

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board – Regular Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, March 22, 2023 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location:	Remote Participation via Zoom
DRB Members Present:	Chair Paul Durand, David Jaquith, Glenn Kennedy, Catherine Miller, Marc Perras,
DRB Members Absent:	J. Michael Sullivan, Sarah Tarbet
Others Present:	Kate Newhall-Smith
Recorder:	Colleen Brewster

Chair Durand calls the meeting to order at 6:07PM. Roll call was taken.

Signs in the Urban Renewal Area

1. 76 Lafayette Street: Cough Dog Brewing

Adam Shoemaker and Alli Pine were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Shoemaker stated that the New Derby Street wall sign is proposed above the door along with a vinyl decal on the window and entry door. They will use existing gooseneck fixtures mounted on the wall. The two window signs will be 1-foot-high x 3-feet-wide and in the center of each Lafayette Street window openings. There will also be a blade sign on Lafayette Street towards the corner.

Kennedy asked if the decal would fit between the mullions of the center windows. Mr. Shoemaker replied yes. Kennedy suggested that the decals leave 4-5-inches on either side of the vinyl decal. Ms. Pine noted that the Couch Dog sign on Lafayette Street will not be lit.

Kennedy asked if there is an existing wall sign in place. Ms. Pine replied no, it was removed with T Mobile left.

Perras requested wall sign materials. Ms. Pine replied, a black aluminum background with vinyl stickers.

Perras requested the signs be fastened into the mortar and to not damage the brick.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Kennedy: Motion to approve as presented, with window decal to fit within mullions of center windows, and the wall sign mounted into mortar and not brick. Durand requested an amendment to include the filing of surety bond for signs over public ways. Kennedy accepted the amendment. Seconded by: Jaquith. Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Durand, were in favor. Passes 5-0.

Ms. Pine noted that they hope to open by the end of May.

Projects in the Urban Renewal Area

2. **27 Charter Street:** Small Project Review – Removal of existing, and installation of new, rooftop telecommunications infrastructure for AT&T.

Allison Conwell (Centerline Communications on behalf of AT&T) was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Conwell stated that AT&T will replace 6 existing antennas with 3 similarly sized sub-stack antennas within each of the three sub-sectors. Of the 3 sectors, one will be the same size, the middle will consist of two smaller antennas stacked on top of each other, and a third set will be adjusted and evenly spaced at the Beta sector at the northeast corner. All antennas will be painted to match the existing ones.

Kennedy raised concern with the spacing of the antennas and noted that the even spacing makes the antennas disappear. Conwell noted that the separation helps with interference.

Miller asked what the brick pattern was. Conwell replied that it was painted on. Perras noted that while existing may have a brick pattern applied but he'd prefer the monotone color of the brick.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Perras: Motion to approve as presented using the current paint strategy on the antennas. Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Durand, were in favor. Passes 5-0.

Newhall-Smith stated that SRA pre-approved this application pending DRB approval so there is no need for applicant to return to the SRA.

3. **301 Essex Street:** Schematic Design Review – Erect a three and one-half-story addition above the existing building (known as Jerry's Army & Navy Store) with eighteen (18) residential units and twelve (12) onsite parking spaces located inside the building at the first-floor rear with retail space fronting on Essex Street, continued from 02/22/23.

Dan Ricciarelli and Sanir Lutfija of Seger Architect and Charissa Vitas and Michael Becker of Atlantic Coast Homes.

Ricciarelli stated that they want to erect an addition on top of the existing one-story building that was constructed in 1987. They will refurbish the existing storefront and wood panel base and will set back the addition above. Since they last came before the Board some revisions were made. There are 18 units total, a mix of upper and lower

townhomes with 4 flats in the middle. They are inter-flooring at the retail level with the first floor of a townhome and creating upside-down townhome since the level will be behind the parapet. The top units are also townhomes. They are considering changing the existing mauve colored brick to dark grey, which works well with the new cornice above. There will be a strong band around the building to define the stories in a lighter grey.

Ricciarelli stated that the storefront will be all glass and a soffit will be pushed further into the interior at the inter-floor. They are considering café windows at the lower half of the storefront and removed the transom above garage door. They've wrapped the materials to the first bay only on Summer Street elevation and created a bay to break up the Summer Street elevation. They brought back the cornice and adjusted the brick inset masonry in a darker iron color in a regular pattern. The banding replaced a previously considered cornice, there are mullioned corners, inset windows in the masonry, the bay is centered over the garage door, and they painted the cornice and cast-iron columns to the ground level.

