor, color variation, panel dimensions were adjusted to reduce material waste while maintaining design intent.
- Site Plan: Changes to shape and location of the softscape areas due to the National Grid requirements for its equipment.
- Planting Plan: Changes made to the planting schedule.

Mr. Rubin appreciates the work put into the project since the last time he saw it. The changes are dramatic and seem to be due to code requirements. He asks how long the vehicle drop off space is. Ms. Schneider confirms that the area is sized to accommodate five cars for short-term parking. There will be signs labeling it as such. Maybe two trucks and a car at the same time. Mr. Rubin asks about the loading zone. Ms. Schneider states that the loading zone will be primarily for move-ins/outs. Mail and deliveries will likely use the drop off on the overpass. Mr. Rubin asks where the elevator is located in relation to the loading zone. Ms. Schneider reviews the two options for accessing the elevator from the loading zone area.

Ms. Madore asks about site signage indicating the various functions of the site. Ms. Schneider shares that they will use building-mounted wayfinding. Ms. Madore asks about additional signage not for wayfinding. Ms. Schneider states that they haven’t designed it yet. Ms. Madore asks about passive house intent and funding. Ms. Schneider confirms that their design was always intended to meet passive house standards, which is nearly the same as the new codes that are coming out both at the state and the local level.

Ms. Madore asks about thermal bridging at the commercial spaces facing the river and if that impacts textures and design. Mr. Prestejohn confirms that there are no changes to the textures, walls, or windows. She asks if the team anticipates additional changes. Ms. Schneider and Mr. Prestejohn confirm that they are not likely to come back with additional revisions.

Ms. Madore asks about the retail space and shares that she wants to be diligent with these commercial spaces to make sure they don’t remain vacant. Ms. Schneider states that there is only one true retail space available. The other areas (coworking space and a fitness center with locker rooms) are to meet the public accommodations requirements of Chapter 91. There is one small

retail space available that is at the confluence of the Bridge Street access, the monumental stairs, and the MBTA area. Ms. Madore asks about retail trash. Ms. Schneider confirms that it will be self-contained within the 1,360 square foot retail space. Ms. Madore asks if the space can be subdivided. Ms. Schneider states that they have flexibility depending on the tenants. Ms. Schneider reviews the type of tenants that could go into the space; it is not made for a full-scale restaurant.

Public Comment:

Genevieve Sinha, 7 Botts Court: Concerned with retail space on the first floor have access facing downtown Salem. She is concerned with finding and retaining businesses that rely on heavy foot traffic due to low visibility from downtown.

Ms. Schneider responds and shares that the pedestrian connections from Bridge Street to the building provide access to the space. Even if the space was facing Bridge Street, there is no door to enter that retail space. Mr. Prestejohn confirms one goal of the project to promote activity across and through the site.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Rubin confirms DRB review and asks if it should come back to the full SRA. Ms. Newhall-Smith reviews the typical process for design drawing review.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to accept the 75% design drawings upon successful completion of DRB review of the materials. Seconded by: Dunn.

Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

14. 32 Federal Street: Schematic Design Review – Review of proposed changes to the exterior of the Superior Court House and the County Commissioners’ Building

Derek Hanson and Adam Stein, WinnDevelopment, Joe Correnti, Correnti Kolick, LLP, Michael Blier, Landworks, and John Seger, Seger Architects were present to discuss the project.

Attorney Correnti introduces the project. He shares that the team will present schematic design drawings with a goal of getting a referral to the DRB.

Mr. Hanson introduces himself to the Authority members.

Mr. Blier reviews the site plan and orients the members to the two buildings and the site surrounding them. He shares that this project anchors the top of Washington Street at Bridge Street and is a gateway and the front door to downtown from the train.

Mr. Seger reviews the proposed program for the interior space. The county commissioner building will have residential units on the first and second floor. The superior court will have restored office space and event space toward the back (Bridge Street) of the building. The connecting element between the two buildings will remain and serve as the primary access for both buildings. The project will maintain existing egress areas though they will not be for primary access. He confirms that trash will be retained within the building and moved outside for private pick up; they are trying to avoid an exterior dumpster.

