

City of Salem Planning Board
Approved Meeting Minutes
Thursday, April 5, 2018

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, April 5, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall Annex, 120 Washington Street, Room 313, Salem, Massachusetts.

Chair Ben Anderson opens the meeting at 7:00 pm.

I. ROLL CALL

Those present were: Chair Ben Anderson, Kirt Rieder, Dale Yale, Noah Koretz, Carole Hamilton, Helen Sides, Bill Griset (7)

Absent: DJ Napolitano, Matt Veno (2)

Also in attendance: Ashley Green, Staff Planner, and Stacy Kilb, Recorder

II. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Location: 11-13 Dodge St., 217-219 Washington St., and 231-251 Washington St. (Map 34, Lots 404, 405 and 406)

Applicant: DODGE AREA, LLC

Description: A public hearing for all persons interested in the amendment to the approved Site Plan Review, Planned Unit Development Special Permit, Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit, and Stormwater Management Permit for the property located at 11-13 Dodge St., 217-219 Washington St., and 231-251 Washington St. (Map 34, Lots 0404, 0405, and 0406). The applicant proposes changes to the proposed buildings, landscaping, hardscape, parking, utilities, and lighting, primarily in order to incorporate changes requested by other City boards and departments and to make the project economically feasible by reducing the maximum number of stories from six to five and constructing the project all at once rather than in phases. As amended, the applicant proposes to construct an approximately 146,000 square foot mix-use development with 52 residential units, commercial space including a 113 unit hotel, a parking structure with 212 parking spaces, associated landscaping and pedestrian and transportation improvements.

Present for the Applicant are:

- Mr. Thomas Alexander, Esq.
- Ken McClure, Project Manager, Opechee Construction Corporation
- Barry Stow, Opechee Construction Corporation
- Drew Queen, Opechee Construction Corporation
- David Giangrande, M.S., P.E., Traffic Engineer, President & CEO, DCi
- Erik Swanson, P.E., Civil Engineer, DCi

Attorney Thomas Alexander presents the current status of the project and proposed changes. Demolition has occurred and a pit has been dug. The project was put out to bid, but was not economically feasible, so changes were required.

Changes include:

- Number of hotel rooms has increased from 111 to 113
- Residential units have been reduced from 68 to 52 and one story has been eliminated

- Commercial area will be reduced slightly from 23,000 to 21,000 square feet
- The number of parking remains the same, with 212 spaces, 38 of which are public

The Salem Redevelopment Authority (SRA) and Design Review Board (DRB) have granted final design approval for the revised project. If Planning Board (PB) approval is obtained in a timely fashion, the Applicant would like to begin work in July.

Ken McClure, Project Manager, speaks, outlining his background.

Drew Queen with Opechee, a design/build firm, provides a general outline of the new Plans.

- Architecture revised to meet changes in footprint; changes have been approved by SRA and DRB
- Building is one floor shorter
- Open air passage between the buildings has been eliminated
- Parking garage will be enclosed with a roof
- Hotel entry has been relocated closer to Washington St.
- Revisions to utilities and public service connections

Mr. Queen presents comparisons of the revised Plans to the original.

- Footprint adjustment
- Elimination of entryway overhang
- Project was previously expected to be constructed in two phases, now it is planned to be constructed all at once
- Utility connections and changes are occurring, due to the change from the concept as two separate projects/owners to a single project/owner
- Tree layout has been adjusted after City improvements. One fewer tree will be planted
- Architectural plan outlined
- Elevations are outlined
- Façade and massing on various sides
- Pavement pattern along Dodge St., color matches façade on relevant sides

Board comments/concerns:

Chair Anderson wonders why this is an amendment rather than a new filing, as the project was last amended in September of 2015 and is now long past the two year timeframe for special permit approval. There are also far more changes than would normally be included in an amendment. While he still feels the project is positive and understands the economics of it, he nevertheless feels that this Plan is not as dynamic as what was previously proposed.