Perras asked if there will be no spandrel glass used at the storefront. Ricciarelli replied correct and noted that the soffit will be 2-feet back from the storefront. They returned to a composite wood paneling at the base of the storefront, 2-feet of flat Dutch cladding will wrap the back side of Summer Street.

Chair Durand raised concerns with center cornice at bay over garage. Ricciarelli replied that they considered multiple options or keeping the same material color, but no one was in favor of it.

Ricciarelli noted that along the west elevation on Essex Street, they wrapped the fenestration one bay in, and the remaining side will be clad.

Ricciarelli reiterated that along the street line, café windows with a mullion are being considered. Chair Durand raised concern with exhaust piping. Ricciarelli replied that a 4-foot boxed out area will be included on each level if it becomes a restaurant and if not, it could become a closet.

Chair Durand requested the ceiling height. Ricciarelli replied 9-feet-3-inches, he noted that the related square footage has increased larger spaces at the retail base, and the base sills are also heavier. He noted that Bonchon used a Hardi inspired flatboard series, which is proposed at the penthouse above. The Salem Inn and Bonchon facades will be mostly obscured. The garage doors will include 2 upper panels of frosted glass for diffused light and the door will be aluminum. The windows will be aluminum clad awning style for natural ventilation to match the storefront below in dark bronze or black. The Dutch lap siding will be grey, and the cornice could be SAF metal fabrications, although they are still considering cornice the proposed shape. The banding will be precast, the fascia will have Hickman details that are minimally visible, the Boral composite wood painted, and the railing will be a vertically installed cable in black.

Perras asked if the iron spot brick material will be provided. Newhall-Smith noted that a materials board should be delivered to City Hall Annex.

Public Comment:

Newhall-Smith stated that the following public comment letters were received:

1. Historic Salem Inc (HSI), 9 North Street, dated March 22, 2023
2. Colleen O'Toole, 244 Lafayette Street, dated March 22, 2023
3. Emily Rogers, 34 Broad Street, dated March 22, 2023

Neil Harrington, 61 Weatherly Drive. Asked why the façade was dark grey and not red brick because it doesn't match brick facades of neighboring buildings. This is a primary entrance and this design sticks out like a sore thumb and doesn't seem appropriate. Ricciarelli replied that they considered the brick too matchy-matchy, the Witch House is diagonal and is a dark color, and the iron spot brick brought a contemporary feel, as would the painted cornice and banding which they felt was a better match. Harrington added that on this side of the street the surrounding buildings are red brick, the change could be a cost issue, he doesn't see the connection since the downtown has a lot of traditional red brick within the historic area. He had no concerns with the ground floor and hopes they reconsider.

Christine Boynton, 1 Vail Street. Asked if one of the dark grey colors is a brick material. Ricciarelli replied yes, the façade along Summer Street is masonry brick. Boynton asked if the parapet material could be carried up to the roof the addition. Ricciarelli replied that it was used in early iterations, but there was too much mimicry to the ground floor. They've brought the panel details up to the addition and not just the finials.

Emily Udy, HSI. Noted the letter that was submitted a letter, stated that they also disagree with the grey brick selection despite the Witch House color, which is iconic and doesn't need to be replicated. The Essex Street elevation could be well done using grey and brick along the Summer Street elevation, make the corner moment stand out and combines the context better. Another change is the new second floor, the January design has subtle differences and created some cohesiveness. The columns may have been shallower and banding between the floors was stronger, she suggested that be reintroduced at the second floor.

Polly Wilbert, 7 Cedar Street. Raised concerns with the dark grey color scheme which make it appear heavy and overwhelming visually at a significant entrance to downtown Salem. The compelling context is brick, and it calls attention to it rather than joining in context and is not respectful of the neighboring buildings. They need to carefully consider what the building is trying to do, stand alone or join the rest of downtown.

Barbara Clearly, 104 Federal Street. Echoed the earlier comments, agree with brick being preferable on Summer Street, noted that the previous iteration felt more elegant and lighter while the current design feels like a heavier building. The pediment on Essex Street doesn't work and contributes to the heavy feeling.

Ricciarelli presented the January scheme.

