

City of Salem Massachusetts Public Meeting Minutes

Board or Committee: Design Review Board, Regular Meeting
Date and Time: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location: 98 Washington Street, Large First Floor Conference Room
DRB Members Present: Chair Paul Durand, Chris Dynia, David Jaquith, Glenn Kennedy, Helen Sides, J. Michael Sullivan
DRB Members Absent: Ernest DeMaio
Others Present: Tom Devine
Recorder: Colleen Brewster

Chair Paul Durand calls the meeting to order at 6:00PM. Roll call was taken.

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

- 1. 131 Essex Street (Moody Interiors):** Discussion and vote on proposed signage (sign permit) scheme

Jessica Moody of Moody Interiors was present to discuss the project.

Moody stated that they are seeking approval for a black aluminum sheet metal sign with white vinyl lettering and it will be secured to an existing wood backing. It will be a .04" thick x 14" high x 74" long sign band. They are seeking final approval for a 60"x10" aluminum wall directory sign, window graphics, and an aluminum A-frame sign. Kennedy asked for clarification on where in the sign band the first sign will be located. Moody noted that their sign band will be located directly go above the entrance door, in ¼ of the sign band length, so Brew Box has room to install a future sign.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Kennedy: Motion to approve as submitted.
Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 6-0.

- 2. 283R Derby Street (North Brewing):** Discussion and vote on small project review

Mary Ellen Lahey was present to discuss the project.

Lahey stated that will use the same materials and colors as before just installed in the next bay. The opening will be half roll-up door and half door to provide a second means of egress. The landscaping will also be extended. Any additional signage will come later.

Sullivan asked what style of door will be installed. Sides replied a man door placed within a garage door.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Kennedy: Motion to approve as submitted.
Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 6-0.

3. 65 Washington Street (District Court): Discussion and vote on final review of development project

Merrill Diamond (Developer), Greg Winter (Project Manager), Jeff Hirsch (VP of Operations for Urban Spaces and Senior Project Manager), and Steve Tise (Architect) were present to discuss the project.

Diamond stated that today they cleared the appeals period of the Planning Board and the DRB is the next step in the process. They have met with the Public Art team and came to a conclusion with the Federal Street artwork. They've explored some items that weren't presented to the Planning Board. The panels at the bays have switched from a cream to a dark rosewood to make the elevation more subdued. They've refined the ground floor, entry canopy, and roof, although no firm finish decisions have been made.

Hirsch stated that the previously presented plan was approved in August 2017 for Schematic Design and approved for Design Development. Several upgrades and changes have been made; the color of the panels which are now an Italian rosewood made by Longboard with an interlocking metal panel with a rain screen system at the bays, shutters, and at the penthouse. This is a 6-story building under the high-rise height requirements. There will be 2 levels of parking, one of them is underground within the existing courthouse foundation walls and they hope to reuse the sub-basement also. There will be parking for the 61 units with 61 regular spaces, 6 tandem spaces, and up to 21 stacker spaces. A portion of the site will remain unexcavated. The entrance lobby is approximately 2-feet above grade, there will be 3,000 SF of retail space all accessed through stairs or recessed ramps. The rear interior courtyard will have interior balconies and only the penthouse level will have balconies along Washington Street.

Hirsch stated that the original approved base was brick with a cast stone lintel above and now the entire base is cast stone to fit in with the main entrance and artwork along Federal Street. Diamond added that the artwork has an interesting approach that will work with the name of the building.

Hirsch stated that the new rosewood panels will fit in with the soldier coursing of the window lintels. Kennedy noted the change in brick color at the soldier coursing. Hirsch noted that those detailed will be present at the next meeting. The window shutters will be abstract with a series of tubes that are back fastened, protrude 2", and will alternate

on which side of the window they are placed on from floor to floor. Chair Durand asked if Longboard provided corner pieces to conceal what would be a joint at corner. Hirsch replied that monolithic pieces will form the corners.