His main concern is the blank parking garage roof that tenants will have to look at. He is also concerned about the location of the garage exhaust. While Planned Unit Development (PUD) projects with minimal open space proposed have been approved in the past, he wonders if this proposal meets the requirements.

Other Board concerns:

- Noah Koretz echoes the Chair's sentiment that while still decent, the amended project is less desirable than the original
- Other Board members also question the filing of this as an amendment vs. re-filing the Special Permit

- Mr. Alexander notes that even though the Applicant has filed this as an amendment, they are using the same process as the one required to file a new permit. It was readvertised with the new proposal details.
 - There is some question as to whether, if this is a new filing, issues other than those in the description can be discussed
 - Noah Koretz quotes the zoning ordinance section 9.5.13, which states that Site Plan Review should review compatibility of architecture so this Board is obligated to look at it. The Chair notes that in the past the DRB has had the final say on exterior design if in the Urban Renewal Area
- Much discussion centers around the bare parking garage roof
 - It is felt that this large expanse of bare space is a missed opportunity to provide some sort of an amenity to guests and residents, driving the value of residents' units
 - The previous design created activity and access in the back of the building, activating the project; that has been lost
 - Kirt Rieder also feels very strongly about this, and suggests several options, including a green roof or patios for the apartments. Some square footage of relief of some sort should be provided so that the view is not so unrelenting
 - Helen Sides comments that the DRB members spent time discussing the ground floor re the corner, restaurant, material, and was satisfied with the selected materials. While they did discuss interstitial space material changes, there was no discussion about the parking garage roof. Conversation was only about the screening of mechanical units on the main roof, but the back side was not discussed
 - In the original Plan, the garage was to be a parking lot, so the Applicant perceived it as one impervious space swapped for another, with a roof, so not a large design issue
 - Chair Anderson mentions the elevations of roof and floor, noting that there could be an access point.
 - Kirt Rieder asks why the Applicant decided to cover the garage; the Applicant feels that residents would prefer covered, heated parking as an amenity, so that they would not have to shovel cars and worry about snow removal. An open parking lot would have required snow removal offsite as well, as there is no storage onsite. The lower façade of the garage is windows, not screens. The garage is temperature controlled.
 - Kirt Rieder comments that the gas fired power plant has public landscaping planned, and this is a public amenity where you would not expect one, so that is a touchstone as to why he feels the Board is discussing a garage roof
 - The Applicant comments that the roof can't be seen by the public, but there will be one less level's worth of units looking down out over it, and they would have originally been looking out over a parking lot
- Garage ventilation: The Dodge Court side will have louvered windows and fans for mechanical ventilation; a possible setup is described. Kirt Rieder asks about the bands across the top; they are roof parapets. Empty space atop another building was explored as ventilation. This should be clarified for the Board as this is a Site Plan Review question
- Façade materials are mostly the same as before, though some areas on the hotel were not previously fleshed out. Masonry on residential wing was previously thin brick but has been redefined. Materials are shown and described.

Chair Anderson clarifies that building design and elevations are not under the purview of this Board for a project in the Renewal Urban Area, but under that of the SRA and DRB. His were general comments but this Board can only discuss Site Plan Review, the Planned Unit Development Special Permit, the Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit, and the Stormwater Management Permit.

The Applicant comments that the option of a green roof was explored, but at a cost of \$3 million for the 30,000 square foot roof, it was not economically feasible, especially for a feature that would not benefit the public. They feel that it is more important to spend those dollars on the surrounding of the building and create a vibrant streetscape, including using permeable pavement there. Public spaces are improved, and the Applicant will work with the City in changing the pavement along the streetscape to follow City of Salem standards so that the City can plow and maintain in the same manner.