Jaquith stated that he didn't like how the columns end at the top and they should stop at the cornice. He had no issue with the change in brick color and suggested the rendering may be the reason it not favorable to some. He agreed with a different size cornice along Summer than on Essex Street and suggested the Summer Street return be 3-feet not 2-feet. Jacquith stated that the columns bite into the top cornice. He suggested they may include brick on Summer Street, although many buildings in Salem don't have a brick face, there is some variety in Salem, as well as contemporary buildings. Ricciarelli replied that they will continue to review the details.

Perras stated that the addition should have a contrasting base. Other buildings further down Essex Street have beautiful facades that stand out but lend to the fabric of the city and he doesn't feel red brick would be successful. He requested the mechanical system location. Ricciarelli replied that they have the basement and are proposing setback rooftop units. They could raise a 2–3-foot-high parapet to hide any rooftop equipment. Perras admired the amount of articulation which could have nice detail and layers of coursing. He didn't believe it felt heavy, they created a tartan pattern of elements crossing over each other and this could be a very nice building. He is still considering the detached cornice.

Kennedy echoed Perras' comments, noted that it feels forced to apply red brick to Summer Street in red which will not fit-in with the existing red brick base. He also didn't believe it felt heavy and suggested the recessed areas have a subtle difference so it disappears will make the cornice more subtle while also adding to it. He suggested the bay have a subtle cornice that is simplified. Jacquith agreed.

Miller stated that the brick details are important and noted that there are many versions of iron spot brick. They could be the same material as Essex Street in the renderings, but they should be separate elements with different detail. She noted that the rendering doesn't show the brick textures and mortar joints. She noted that the storefront should have horizontal mullions above the café window height is important rather than one large solid piece of glass. She was not concerned with the cornice but with a different material it should be different. She was not in favor of the pale grey on the back which creates a stark contrast and wants to see more detail.

Kennedy presented a subtle black cap at the two setback areas along Summer Street. Ricciarelli agreed that it would help terminate the brick.

Chair Durand agreed with Perras, that the upper addition needs to stand out. He was not against partial brick but doesn't feel strongly about adding it. He suggested the rendering may be making the façade appear darker, and they should continue to study the Summer Street façade because adding red back to match the ground floor isn't the right idea. He suggested that be determined in the CD set or with a materials board. Kennedy noted that the façade won't look as much of a contrast in execution. Ricciarelli stated that they will try to make more realistic renderings.

Newhall-Smith stated that the Design Review of Schematic Design is step 2 in a 6-step process to provide direction to the design team. The SRA will have a final review and vote, and once approved the team will work on the CD set, materials board, historic restoration work, budgeting materials that are feasible and conditions can be applied. The Design Standards must be met, and the Board can make a finding for a compliance alternative. She noted the following deviations from the design standards.

1. Standard setback of 10-feet: 8-feet is proposed.
2. Façade materials and compatibility: There has been some debate.
3. Window patterns that respond to the neighboring buildings. She didn't feel they corresponded.

The Board discussed continuing or approving with conditions.

VOTE: Jaquith: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting with tonight's comments. Perras amended the motion to approve through schematic design with the following conditions; pay special attention to the cornice, the tone, texture, and detail of the brick, mechanical system location, and city's concerns of which the Board believe that an 8-foot setback is adequate, façade materials will continue to be developed, the window pattern and scale is appropriate as designed. The final design submission shall include historic restoration plans with materials and details, specifications on restoration materials, the deficit of 8 parking spaces that need to be within 1,000 feet of the property requiring either a statement or an executed lease for those missing spaces, the engineering departments site safety concern and ADA representatives for what is needed around the site for pedestrian safety and accessibility, and to meet with Salem's new Tree Warden to discuss street trees. Jaquith seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

Projects Outside the Urban Renewal Area

1. **266 Canal Street:** Design Review for Entrance Corridor Overlay District – Redevelop the property by removing all existing buildings and infrastructure and constructing five new buildings for a total of approximately 73,615 square feet with 250 residential units (of which 20% will be affordable), commercial space along Canal Street, and preservation of nine acres of open space. The project also includes construction of 117 surface parking spaces, 196 garage parking spaces, and supporting infrastructure.

David Seibert of BKA Architects, Chris Koeplin and Marc Tranos of Canal Street Station LLC, Robert Uhlig of Halvorson Design Partnership Inc. were present to discuss the project.