Mr. Blier reviews the site plan changes:

- Federal Street
 - Strong row of street trees with a secondary line of smaller trees.
 - Small pullover area in front of the building.
 - Framing existing entries with vegetation and walkways
 - Ramped walkway to front door (in connector building)
 - The courtyard between the two buildings is at the sidewalk level and accessed via the ramp or stairs, there will be gathering space there with shade trees.
- Bridge Street
 - Two options
 1. The courtyard is framed by planting zones along sidewalk with trees, green span between the sidewalk and granite wall. Plaza with public art.
 2. Lush plantings, no/limited hard scape, public art included.
- Low level lighting throughout the site, pathway lighting, step lights, featured lights to focus on the building. The lighting plan continues to be a work in progress.

Mr. Seger reviews the existing facades and their elements. The existing facades will be restored to what they previously looked like. The predominant change to the buildings is the connector space. It will be removed entirely and replaced with an identical structure in terms of footprint and height. However, it will feature a full glass curtain wall. All of the restoration will comply with National Park Service standards.

Mr. Rubin appreciates the work that has gone into the restoration plans. He asks about the courtyard entrance and if the functionality of the primary doors on Federal Street will be removed. Mr. Seger confirms that they will be for egress, but not for entering the buildings. The courtyard entrance is safer and more secure. Mr. Rubin appreciates the courtyard space.

Mr. Rubin asks about the parking spaces in front of the Superior Court building. He asks who can park there and how that will be determined. Mr. Hanson shares that since parking onsite is limited, they are not interested in removing any existing parking spaces. He shares that it will likely be for guest parking or drop-off/loading space.

Mr. Rubin asks about the Bridge Street site options. He does not have a strong opinion on a preferred concept. He asks if Winn would like to see it activated and engaged or just a garden space for people to view and enjoy.

Mr. Rubin shares that he hopes the HVAC system is integrated into the site and not easily seen.

Ms. Madore acknowledges this milestone for the project. She shares that she would like to see the slip lane from Bridge Street to Washington Street removed and the courtyard space extended. This is one of the reasons why she was in favor of Winn's original RFP response. Mr. Daniel responds and shares that the original RFP included a study from Toole that showed improvements to this corner. Upon conversations with MA DOT about this area, they wanted to see a roundabout in this location. MA DOT ultimately decided that this intersection was beyond their project scope and were not going to continue to explore improvements to the area. He shares that modifications would require significant analysis. Mr. Hanson shares the complexities at this corner that create challenges for programming – topography, access to the buildings, area of space (approx. 2,000 sq. ft.).

Ms. Madore reinforces her desire to see significant improvements to this area and would like to see the intersection studied, even internally via City departments, to see if the slip lane could be removed.

Ms. Madore asks about the West/North elevation and the windows in the turrets. Mr. Hanson confirms that they are bricked and are where the spiral staircases in the Law Library are located. The other bricked-in windows near the turrets are the exterior of the Law Library and have been bricked for a very long time. She then asks about the later addition egress facing Bridge Street. Mr. Seger responds that this door is one of two basement egress points that needs to remain. They will install a more appropriate door. Ms. Madore believes that the door negatively impacts the symmetry of the building.

Ms. Madore is in favor of removing the four parking spaces on the Federal Street side in favor of more green space and acknowledges the largely underutilized MBTA parking garage across the street.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Rubin made a motion to refer the project to the DRB for review noting SRA desire to improve the Bridge Street/Washington Street corner. Seconded by: Madore.
Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

New / Old Business

Redevelopment of the Historic Courthouses and the Crescent Lot: Update on Project Status: Update on Project Status: Ms. Napolitano suggested skipping this item since Winn presented both projects.

SRA Financials: Received and filed.

Other: None

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Napolitano stated that review of the minutes would be continued to the next meeting.

Adjournment

VOTE: Dunn made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by: Rubin.
Roll Call: Dunn, Madore, Rubin, and Napolitano. 4-0 in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 10PM.