

City of Salem Planning Board
Approved Meeting Minutes
Thursday, March 15, 2018

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, March 15, 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 (arriving late), DJ Napolitano (arriving late), Carole Hamilton, Helen Sides, Matt Veno (8)

Absent: Bill Griset (1)

Also in attendance: Amanda Chiancola, Staff Planner, and Stacy Kilb, Recorder

I. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 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: *The applicant requested a continuance to the regularly scheduled meeting on THURSDAY, April 5, 2018* 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.

A motion to continue to the April 5, 2018 meeting is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Matt Veno, and passes 6-0 with Noah Koretz and DJ Napolitano not yet in attendance.

Noah Koretz arrives at 7:06PM

B. Location: 65 Washington Street Salem, MA (Map 35, Lot 600)

Applicant: 65 WASHINGTON STREET, LLC

Description: A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of 65 Washington Street, LLC for the property located at 65 Washington Street Salem, MA

(Map 35, Lot 600) for a Planned Unit Development Special Permit, and a Site Plan Review in accordance with the Salem Zoning Ordinance sections 7.3 Planned Unit Development and 9.5 Site Plan Review. Specifically, the applicant proposes to raze the former Salem District Court building, and construct on the existing foundation a new mixed-use building consisting of sixty-one (61) residential units, two levels of enclosed parking, and commercial/restaurant space on the ground floor. General infrastructure updates to drainage, sewer and landscaping are also proposed.

Presenting for the Applicant is Attorney Joseph Correnti of 63 Federal St. Mr. Diamond of Diamond Sinacori and Mr. Jeff Hirsch with Urban Spaces are also present. Updates and revisions, along with outstanding items, will be presented tonight. Some submissions previously turned in are on slides. Landscaping plans and peer review final reports will be presented.

Jeff Hirsch with Urban Spaces presents:

- Site Overview
- View from Washington St.

Ryan Bianchetto from Allen & Majors, Landscape Architect, presents

- There are some changes from the original landscape plan, based on comments received
- Landscape Plan, including illustrations of hardscape, trees, shrubs, perennials & groundcovers on different areas of the site
 - Sidewalk Plantings are outlined. Lindens along Church St. will be maintained and tree beds improved
 - Hardscape will be concrete with brick banding, except as below:
 - It will be granite pavers at the seating nooks, corner of Federal and Washington St., and at the entrances on all three sides
 - Seating nooks will be added on Federal St. Plantings proposed are outlined
 - Planted beds will be enclosed in raised granite planters; Chair Anderson asks about the contents of the planters and Mr. Bianchetto outlines; they will be mostly annuals

DJ Napolitano arrives at 7:18PM.

Kirt Rieder asks about the declining trees on Church St.; he feels that Mr. Ryan should discuss this with the Tree Warden and if need be, the Applicant should replace them. This will be written as part of the decision. Kirt Rieder also would like additional details on the Planting Plan. Locations of existing trees and proposed London Plane Trees and Lindens are outlined. Five street trees will be maintained and three new trees planted, for a loss of one tree. Kirt Rieder comments that Serviceberry is all that is proposed for Federal St. vs. what is there, which are street trees that would have reached heights much greater than the 20' of Serviceberry; he is disappointed that they are losing five shade trees on that street. The project is about continuity of the public streetscape; while he does not argue for saving the trees, the replacements should be of a similar scale. Ryan Bianchetto notes that there are additional shade trees on Federal St. and logistics of planting in that sidewalk are discussed. The Applicant prefers London Plane Trees but Kirt Rieder notes that there are already many in Salem and would like to see more variety. Oaks would be preferable. These should be planted as public street trees, and can be swapped for something in the planting area.

Kirt Rieder asks Amanda Chiancola about street paving and how the City views developer improvements to flatwork. The City would appreciate the developer adding improvements, which would be reviewed by the Design Review Board (DRB) and recommended to Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA); the process is described. Chair Anderson notes that the sidewalk color looks brilliant white in the rendering, however it will be standard gray

concrete. Mr. Steve Tise, architect, notes that the recessed seating areas relate to the architectural treatment on the building at those locations.