Hirsch stated that the entrance canopy will be clear polycarbonate with a steel frame and will integrate with the 24" and 28" columns. The First Floor will have an 18" high granite base with cast stone at the sides of the storefront entry. The cornice was capped beams but now has a waffle slab look from below. They have a lighting consultant so the lighting will be determined. The original 6th floor was all curtain wall and is now broken up with a combination of walls and glazing. The louvers will now alternate from the left side to the right side of each window at each floor, and they will also be manufactured by the Longboard company, to match the color, style, and material. They've added 2 blue banners to the façade to define the building entrance and provide some color. The maintenance of those banners will be written into the condominium documents for the building. Diamond added that the banners will also add verticality to a horizontal building. Hirsch noted that what is placed on the banners hasn't been determined. Diamond noted that the round item on lower left corner of Washington Street is the start of the artwork that will continue along Federal Street.

Hirsch noted that they presented the landscape design to the Planning Board. Some of the plantings will be maintained and other will be replaced. The Federal Street trees will be removed and replaced because they share that piece of land with the City. They will integrate planters at the ramps, new park benches along Federal Street, and brick banding in the sidewalk. The landscape architect will determine what patterns will work best.

Durand noted that the glass windows are no longer transparent. Hirsch replied that the condominium documents will stipulate that the window treatment at all the windows will match.

Tise stated that they have made numerous modifications since the last presentation. The current elevation was in response to comments from the DRB, Planning Board meetings, and the art group.

Tise noted that the overall design is podium construction, where the existing base is being salvaged and reused, the first floor will be steel, and the upper floors will be treated wood construction. The projected canopy needs to be reviewed with the building inspector. They wanted the maximum interior heights but the building also must stay under the 70-foot-height limit. Stone accents will be integrated into the brickwork and samples of all the proposed materials were present for the Board to review. There are two column types, 28" square stone clad columns at the façade and 24" square metal clad columns at the storefront. The larger precast stone clad columns went from 24" to 28" square to allow for the fireproofing of the steel. The projecting cornice outriggers will be constructed out of glue laminated timber, with a factory finished intumescent paint to meet the fire code. The treated wood decking will span the 4-6 feet with an Alucobond fascia to create a very narrow profile.

Tise noted that there are two handicapped ramps, one on Church Street and one on Washington Street. The Washington Street ramp is beyond the existing foundation and the Church Street ramp is cut into the foundation, although both will appear the same.

The ramps will be concrete with 2" granite pavers. The ramps will also have back-lit translucent LED panels at back walls to help deter the homeless.

Chair Durand asked where mechanical systems will be placed. Tise replied on the roof. There have been many technological advances in those systems over the years, and they will finalize that selection next week. They will return to the DRB for approval on how it gets installed and screened.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Anne Sterling, 29 Charter Street. She noted that the Federal Street elevation hasn't been shown and as a gateway it is important. Hirsch replied that it will not be shown until the proposed art is determined and they are aware that it's an entryway to the city. Sterling suggested that banners be placed along Federal Street to advertise events in the city. Diamond replied that the proposed art will be perceived as very appropriate.

Blake Colamore, 10 Upham Street. Asked for the architect's inspiration because he believes they'd want something more iconic at a gateway entrance. Tise replied that the building is transitional, they didn't want to recreate a building they wanted to bridge all the vocabularies. Through the public process the public has wanted various different styles and inputs. Diamond noted that this will become a signature building that they didn't want to be too contemporary or too historic.

Judy French, 16 Foster Street. Ms. French is in favor of the design as it is a good transitional building although she is curious about the proposed art. She asked if balconies were at 6th floor only where they won't be seen. Tise replied that along Washington Street they are only at top floor because they didn't want the look of balconies along the main street because they would interrupt the streetscape. The interior courtyard will have balconies that will overlook the outdoor terrace and landscaping at the interior courtyard.

Victoria Riggadelo, 5 Foster Street. Asked for the unit breakdown. Hirsch replied 13 1-bedrooms, 38 2-bedroom, and 10 3-bedrooms.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Chair Durand stated that all improvements are positive, he's curious about the mystery façade along Federal Street. The lighting will need to be studied, especially at the ramps, to ensure that it is at a comfortable level. The translucent panels could also be placed on a dimmer so they aren't too bright. Tise noted that the lighting consultant created a preliminary lighting plan that was presented to the Planning Board, and they can provide it to the DRB if they are concerned with lighting controllability at night.

Jaquith stated that he agrees with Chair Durand and is in favor of what's been presented.