Koeplin stated that they last presented the architectural plans on February 22, 2023, feedback was received, and changes were made which and will be presented tonight along with a landscape plan.

Architectural Design

Seibert stated that the masonry base has been darkened throughout all façades which simplified the exterior cladding and stair towers through the corrugated banding. A simplified sign band along the street scape and retail area creates a single coloration along Canal Street and the main entrance, amenity space and public art area. The deck area off the amenities space has been simplified and a ramp was eliminated to allow for more landscaping at the two corners. At the entry corner, Building B was simplified by in boarding the roof deck lighting poles, some balcony elimination at below the roof deck while expanding the balconies at the corner. At the rear of Building A there is much less emphasis at the retail and residential levels, dark and light grey color scheme at the stair towers, and an overall reorganization of the color panels.

Seibert stated that at Building B, the stair towers were reorganized and used less banding for only subtle emphasis with a white and grey scheme. The rooftop HVAC units have been located on the roof. Several balconies were also eliminated to soften the impact at the entry corner. The façade changes were also applied to Building B, C, D and E. The materials spec sheet has been revised to reflect the recent changes.

Landscape Design

Uhlig stated that revisions to the proposed plan are reflective of feedback from the Planning Board. There will be entrances to the site off Canal Street and Kimball Road, Building's B-E have a shared pedestrian boulevard, and the Salem Rail Trail runs parallel to the building ensemble. Pedestrian access is accessible throughout the site with a connection at the north end of the site at the wetland area that connects to the Rail Trail. On the east side of Canal Street there are ornamental street lights and wood utility poles with overhead power lines overhead. They are looking to create a unified streetscape on the west side of the street that connects to the "community space" at the entrance and links up with the Rail Trail at the northern end. Trees have been paired along the buildings façades facing Canal Street that are bookended by single trees, that are approximately 25-feet on center with the paired trees at approximately 45-feet apart. Those groupings are interrupted by seating niches at the back of the sidewalk and off the retail office and gym is a terrace which activates the street corner with stairs to respond to the grade change. At the southwest corner of Building A is a café terrace to accommodate a potential commercial/retail tenant to activate that corner, along with bike accommodations. At the Kimball Road entrance there is a grove of ornamental flowering trees that will vary from the street trees. In the parking lot behind building B a waste management area has been placed to house recycling, a dumpster, and compactor within a gated enclosure. Along Canal Street, plantings rather than grass is proposed between the face of the building and sidewalk with a mix of perennials and woody plants. The lighting consultant recommended supplementary light poles be added along the west side of Canal Street to meet the required lighting levels.

The northernly Canal Street main entrance corner has been given a lush feel with even more plantings and a boulder motif as a unifying element that would be used throughout the site. Ornamental tree species, Amur Maackia, Eastern Redbut and

Servicesberry are being considered for the Canal Street streetscape as to no interfere with overhead utility lines.

Due to the offset of the Rail Trail connection, at the main entrance corner, they will create a concrete transition zone for riders to slow at the edge of the Community Open Space before crossing Canal Street. A Blue Bike station will also be incorporated at this location. The Community Open Space is meant to be inviting to residents and the public and will be buffered with plantings. They've discussed with the Planning Board the use of the space and how to make it multi-generational.

At the ensemble of Buildings B-E, they envision each end having a flowering meadow mix to create a habitat and pollinator areas that are mowed once or twice a year to manage the growth of weeds but to create a more natural edge along the Rail Trail and wetland environment. A shared use vehicular/pedestrian boulevard will run between the buildings that is asymmetrical, on the east side of Building B and D there would be a row of trees with ground plane planters and a protected sidewalk along the building façade with various entry points highlighted with overhead catenary lighting above the crosswalks highlighted by the change in paving material with the main roadway material as asphalt. Across the boulevard is a concrete shared pedestrian/vehicular environment. Between the buildings ends, where vehicles exit the boulevard, will be the same paving material change to signify shared pedestrian use, along with stop bars and signs so pedestrians and vehicles on the promenade get the right-of-way. A turnaround area has been placed at the northern end of the boulevard.

In addition to the northern Rail Trail entrance a bridge across the wetlands will be added and a natural path leading to benches to create an overlook into the pond. With city support, a sprinkling of trees would be placed along the Rail Trail for a more seamless integration into the site.