Kirt Rieder feels that Dodge St. is bleak. The four proposed trees have been stripped, and this is not ideal. Rather than five small ornamentals, the Applicant should plant one large shade tree instead; its impact would be greater than that of several ornamentals. Dodge Court and Dodge St. are bereft of shade, and these are big buildings, so it would be nice for the hotel occupants to see something other than retail. The other sides are fine. He would prefer shade trees even if there are fewer of them overall.

The “interior” labels on the project are no longer applicable and should be stripped.

Elevation above the floodplain and other drainage elements has not changed.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment.

Josh Turiel, 238 Lafayette St. and Ward 5 councilor:

- Attended some DRB meetings, was much more excited about previous design, and feels the new plans are “adequate,” but that the project went from distinctive to decent.
- There are still good elements to the revision; street usage remains in place, the City’s intent was to draw things toward the street edge, especially important in this B5 area
- Asks about public parking for the shops/restaurants, since as a condition of the City’s sale of the lot, the Applicant was required to provide an equivalent amount of spaces for public use
- Suggests using garage roof for outside dining for second, recreational use by public or residents, or even picnic spaces to activate the space

Tom Furey, 36 Dunlap St. and Councilor at Large:

- Is the City Council Liason for the SRA
- Discusses other updates to City, particularly in the Entrance Corridors
- Project must come on board ASAP to combat blight in the area; it is a linchpin to the area
- Project must make a statement

Polly Wilbert, 7 Cedar St.:

- Blank roof shows a lack of imagination; should be at least visually interesting. A restaurant could have its own garden for produce; many apartment dwellers would love to have raised beds to plant there as well
- Would require water and drainage; make sure those amenities are in place so options can be considered

Emily Udy, 8 Buffum St. on behalf of Historic Salem, Inc:

- Asks the Board to focus its comments on the overall appearance and context of the project
- Project is benefitting from its location in downtown Salem and should give something in return
- Would like to hear from Board on how design can be included in this process

Tim Jenkins, 18 Broad St.

- Taking advantage of large space on the garage roof is a good idea, and will benefit residents and hotel guests

Additional Planning Board comments:

Noah Koretz:

- When first approved, photometrics had an issue with building directly to the bottom left of site on Washington St. across from record store. Discussion at that time centered on lighting in driveway area disturbing residents of that building
- Current plan shows .8 foot candles, however it turns out that the printing is not clear, with numbers overlaying each other. All are .2 and .3 foot candles
- Barry Stow comments that lighting has been changed on that side; previously pole mounted lights were proposed; now they are wall mounted, and lower fixtures that will be cut off are proposed.
- All foot candle values are proposed. No existing lighting is taken into account but the concern of excess lighting was noted and taken into account on this Plan
- Noah Koretz opines that some public comments are correct re creative use of garage roof. Examples of street art abound, and this could be an opportunity for horizontal public art. There are more economical options than a full green roof. North Shore CDC could help tie this in with the Point neighborhood.

Kirt Rieder

- Asks about publicly accessible parking spaces; at least 34 are required and 38 were shown on the original plan
- Current plan shows 10 spaces on the top deck and 28 on the bottom floor for access to retail and restaurants
- The SRA had commented that all 38 should be on the bottom floor to avoid confusion, and asked the applicant to solicit PB feedback
- Kirt Rieder asks if it would be possible to roll back the expanse of the roof, thus making publicly accessible parking unheated and uncovered. This would free up dollars from that portion to make the remainder a roof with amenities

Carole Hamilton

- Feels that split public parking will be confusing and notes that most retail/restaurant space will be accessed from below
- The Applicant notes that there will be signage, which will need to be reviewed by the DRB in the future; as previously presented, there was public parking provided on the top level, so this was to address the needs of parking on lower level and responding to what was previously designed.

Bill Griset was more enthused about the original design, and feels that what is presented now is generic.

Kirt Rieder is disappointed to see the parking garage staircase go away, as it broke down the mass of the project and gave credence to the public parking on 3rd floor. Chair Anderson notes that the open space requirement was being met based on parking access in the original design; now it is not so clear that it is being met.