Sullivan asked why they selected podium construction. Tise replied that it was determined by the need for cost savings and the reuse of an existing light weight foundation. Wood is a clear and sustainable product, new technology will be included, sound proofing will be included with the use of an Acousti-mat material between the

floors as well as acoustic installation. The sound-proofing will exceed than code requirements.

Sides stated that she is also on the Planning Board and they were pleased with the results. She is in favor of the switch to rosewood paneling which creates a more sophisticated look. The building design has continued to improve.

Chair Durand requested that the applicant present the building materials along with the artwork at their next presentation. He noted their thorough landscaping design.

Dynia asked if face or thick brick will be used at the façade. Hirsch replied thick brick.

Kennedy stated that the base material color has improved although he is not in favor of the painted waffle slab look between the wood projections at the roofline. Sullivan stated that he is in favor of the deck underneath it. Chair Durand agrees. Tise noted that the ends of the wood projections would be concealed behind the fascia.

Chair Durand questioned the small blue square elements on the façade. Hirsch replied that they are brick vents resembling medallions. Kennedy stated that the blue stands out and doesn't fit with the elevations. Tise replied that the medallions will dark bronze not be blue.

Kennedy: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting on May 23, 2018.
Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 6-0.

North River Canal Corridor Renewal Area Projects Under Review

- 1. 16, 18, and 20R Franklin Street (Ferris Junkyard):** Discussion on design changes to proposed five building, 48-unit residential development.

Ryan McShera, architect, of Red Barn Architecture, and Mark Tranos, owner of Jupiter Point Development, were present to discuss the project.

McShera stated that in October 2017 a 5-building scheme with parking below the buildings oriented around a circular drive was presented. The revised scheme now includes 5 buildings with a main entrance at left edge of the property heading towards the river. On the site are two 5-unit townhouse buildings, one along Franklin Street and another backing up to the new driveway. The goal is to bring the size and scale down to meet the neighborhoods. The building beyond the townhouse, at the center of the site, is a little higher, and the two buildings closer to the water's edge are even higher. Vehicles have access to parking under the 3 larger buildings and the townhouses have garage parking at the back sides that face away from Franklin Street. The three higher buildings have deck spaces and are stepped back at the edges and corners to reduce the massing. There are front facing decks at the townhouses along the entrance drive and Franklin Street. The critique was that the previous design was not sensitive enough to the park because a large building previously backed up to the park so they've moved it away from the parks edge. The plans are conceptual at this time to meet the goals of the project although they will be providing amenities spaces for the residents such as common rooms, a second-floor gym in the middle building, and an outdoor patio at the turnabout of the driveway that faces the water.

McShera noted that in terms of the landscape design, the Planning Board recommended ways to develop the landscape plan so there isn't just concrete and pavement to give pedestrians a greater sense of self.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Victoria Ricciardiello, 5 Foster Street. Ms. Ricciardiello asked about the 3 higher building heights and why they require 48 units. McShera replied that the two higher waterfront buildings are 59' high with 1st floor parking, the 5-floor middle building is 1 story shorter and just below 50' high with 1st floor parking. Ricciardiello asked why the units increased from 43 to 48. McShera replied that they are still determining the massing and size of the development but 48 units makes sense based the size of the site and parking available. Ricciardiello noted that the site is very congested for a neighborhood, other buildings being built along back roads in Salem are at a much lower height. This is prime real estate; North Street is a main corridor and a gateway entrance. The other sites have also had clean-up and they are more appealing.

Anne Sterling, 29 Orchid Street. Asked about the proposed parking. McShera replied 74 total spaces, with a mixture of indoor and outdoor parking equaling 1.5 per unit. Sterling noted that NRCC zoning requires 2 spaces per unit. McShera noted that the Planning Board is on board with the proposed parking space.

George O'Brian, Locust Street. Asked if the entrance is sufficient for safety vehicles to access. McShera replied that their civil engineer has studied fire department access and they meet the access requirements in and around the site.