Jeff Hirsch of Urban Spaces introduces, and Steve Tise presents regarding the garage entry warning system. Pedestrian/Vehicular Warning Systems:

- Large, flashy systems are not desirable
- Garage itself is only for residents, so there will not be a lot of traffic; traffic on Federal St. is one way, with adequate previewing dimension from door to back of sidewalk. The Applicant could move the door back 2' from the façade to give a total of 12' from the garage door to the back of sidewalk
- Mr. Tise feels that that a pedestrian warning system is not warranted, but did look into two options. He is concerned that neighbors will not like it
- The most discrete system is bollard with a strobe and recording that flashes/sounds when cars are exiting; light level, volume and hours of operation can be adjusted
- A warning light in the garage to warn residents to look out for pedestrians is another option
- Mr. Tise discussed this with Kirt Rieder who suggested he speak with Matt Smith, City Traffic Engineer, who does not approve of pedestrian warning lights, which would facilitate cars in a City that is trying to prioritize pedestrians. However, he supports the warning light in the garage. Mostly these warning systems are desirable where there is not adequate previewing dimension, but that is not an issue here
- If insisted upon by Board, bollards are the most discrete option
- Acknowledging there is a hazard by installing bollards, then turning the volume down to where it is ineffective, creates more of a hazard; responsibility should be on drivers to be on alert for pedestrians

Noah Koretz asks about a difference in the plans regarding the trash area; it has been modified in response to the peer review. The area is described in more detail.

Kirt Rieder asks for clarification on the status of the transformer; the existing one was originally to be put underground, but now will be a surface transformer in the same location as the current one. It does not currently have a fence, and is set well back from street so none is proposed, but the Applicant is willing to put one in. Chair Anderson notes that transformers are required to be surrounded by bollards and allow truck access. Kirt Rieder notes that all illustrations are different, but the size of transformer is unknown; when known, the Applicant will submit all plans for DRB approval. The "cage" surrounding the transformer Derby St. will not be duplicated.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment.

Martin Kessler of 18 Osborne Hill Dr. asks about minimum size requirements for trees being planted. Ryan Bianchetto replies that the team has an interest in dressing the building properly; in the past, substantial tree calipers have been proposed (2.5-3" caliper). Shrubs of a couple of feet in diameter are also proposed. Kirt Rieder adds that previous documents are at odds with what was just stated. Lindens were 3-3.5" while maples and oaks were 2.5 -3". Typical minimum size is 3.5" and this is the expectation; the Applicant is fine with this.

Noah Koretz makes a motion to close the public hearing, is seconded by Kirt Rieder, and the motion passes 8-0.

Attorney Correnti notes that 6 eligible Board Members are present and asks if any other information is needed by them before a vote is taken. There are no further Board comments.

The Draft Decision is reviewed by the Chair, and the following changes are made:

- Section 5A:

- If included, Serviceberry trees should be a minimum of 15' tall; a 3.5" minimum caliper is set for oaks. 3-4 of these should be planted beyond the back of the sidewalk on Federal St., with London Plane Trees on Washington Street, to be reviewed by the DRB and the SRA
- Oak species should be identified, preferably one with a canopy to serve as a street tree
- Applicant to coordinate w/City Tree Warden on health of Linden street trees on Church St. prior to issuance of demolition. If determined to not be viable, they must be replaced by the developer before issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy
- Annuals in raised planting boxes are to be replenished seasonally by the manager of property
- The Board recommends an internal driver alert system, to be moved under #4, Site Specific Conditions
- Utilities: Applicant shall submit the plan for the transformer and will obtain final review of it by the Planning Department prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy. Site Plan should be submitted to Planning Dept. at same time it is submitted to Building Dept.
- A Construction Management plan has been submitted and where possible, all work will be handled onsite. Logistics are described. Boilerplate language says it shall all be onsite, and the Planning Board must approve if not.

A motion to issue the PUD Special Permit Decision is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Noah Koretz, and passes 6-0 in a roll call vote with Chair Ben Anderson, Carole Hamilton, Kirt Rieder, Helen Sides, Noah Koretz, and Dale Yale (6) in favor and DJ Napolitano and Matt Veno (2) abstaining.

Mr. Diamond compliments the Planning Board, calling it one of the most professional he has been before in four decades, and promises a great and important project. It will create an appropriate link between historic Salem and a new Salem. He thanks the Board for supporting them. Jeff Hirsch echoes those sentiments.

C. Location: 57 Marlborough Road/Osborne Hills

Applicant: Osborne Hills Realty Trust

Description: A five-year extension request to complete the Osborne Hills Subdivision, located at 57 Marlborough Rd.