The Chair suggests that the Applicant focus on:

- Garage:
 - Roof
 - Parking
 - Exhaust
- Initiation of a new Special Permit application vs. amendment
- Architectural review. Normally an Applicant must come before the Planning Board first, then seek SRA and DRB review, though in this case, things happened in the opposite order. However, this was assuming it was a modification. If this Board is able to review architecture, it will need to be discussed

Thus he suggests a continuance to the next meeting

A motion to continue to the April 19, 2018 meeting is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Dale Yale, and passes 7-0

- B. Location:** 132-134 Canal Street, 142 R. Canal Street, and 144 Canal Street (Map 33, Lots 5, 6, and 8)
- Applicant:** CANAL STREET WAREHOUSE LLC, CANAL STREET REALTY DEVELOPMENT LLC and CANAL FURNITURE LLC
- Description:** A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of Canal Street Warehouse LLC, Canal Street Realty Development LLC, and Canal Furniture LLC for the properties located at 132-134 Canal Street, 142 R. Canal Street, and 144 Canal Street (Map 33, Lots 5, 6, and 8) in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 7.3 for a Planned Unit Development, Section 9.5 for a Site Plan Review, Section 8.1 for a Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit, and Section 6.7 for a Drive-Through Special Permit, and a Stormwater Management Permit in accordance with Salem Code of Ordinances Chapter 37. Specifically, the applicant proposes the redevelopment the site by razing the buildings at 132-134 and 144 Canal Street and constructing three (3) new buildings with associated driveways, parking spaces, landscaping, utilities, and drainage systems for stormwater runoff. Construction of a new three-story, mixed-use building with approximately 7,000 square feet of retail on the first floor and 20 residential units on the upper floors is proposed at the north side of the site. Construction of a three-story building with 30 residential units and parking below; and a 2,500 square foot retail building with a drive-through is proposed at the south side of the site. The existing buildings located at 138-142 Canal Street will remain with some site improvements.

Present for the Applicant are:

Attorney Scott Grover

Landers Symes, Symes Associates

Also present for this matter is Matthew Mullally, P.E., AECOM, consultant for the City for the bike path extension project.

Attorney Scott Grover presents for the Applicant.

Bill Griset notes that he has decided to recuse himself from this item. He describes his prior contact with Symes Associates. He has consulted with City Solicitor Beth Rennard, who had no strong feelings as to whether there was a conflict or not. He has decided that he will sit in on the conversation but not deliberate or vote. Attorney Grover asks if the Ethics Commission can provide a more definitive ruling, since, with some Board members having missed previous meetings where this item was discussed, and some cannot attend upcoming meetings where this is on the agenda, the Applicant is concerned that they may not have enough Board members available to vote on the project.

Options and logistics are discussed. Attorney Grover consults with the Applicant, who ultimately decides that they will present tonight to obtain feedback on the conceptual plan, and then they intend to withdraw the petition as they have several meetings left in the process and are concerned they will lose enough eligible voting members. Re-filing would hopefully reduce the chances of not having enough voting Board members.

Chair Anderson would like clarification from the Planning Department on this process, and also from the City Solicitor before the Applicant actually withdraws.

Landers Symes presents, describing progress since the Applicant was last before the Planning Board. They had not been fully aware of the plans for the Multi-Use Path before applying to this Board for this project. Plans for the path have changed and have been incorporated into tonight's presentation, along with Board suggestions from previous meetings.

The Applicant worked with the City Engineer and AECOM, the City's consultant for the bike path extension, to develop a plan that works for everyone during the development of this property.