Andrew Fett, 1 Felt Street Way. Asked for the design ques taken from neighborhood in terms of building heights and design elements. McShera replied that they researched in and outside the City for buildings to emulate, such as the Courthouse across the river and as a main entrance to the City the architecture demands to be impressive, and the style of Salem architecture is transitioning. They took residential que's from rowhouse style homes with dividers at the top floor decks, the building height is tricky as the site is near flood elevation, so parking below is required since no living space is allowed on the first floor and the living space has been pushed up. Fett asked if their goal was to match the Court building in immensity since the proposed doesn't fit the neighborhood in terms of density or size and it not reflective of the neighborhood of houses. McShera replied that with a park next door and the opportunity for development at the neighboring site, this is an opportunity to transition into and reflect what is across the river. The single family home density isn't directly next to their site and the commercial sprawl provides a buffer of separation for the residential district.

O'Brian noted that the neighborhood is all single and multi-family house and asked how this would help the residential neighborhood or it's traffic since there are only 4 ways to enter the neighborhood. Many 2 and 3 bedrooms have 2 or more cars. McShera replied that fewer cars is better.

Sides stated that the Design Review Board reviews what is presented to them and the zoning and site plan concerns are for the zoning and Planning Board to review, not the Design Review Board. Durand replied that he would like to hear all of the publics concerns.

XXX, 16 Foster Street. stated that this is confusing, she read the minutes from the September 2017 meeting and some items do overlap. Durand replied that in the NRCC they are advisory board to the Planning Board. She asked how high the grade below the new 6-story, 59' high building, will be built-up. McShera replied that a portion of the site will be raised 1 foot to meet the flood requirements, the site is at elevation 10 and it needs to be at 11. She noted that a 6-story building is 2-stories higher than Bell at Salem Station and the MBTA parking garage, the Franklin Street homes are 1 and 2 stories, and the businesses are 1 story. There is no buffer, this area is part of Northfields not downtown, and she doesn't want to abut something that will transition into downtown. She requested a height marker and spoke to Tom St. Pierre who indicated that the neighboring crane is approximately 50 feet high which will give her an indication of the proposed building heights. She agrees that the South Mason Street buildings are better and the buildings should transition down towards the water.

Victoria Ricciardiello stated that there are beautiful homes along the waterfront of the North River. She suggested they build something beautiful that will enhance the neighborhood like what is on Goodhue and South Mason Street, since what's being proposed would be more suited for the back roads not part of neighborhoods. The proposed doesn't meet the character, heritage, or history of Northfields.

Blake Hollomore, 10 Upham Street. Stated that 1.5 parking is a good idea since Salem has a density issue and having less concrete and pavement and providing parking under the units is positive. They did a good job respecting the park and public access, and the townhouses along the street is a good transition. Salem is growing and changing and architecture in this area is a hodgepodge and the design can speak to the neighborhood as well. He would like to see images of the proposed architecture and not computer renderings.

George O'Brian stated that there is very little green space around the property or along Franklin Street, the parking next door is well used especially in the summer, 3-4 other neighboring properties could want the same thing with the same density if they were ever sold. This is a bad project.

Beth Girard, Ward 6 Councilor. The newly proposed is better than the last design and they kept the roof decks on the taller building and added common space. 1.5 parking spaces is a good ratio for a change in density. She is pleased with the direction they are going and it could be 1' shorter than Bell at Salem Station.

Emily Udy, 8 Buffum Street. Asked if the building heights still transitioned from lower to higher buildings as they got closer to the river. McShera replied yes and they are carving away at the massing of the building as they rise.

Patricia Murphy, 97 Foster Street. Asked for the unit ratio. McShera replied 3 in the townhouses and a mixture of 2 and 3 bedrooms in the mid-rise buildings. She is concerned with raising soil levels since water has flooded that area of the neighborhood. McShera replied that they shared those concerns, the site will be designed by a Civil Engineer and only parking will be on the First-Floor levels.

Meghan Clair, 19 Foster Street. Questioned whether the buildings will have brick façade, asked if beach, green space, or a bike path will be added. Believes it's still an

exclusive design that doesn't include the neighborhood. Noted the possibility of joining other parcels for a future larger and less dense site. McShera replied, the facades haven't been determined, they will not be red, the new entrance will include a footpath to and through the site, the park, and around to downtown through a waterfront development.

Anne Sterling. Asked if raising the grade displaces flood water to elsewhere in the neighborhood. Jaquith replied that normally if an area is raised another portion must be lowered to compensate.