Mr. Paul DiBiase, Trustee and owner of the project, requests the extension. This is a large, single family, cluster subdivision of which three of five phases have been completed, with a lull in construction due to family and financing issues. Five model types are available and will continue to be used. He has met with the City Engineer to discuss paving of the areas completed with homes and hopes to complete that work by November and submit as-built; phases 4 and 5 would be constructed soon. Noah Koretz asks for clarification: the houses highlighted in green have been built; the location of end of pavement is described. Phases 4 and 5 are clarified (highlighted in yellow). Five additional phases are in the RC district, with a proposed bridge over wetlands for access. Mr. DiBiase is working with the power company to determine elevation of bridge, etc.

DJ Napolitano asks about list of concerns received by the Board.

Concerns submitted by current homeowners in the development are listed, along with Mr. DiBiase's replies:

- Median landscape lighting at Strongwater Crossing: Up lighting for trees was installed; bulbs have burned out or there is some other issue; this will be investigated ASAP
- Flag pole at entry broke off, this will be replaced
- Several trees on Amanda Way and Osborne Hill were struggling; they are not dead, and Mr. DiBiase was told to give them a couple of years. Some came back, some did not, so will be examined again to see if viable or need replacement. This will be discussed with the Tree Warden
- Grass belt along Amanda Way is in poor shape; the Contractor may overlook this area as there is no irrigation, and Mr. DiBiase will meet with him to address these smaller areas

- The empty lot is an eyesore; it is the space adjacent to Lot 36 at the intersection of Amanda Way and Osborne Hill Drive. A fence will be installed. This lot houses the subsurface detention area for Phase 2, and is slated to be grass, will be improved in the spring; however, there is no water source there either, so the grass may not be as good quality. DJ asks when phase 2 was completed. This was a couple of years ago; it was seeded then but must be done over.
 - Kirt Rieder asks if subdivision requirements say an area must be seeded lawn for stabilization; the Plan did call for that, but if there is inadequate water, the Applicant should seek a low intensity ground cover such as meadow grasses or something else that is drought tolerant, available by mail order. This will be done if Board recommends. Kirt Rieder wonders what is required by Subdivision regulations. Conditions of approval can be updated to reflect wishes of the Board.
- There are many potholes in street; existing potholes will be fixed when plants open, and the street maintained until fall when the final asphalt layer is installed. Mr. DiBiase must meet with the Clerk of the Works to review parameters and what needs to be done prior to the last asphalt layer installation, as some work remains
- He is unsure about the street lights malfunctioning. These have not yet been turned over to City. Mr. DiBiase will send an electrician to take care of this.

Matt Venio comments that this has been an informal discussion, but the above will be made conditions of approval. Chair Anderson asks if the Clerk of the Works has had any concerns regarding previous phases. The Project has been on hold for about at least a year and a half, so concerns were heard from neighbors.

One major issue/concern is that it is one way in and out from Marlborough Rd, and usually streets are not turned over to the City until the whole project is complete. However, in this case, the extension means construction vehicles will continue on Amanda Way and Osborne Hills Drive. All items of the original conditions to be resolved by Dec. 31st, while those discussed tonight are to be added.

Noah Koretz wonders why Osborne Hills is a cul-de-sac at the end of Phase 4; the Board at the time of approval and City Councilor opined that no traffic would travel through Barcelona Ave, but go onto Marlborough Ave, so it was approved that way. This would be a second way out. Noah Koretz asks if developer would prefer Osborne Hills Drive connect to Barcelona Ave. Mr. DiBiase would prefer this, but it was not approved that way. That would be a major amendment to original decision, and traffic would need to be reviewed again. Carole Hamilton asks at what point a subdivision is considered abandoned, thus requiring resubmission, under Planning Board regulations. Amanda Chiancola outlines the language. Under Section 81W of MGL, the Planning Board can make modifications when a Plan has expired; this one has, so the Applicant is seeking an extension. There is no requirement that an extension be requested prior to expiration. Procedurally, this project has been abandoned.