The benefits and drawbacks of giving up the rail spur are described; the Applicant was requesting an easement from the MBTA to allow parking to continue on that property, in exchange for the rail spur, however some issues have come up. Giving up the rail spur is less costly for the DOT, however funds saved cannot be allocated elsewhere, so this costs the Applicant instead. Discussions also occurred with City and Ward Councilors, who requested the addition of residential units to the development, which is why they filed this as a PUD. The Applicant and Steve Feinstein (Director of Finance, Symes Associates) also discussed the possibility of a train stop in the future; there was no access, and right now rail station will most likely be directly behind this property so only the Applicant can provide access.

Changes from the previous plan include:

- Drive through in the North building was eliminated due to traffic and noise concerns given that there are residential units above
- 22 residential units are proposed
- 33 parking spaces are in front for retail
- Pedestrian access has been a large part of the discussion; several walkways have been added and access points are described
- South end building has been moved up to the corner, the drive through maintained there and parking is now in back
- Added landscaping along street
- Continued walkways and paths to/from Multi Use path. While somewhat convoluted, an attempt was made to create walkways within the site to get to/from each building and from Canal St. into the site
- Main change is to the area in the rear; the initial plan was this area would be landscaped with trees, but the MBTA have stated trees are prohibited within their easements due to leaves on the track

- The original plan included a longer retaining wall, however, the DOT, which is funding the multi-use path, will not pay for items that are not necessary for the project and this retaining wall was determined to not be necessary

Noah Koretz is incredulous about leaves not being allowed within their easement. The Applicant was told that leaves are more dangerous than snow and ice. Mr. Symes notes that the Multi Use Path is an alternative transportation corridor, so the original plan was not for a “nature trail,” but a way to get from point a to point b, next to an active rail.

Matthew Mullally, P.E. from AECOM, addresses technical questions regarding the MBTA’s requirements.

While landscaping by the Path cannot happen, the Applicant has attempted to address other comments in these updated plans. 80 shade trees, along with bushes, shrubs and grass, are proposed for the site. Amenities are described.

Chair Ben Anderson opines that this plan is an improvement, and appreciates the connections and walkways, though work will need to be done re materials to make the paths more distinct for pedestrian safety. He also appreciates the additional landscaping, but wonders about the MBTA’s concerns about leaves, and if the existing trees there now are an issue. He wonders if they can be left in place. Mr. Symes thinks that the entire area will be clear cut. Chair Anderson asks, if trees cannot be replaced, are there other ways to create a more pleasant experience adjacent to this property that is more pedestrian friendly? This would help the development even if it is just lower landscaping. He would petition for some of the existing trees to stay.

Chair Anderson appreciates the building being moved closer to the corner, but would like to see more public amenities, such as benches to activate the landscaping, if there is usable space. There are pockets of usable space that can be explored. The Chair was disappointed to see the current tanning building go away, as he thought it had potential for conversion and liked that it was along the street edge.

Noah Koretz feels that Building 2 is much improved, being flush against street, but feels that Building 3 could be further improved, possibly by positioning it where Revere Tan is situated now, perpendicular to Canal St. This would also provide a building that faces the outside of the site. He also wonders what some options are for plantings along the Multi Use Path. The Applicant clarifies that the “pocket park” they refer to is in the corner near the rail trail.

Building 3 configuration is such that parking in the back is intended for residences, and that in the front is for retail. This is not designated, but understood. Noah Koretz notes that the Applicant may need to recognize that residents park in largest numbers when stores are closed, so making parking less differentiated may be appropriate. He appreciates the internal walkways, though materials and desire lines will need to be considered.

Chair Anderson has concerns about the roofing design on Building 3. This was changed and will be further reviewed again.

Kirt Rieder finds it irritating as he worked on another project involving a bike trail with trees 20’ away from a rail line and the MBTA did not have an issue with the design. One tree is stray in MBTA property. The MassDOT will build it the path and rip rap slope; applicant control ends at bottom of their slope, and the City will maintain it afterward . Kirt Rieder suggests that the City could “un-maintain it” but Scott Grover notes that the Applicant is seeking a 99 year lease agreement for an alternate transportation corridor with the MBTA, that will have an Order of Conditions associated with it. Assuming all Conditions are met, the City will be required to maintain the slope, bike path, drainage on the other side, and slope up to the rail.