Pam Ryan, 11 Locust Street. These are very tall buildings on a densely populated property, shouldn't the buildings stagger downward towards the water instead of higher. It's difficult to drive down Franklin Street during baseball season or in October with everyone parking on the street. Townhouse residents may park on the street for easy access instead of in their garages. With 1.5 parking spaces there is no visitor parking and Franklin Street is already full with other resident vehicles.

Jerry Ryan, 11 Locust Street. This is a tough site to develop and he would like all the parcels together. There should be a better transition from downtown to the neighborhood. There must be a way to work together and transition to the neighborhood. Moving the road to the park is a plus but the City needs to find a way to deal with the parking. The project looks better now than it did before.

Chris Wollworth, 23 Mason Street. The green space in an anchor. Believes this is the least dense project in the NRCC, HMA won't be developed, and Burnham won't sell only so only one other parcel open for development. There is a commercial space to one side and this will reduce appearance of that and make the street will look better. The family size has shrunk and its residents are more likely to use bikes and less cars.

George O'Brian. The green space is tight, there was 4' of water on Franklin Street with the last flood, and the plans is too dense for the site.

Meghan Clare asked if the site was 1.6 the acres. Chair Durand replied that that can be determined.

XXX, 16 Foster Street. She asked if 34 3-bedroom units and 14 2-bedroom units was still the count of the various unit types. She calculated approximately 41 units the length of Foster Street, and 48 units are planned for one block away, and others are rumored to be in the works. This sets a precedent and there should be a nicer transition because this proposed creates a very dense site.

Victoria Ricciardiello. They should be appealing that will enhance the City. 34 3-bedroom units are proposed and there are very few of those in Salem so there is a need for them, the site is prime real estate so a profit will be made, but she doesn't understand why they can't be 3-4 stories maximum.

Devine read a letter from Mary Ellen Hallowell.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith stated that this plan is less desirable than the previous, the view corridor is not a view corridor unless it is four cars wide, connection to waterfront path is an afterthought and they need a landscape architect. The townhouses don't look like townhouses and they are 40 feet tall which creates a wall that disconnects the site from the neighborhood. Vehicles backing up into the entryway will cause a problem for those entering and visitor parking should be identified. You can't use the downtown as an example for the proposed design, the design should be encompassing of the neighborhood and how the waterfront is accessed. By giving views to the tower you've blocked off views to the townhouses making them less desirable. The townhouses create a wall not a transition, the buildings should work outwards towards the water, there is too much density, and Northfields is totally disregarded. McShera noted that their first scheme that was more open to the water was rejected. Chair Durand replied that the first scheme was not very open and provided views in between the buildings only.

Dynia agrees with Chair Durand, they've walled off neighborhood and not embrace it, and the site resembles 3 Marriot's on a small piece of land. The commercial parcels look more residential than this proposed design which is still overscaled for this location.

Kennedy stated that the illustrations aren't helping and the more accurate perspectives should be used. He appreciates them doing something different, opportunity to go further but it is not successful yet. He also appreciates moving the buildings inward and to a 3-building site. The site is very dense with 6 story buildings and 5 stories could work better. There will never be single family homes but they need to find the in-between solution.

Chair Durand asked if a traffic study was done. Sides couldn't recall but one will be done.

Sides noted that this presentation is pre-schematic but it's improved since the last presentation. The improvement is the collected buildings, provided access for the public to the site and the water. She noted that the two different types of buildings and looks needs to be unified and the porches should all face the water and not the road. Fewer buildings will help with the simplification on the site. The proposed design was not cohesive this time around. The Planning Board was pleased with the collective changes and water access. The best image is the one showing the available waterfront frontage and access. This is a start but it needs more work.

Sullivan noted that imagery is important and the presentation materials weren't as good in the presentation as the ones submitted in advance. Although the siting has improved he suggested they make access along park more prominent by add benches and a sidewalk. The visual alleyway and scaling has improved and he liked having the smaller scaled buildings in the front and closest to the street. Building B could be lower to accentuate the progression of the stepped building heights. Simplify the roof that seems complex with some many different parts. The 1.5 parking ratio is good but wanted to see the layout improved. He asked if the 4 parallel parking spaces on the street are for the townhouses and for the setback requirements from the front property line to the face of the townhouses. McShera replied that the street parking is not included in their count and they are working with the Planning Board and Zoning on the setbacks. Sullivan noted that relief would be required for that.