Miller raised concerns with a lack resident bike parking although that may be within the parking areas. Uhlig replied that they have one bike space for every unit, as well as in between the buildings and at the retail area. Miller suggested more seating opportunities be included with the planting area at the Kimball Road entrance. She supported the idea of shrubs and perennials, and their tree selection considers the overhead power lines, they should meet with the new Tree Warden and possibly the Tree Commission. There was a recent article in the Boston Globe about meadow mix but it is not a reality, and those areas should be changed into a perennial mix since it creates an opportunity for weeds and not everyone knows how to maintain them. She requested the power lines be added to the drawings. Regarding the Community Open Space, quality exterior spaces are needed in Salem and paving an entrance corner of the site is not a community park. It should be more thoughtful, and she suggested the space between Building C & E be both paved and green, where people won't feel as though they are sitting on Canal Street with a mix of vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. It should be better addressed. She asked if the boulevard area without a curbed sidewalk along Building C & E is because fire truck width is required between the buildings, expecting drivers and pedestrians to negotiate use of the shared space feels dangerous. She suggested a rolled curb be incorporated.

Jaquith stated that the site plan is poorly done, drivers may speed down the boulevard, the noise levels between the building will be bad. He suggested placing building B on top of Building C and Building E on top of Building D. There are too many units on one piece of land and units on the interior will not be a good place to reside, unless the boulevard were pedestrian only. This is not a good scheme.

Perras stated that a previous comment was made regarding having the openings between the building out of alignment to relieve some of the monotony, by flipping Building C and E and providing some asymmetry with the views. Some movement to make the buildings less rigorous would help. Modifications to the boulevard do make sense while others seem dangerous.

Jaquith suggested eliminating interior balconies and creating 2-foot-deep projecting bays and a random pattern may break up the sound.

Koeplin replied that they have correlated all the vehicle entrance and exit into a central location and offsetting the buildings will allow vehicles to enter and exit at different points along the road, and they believed creating a 4-way intersection was safer rather than staggered. Perras suggested Building C and E swap allowing Building C to extend further into the parking lot allowing the vehicular entrance/exit between them to align or to shift other things around on site. Miller suggested developing an actual 4-way stop that would be familiar to everyone. Koeplin agreed to create a 4-way stop.

Chair Durand asked if fire lanes have been considered. Koeplin replied yes. Perras asked if a fire truck would need to back out of the boulevard. Koeplin replied that a fire truck would need to make a 3-point turn which is acceptable to the fire department.

Perras stated that the shifting of building would create an opportunity for pocket parks suggested by Miller, and the current design is forcing people to go to the northern end of the site at the pond overview area to find an isolated space. Koeplin stated that they considered a center location for sunlight to enter between both sets of buildings and the staggering of buildings may create an even longer tunnel effect along the boulevard rather than a central pause point before continuing. They also studied garage entrances off the boulevard which weren't as good or as safe. Miller agreed on the lack of safety that would provide and suggested moving Building B left to create a park space between Buildings B and D and not along Canal Street. Koeplin agreed.

Jaquith requested the parking requirement. Koeplin replied that there is none, but they are a little over 1 to 1, possibly 1.2 spaces per unit.

Jaquith asked what is controlling the proposed building height. Koeplin replied that they received a variance from the ZBA almost a year ago for 4 stories on Building B and D, 5 stories on Building C and E, and 3 stories on Building A. Jacquith suggested more variety with building heights would be nicer because the boulevard between the buildings would be dark during the day.

Perras stated that Building A is the most successful because of the panel articulation, medium scale, and the modifications to the first floor are a vast improvement. Those elements read better as floating boxes. It's difficult to take a panelized material product on buildings as tall as on Buildings B-E and to distribute in a palatable way. Building A has tan panels in a smaller size, and a varied panel distribution on the other buildings would be beneficial. Aligning the different color panels with balconies is smart and creates an intermediate scale and that ganging together of similar items hasn't been applied to the other buildings. Buildings B-E do have a darker base that lifts them up but some of the panel layout feels intermittent because the pattern changes suddenly and it doesn't feel intentional. Defining the distribution of those panels would be helpful.

Kennedy agreed the panel layout feels slightly random but not far off and it has improved. Koeplin stated that their past use of grey panels on the upper level and brown on the mid-levels, and a dark base in his opinion is a classic arrangement and he wasn't to know if they were on the right track or if they should gang them vertically. Perras replied that that area feels successful, and he has no issues with the vertical accentuations at the ends, his concern is where the logic breaks down. The center area of Building B is quite nice because the verticals are being accentuated, the individual windows are being expressed as a vertical band, and the use of brown panels between the windows that creates the intermediate scale they are looking for. A single color with punched openings or a pixelated/random panel pattern is less successful.