The Applicant asks for input as to what type of vegetation should be on the slope. Kirt Rieder notes that, if grass, it will die, and will be subject to volunteer tree growth, so he is concerned that the City will have to come through and mow the area bare every 5-10 years. Also, drainage swales on other side must be maintained annually. Kirt Rieder echoes the feelings of Chair Anderson and Noah Koretz, seeing discontinuities in the pathways that could be addressed. He understands grade change, but feels it may be over-engineered and does not take into account desire lines. It is good that they are willing to put in new trees but he would like the Applicant to add more between #140 and building number 3 near the residential building. The Applicant comments that there is no more usable space other than the pocket park, and Kirt Rieder is fine with this. While he approves of trees in planting beds along Canal St., he notes that it is best to maximize trees and minimize shrubs. He feels the locations of the bed and pathway in front of the buildings should be swapped.

Additional discussion occurs regarding leaves on the train tracks; the Applicant notes that the next submission to the DOT will include landscaping. The replacing of the riprap with a retaining wall was an expensive change, so they are trying to reduce its size in order to remain on budget. Oil from the leaves remains on the rails after leaves are gone, reducing friction; that is the issue. The Board notes that rail lines go through forests all over the world. Kirt Rieder notes the irony that the MBTA is hiring staff in their sustainability department, yet wants to strip vegetation.

Chair opens to the public.

Polly Wilbert, of 7 Cedar St., states that no mention was made of the prohibition of trees during a 25% design meeting with the DOT. She is concerned about the drive through on Ocean Ave, that those in the parking lot will have to cross the drive through. She also bemoans the lack of visual relief to residents, who will now not have anything attractive to look over. It is a disadvantage to Symes Associates and their ability to provide a residential experience.

Rinus Oosthoek, 265 Essex St., representing the Salem Chamber of Commerce, reports on the presentation of this project to Canal Street businesses. They were pleased with changes in the Plan, and see this as an enhancement to the Canal St. business corridor that will solidify the area. They note that this is not a downtown area. They are mainly very pleased that Symes is doing this project, with the Multi Use Path that will remove bikes from the street, and that Symes is facilitating the train station, which is a big deal.

A motion to continue to the April 19, 2018 meeting is made by, seconded by Carole Hamilton, seconded by Noah Koretz, and passes 7-0.

C. Location: 16, 18 and 20R Franklin Street (Map 26, Lots 400, 401 and 402)

Applicant: JUNIPER POINT INVESTMENT CO LLC

Description: The applicant requested a continuance to the regularly scheduled meeting on THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 2018 of a continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application for a Site Plan Review, Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit, and Special Permits associated with the North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 9.5 Site Plan Review; Section 8.1 Flood Hazard Overlay District; Section 8.4 North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District; and a Stormwater Management Permit in accordance with Salem Code of Ordinances Chapter 37. Specifically, the applicant proposes to replace the existing junk yard with a residential development. The initial application proposed forty-three (43) units in five (5) buildings with parking under each building, in addition to

an independent garage and some surface parking resulting in 69 parking spaces. The project has been revised, and now proposes forty-eight units (48) in five (5) buildings with parking under each building and some surface parking resulting in seventy-four (74) parking spaces. The project also includes landscaping throughout, and public access along the riverfront with walking paths.

Carole Hamilton comments that, when the Applicant requested a continuance at the previous meeting, the Board felt the Applicant did not have enough time to do what they were asked to, yet they insisted on being on the agenda for the next meeting. She feels that the Dodge St. proposal also has more work than can be done in two weeks, and suggests that continuances be pushed out further than two weeks.

Noah Koretz asks about the timeframe once filed for this project as it has been ongoing for a long time. Ashley Green will look into this.