Chair Durand stated that the project need a more urban planning approach because the neighborhood isn't being considered very much in this project. There is more green space in front of the water and access to the site; however, it's an interesting location between the downtown and the neighborhood. It's transitional and could be successful but there needs to be a bridge between the two. He would rather see the floor plans on a larger scale and how the site circulates within itself and interacts with the neighborhood. Study the zoning first, include the proper setbacks first, and be sympathetic to the neighborhoods concerns because the site is too dense. You shouldn't start a project and sort it out with the boards. Scale from the neighborhood, give the neighbors their access, and fill in the gaps with the building. Previous scheme pinched off the water views, they could change the orientation and split it up, and look at it from an urban planning view.

Jaquith added that the occupants can't even see the view, too dense. They should want to build value for the units and give them a view of the greenspace.

Sullivan asked for the density ratio. Mark Tranos replied 2,200 SF, zoning requests 3,500 SF, and the average along the North River is 1,800 SF at all of the NRCC project including South Mason Street making it the least dense.

Jaquith: Motion to continue until the applicant chooses to return with revisions.
Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0.

Old/New Business

- 1. 401 Bridge Street (Levesque Community Life Center):** Discussion and vote on proposed signage (sign permit) scheme.

Sid Silveira, Architect was present to discuss the project.

Dynia asked where the proposed lights will be installed. Silveira replied in the ground. Jaquith asked for the number of proposed lights. Silveira replied 2 and they also changed the lettering spacing.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to approve as presented.
Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0.

- 2. 155 Washington Street (Adriatic Restaurant):** Discussion and vote on design modifications of approved awning

Vini Kurti of Adriatic Restaurant was present to discuss the project.

Kurti stated that the awning company has redesigned the previously approved awning because wind measurements determined it wasn't strong enough. They are proposing new steel and 3 retractable panels, due to the shape of the patio each awning size will be different. The lights will be removed and the posts will be installed in their place, the post color will also change from black to bronze.

Sullivan asked if the sign band on the wall will be hidden. Kurti replied that it will be below the band although the band will only be seen when the awning is retracted.

Sides asked if the signage above will be removed. Kennedy noted that the signage would be visible from across. Kurti replied that the signage will be removed. Sides noted that the structure will be permanent and will have a big impact on the wonderful outdoor space with the operable glass wall they've installed. She asked if this will be used for daytime dining to hide the sun. Kurti replied yes and noted that when it rains it's a challenge to quickly move customers inside.

Sullivan noted that the image provided with this attached to the building doesn't look good. Sides noted that she needs to know how it will impact the building because the structure will look skeletal when the awning is open. Kurti replied that the structure is modern and lights will be added on the sides and those lights will remain on all the time. Sullivan replied that it he would like to see that detail.

Sides asked if the fence will remain. Kurti replied that they will need to build a new fence to wrap around the awning.

Jaquith noted that each section of awning will be at different angles because they are different lengths. Dynia and Sides agreed. Jacquith suggested that they have the same pitch and be repetitive so the awning hits the building at an angle, but either way more information is needed. Kennedy disagreed stating that the awning pitch would be the same it only appears as if it's not in the rendering. Kurti agreed that the pitches are in fact the same if where it hits the building is the same. Sides stated that if the distance from the building to the outside edge of the new post varies than the pitch is different. Chair Durand stated that if the height of each awning changes the pitch can line up. Sullivan asked if there is a gap between the awnings, and noted that he is concerned with how the awning meets with the building, the banding, the lighting, fencing, and the pitch of the canopies.

Chair Durand stated that an architect should study and draw the proposed plan. Sides asked if there can be just one awning and not the entire space to simplify the design. Chari Durand noted that it could be done in a good way.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to continue to the next meeting and to have the applicant engage an architect to study; how the awning meets with the building, the banding, the lighting, fencing, and the pitch of the canopies.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0.

Minutes

The minutes from the March 28, 2018 regular meeting were reviewed.

Sullivan: Motion to approve the minutes.
Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 6-0.

Adjournment

Kennedy: Motion to adjourn the meeting.
Seconded by: Durand. Passes 6-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 8:35PM.

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