Public Comment:

Newhall-Smith stated that the following public comment letters were received:

1. Colleen O'Toole, 244 Lafayette Street, dated March 22, 2023.
2. Councillor Jeff Cohen, Ward Councillor for Ward 5, dated March 22, 2023.

Councillor Prosniewski. He understands that this is the early stage of the design review by the DRB. He likes the idea, use of the land, and the overall concept; however, the building design doesn't fit the character of the city. As an oceanfront community there is plenty of opportunity for the architects to be creative. He spoke with Mr. Cameron at the CLC meeting several weeks ago and suggested the design be more fitting of Salem and not just Anywhere, USA which chips away at that character the city. The Hampton Inn at Riley Plaza resembles boxes stuck together, Leefort Terrace is also a box, the 7-story structure at the crescent lot on Bridge Street resembles a box, and now this. This doesn't speak to the future of Salem and the environment the residents will be living in. People coming to Salem should be impressed and not view mundane designs that resemble military barracks. The architects should be creative and artistic with the façade and incorporate aspects that read as seaport, New England, or historic, because these designs are making the city ugly rather than beautiful.

Polly Wilbert, 7 Cedar Street. As a resident of South Salem for over 40 years, she's not sure what differentiates this design from that of an office park. It's taking too many cues from the Viking Hall dormitory across Loring Avenue at Salem State University and that may not be the design to carry forward. She echoed some Councillor Prosniewski's

statements, she would rather look at 28 Goodhue Street which she believes is successful and fits in with Salem. The proposed design has an institutional flavor that she finds off-putting, and she believed it's unfortunate that the Symes Buildings were allowed to go forward further down Canal Street, which opened a doorway that we didn't want to open. She hopes there will be sufficient spaces in front of the building entrances for ride share companies and delivery vehicles with the increase in drop-off and pick-up services in our lives. Carless existence is being promoted in the community going forward, however; there are still interfaces with vehicles. A mistake at Viking Hall was having no place for vehicles to pull over near the front door which causes traffic back-ups during busy times, and that should have been taken into consideration on this site. She questioned whether there is sufficient space surrounding the dumpster for trucks to negotiate that area successfully with vehicles in the parking lot. She agreed with Ms. Millers suggestion on the parklet along Canal Street, since it will also be a long walk for many residents, and the paved areas isn't conducive to younger children playing. She questioned the quality of life for families living in this complex because children in her area play in parking spaces because city parks are too far away. The family friendliness of this site must be successful, or it will be a disservice to people who will reside here. A better and more successful interface with the pond should be considered. She agreed again with Ms. Miller that meadows take a tremendous amount of time and management, it's more than sowing seeds and mowing a couple times a year. She asked if there was sufficient winter bike storage rather than only storing them outdoors, particularly since bike usage is being incentivized. She hoped hose bibs would be designed in the building façade if sidewalks need to be washed off. The feeling may be that the Hampton Inn is a virus that is spreading across Salem and the entrances along Mill Hill never have people entering or existing those entrances making it feel like a fortress and these proposed buildings may do the same with no engagement and very little outdoor space to enjoy. There seems to be no places where someone could read a book outdoors and enjoy the sunshine, BBQ, or to enhance the quality of life of the 400 people who will live in this development.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Perras: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting on April 26, 2023 with the comment provided. Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

New / Old Business

1. Approval of Minutes:
 - a. February 22, 2023

VOTE: Miller: Motion to approve the February 22, 2023, meeting minutes. Seconded by: Perras.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

2. Staff Updates, if any:

Newhall-Smith stated that this could be the DRB's last remote meeting. A new bill which includes the extension of remote meetings until 2025, that both the House and Senate have voted on the bill although there are some discrepancies regarding spending that are being reviewed. A final vote is needed, but, if need be, an in-person meeting in April may be required so that a hybrid option can be established.

She had no updates on enforcement at this time. Miller believed the Flatbread sign was not lit last time she saw it.

Adjournment

Kennedy: Motion to adjourn. Seconded by: Miller.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 8:30PM.

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A §18-25 and City
Ordinance Sections 2-028 through 2-203