A motion to continue to the April 19, 2018 meeting is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes 7-0.

III. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

- A. Location:** 9 South Mason Street, 3A Buffum Street Extension; and 23 Mason Street (also including 23 ½ Mason Street and 23R Mason Street) (Map 26, Lots 73, 74, 79)
Applicant: JUNIPER POINT 9 SOUTH MASON STREET LLC
Description: Report to the Planning Board regarding Design Review Board recommendation, and changes to the architectural plan.

A motion to continue to the April 19, 2018 meeting is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Bill Grisct, and passes 7-0.

57 Marlborough Road/Osborne Hills, Osborne Hills Realty Trust

Ashley Green states that Paul DiBiase would like guidance on what the Planning Board would like to see on the empty lot where there is the underground stormwater detention basin. Kirt Rieder would advise him to hire a consultant then come back to Planning Board with a proposal.

Dale Yale asks about the punch list for this project. The one from residents is in the DropBox folder. Mr. DiBiase would like to use the same Clerk of the Works as was used in previous phases because of their familiarity with the project. The firm was Stantec and they have agreed to act as the Clerk moving forward. There were 48 items on the residents' list, many of which are minor. Mr. DiBiase has addressed many of the items and will provide the Board with an outline of what has been accomplished and a timeline for when the remaining items will be completed.

Residents submitted an email to Staff stating that they are impressed that work has started. Noah Koretz feels that comments made at a previous meeting regarding the state of the development were overly dramatic.

Procedure for continuances

Chair Anderson asks how much discretion the Planning Board has in granting continuances. He wonders about the possibility and ramifications of denying a continuance, for example, if the Applicant has requested to be put on the agenda for the next meeting in two weeks, but the Board feels they cannot complete the work assigned to them in that time period.

Carole Hamilton states that there must be a mutually agreeable continuation date, and that the Applicant must be able to complete the work that the Board has laid out for them. If the Board knows they cannot complete the work, this should be stated. She feels that this is a tactic developers use everywhere to wear down public

participation and is not fair. The Planning Board can strongly suggest that it will not vote yes on a continuation that is clearly not reachable. The Chair agrees that it is a waste of everyone's time. It also means that meeting further out will have extremely full agendas if multiple Applicants continue to the next meeting then appear on the same agenda.

Carole Hamilton notes that the scope of recent projects has been such that it is unrealistic to request a two week extension when the Applicant knows they will not be able to meet the Board's requests in that turnaround time. Continuations do not have to be for four weeks out, but should be if the work cannot be completed by the next meeting.

Avoiding recusals due to conflicts of interest, once the process has already begun

Noah Koretz asks if there is a way to change the way forms are written in the proposal submissions. He is interested in having the Applicant fill out a DBA Line – i.e. who is the entity actually applying, in order to avoid conflicts of interest. Board members cannot tell who this is based on the Applicant's name or LLC. As it is, this is not obvious until they start presenting. Noah Koretz clarifies that list of firms and principals should be on the form. Ashley Green can change this

Voice and Video recordings of meetings by the public

Chair Anderson asks Board members to confirm that they received the email regarding changes to the policy on voice and video recording my members of the public. Ashley Green will re-send the email. The Chair will make an announcement at each meeting, and the Board should designate a specific area for people to record from.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular Planning Board Meeting held on March 15, 2018

A motion to approve the March 15, 2018 minutes is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and passes 7-0.

V. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Bill Griset, and passes 7-0.

The meeting ends at 9:15PM.

For actions where the decisions have not been fully written into these minutes, copies of the decisions have been posted separately by address or project at: <https://www.salem.com/planning-board/webforms/planning-board-2018-decisions>

Respectfully submitted,
Stacy Kilb, Recording Clerk

Approved by the Planning Board on 05/03/2018

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A § 18-25 and City Ordinance § 2-2028 through § 2-2033.