Carole Hamilton is appalled that there are potholes, noting that the City fixes them throughout the year. She is also appalled that the developer did not do reconnaissance on this subdivision prior to this meeting before requesting an extension to build more. Mr. DiBiase comments that the site is frequented a lot, sanded, salted, and plowed, and that they do intend to finish the subdivision. He requests that the Board allow them to do that and pave the road. Carole Hamilton states that he has an obligation to finish the part that's already begun, whether the rest of it gets done or not, and that she is uncertain the rest of it should be allowed.

Helen Sides comments that in the 2008 economy Mr. DiBiase had also asked for an extension, so this is not the first. Originally he had seven years to complete the project, plus an additional four via the Permit Extension Act. All 52 homes in phases 1 through 3 have been sold.

Though not a public hearing, Chair Anderson will allow neighbor's comments if they are regarding anything other than the above seven items already submitted. This list was not submitted to the DPW or other City Depts. Kirt

Rieder asks if it is unusual for the Planning Department to ask for other City Departments to provide feedback. It is not; the Planning Dept. and Clerk of the Works, as well as the Tree Warden, should review before this Board accepts street trees, but homeowners are our eyes on the street. It is appropriate to ask for that input from other City Departments before issuing the extension.

Stephanie Matthews of 23 Osborne Hill Dr. speaks for the neighborhood. She notes that this is the “short” list of issues; a group of 25 neighbors made a much longer one but prioritized these seven (7) items for submission.

Additional issues:

- Plowing is not done in a timely fashion, and sanding is never done. In wintertime, residents only sporadically get their mail and packages, as the mail and delivery trucks cannot make it up the hill
- While she understands there is no water for the grass in the common space, it is an eyesore, with wires hanging out from some utilities
- One common area lacks a fence, despite a 10-12’ drop
- General maintenance is not done; once each summer contractors weed whack
- Residents were promised beautiful landscaped walkways which have never been touched and landscaped common areas also not touched.
- HOA agreements are followed by residents to the letter, but the same respect not given from Mr. DiBiase
- Residents feel no more homes can be built until minimal City services can be supplied. Emails have been sent reaching out to Mr. DiBiase’s previous administrative assistant
- Liability is rampant in the development

Mr. Chad Cusack of 27 Osborne Hill Dr. states that he has lived there for 4 years and wants Mr. DiBiase to complete work promised in the original 2006 permit; items on the list submitted are outstanding items. Original concerns were regarding compliance with local, state, and federal environmental safety/liability concerns. He also mentions the dropoff at the back of a certain lot, and lack of a fence. He also wants to see the existing development finished before additional houses are built.

Mr. Martin Kessler of 18 Osborne Hill Dr. lives next to the eyesore lot, which he calls a “dump.” He suggests that this lot may be ideal for a community area, and the developer could install a park area as it is the only common area which is needed by the community. It has always been mentioned that there would be hiking trails and parks, but nothing is accessible and the whole community has been waiting for access to trails and a landscaped area. Please finish what is done now before continuing.

Mr. DiBiase responds that he will work with the neighborhood to correct these issues and wishes there was more communication with his office. He clarifies that the empty lot houses a subsurface detention area, and there are manhole covers so it is not a normal drainage area, and because the covers must be exposed, having a park there may not be an option, but it can be improved as suggested. It will be done this spring. This is a good start and he will continue listening to the neighbors. He suggests having a point person in the neighborhood to communicate with his office.

DJ Napolitano comments that before an extension is offered, it should be tabled for a month since some items on the list submitted (i.e. those pertaining to public safety issues) do not require a wait until spring. These include lighting, potholes, etc. In an act of good faith to the neighbors and this Board, those should be addressed before any extension is granted.

Chair Anderson agrees, noting that he and other Board members are concerned about the conditions left, so he proposes to the Board and Applicant to have the Clerk of the Works make a punch list of what has been completed, what are ongoing maintenance issues from the neighbors, and all items on list given tonight, and attach said list to the Decision.

Noah Koretz asks about the process for the City taking over streets as public ways. Acceptance is usually reviewed at completion of the subdivision and ratified by an act of the City Council. Thus, it is up to the City Council's discretion whether they accept it as public way; as long as the work meets all conditions, there is no reason they would not. This step usually occurs when the entire subdivision is done, as streets would have to be brought to the final standards they would need to meet. Noah Koretz ask if for the first condition, is there a way for the Board to recommend that the City accept public ways in a piecemeal fashion; for example, in the Decision to extend, staff recommend that the initial three phases are accepted by the City, but that they must be brought up to condition first.

Regarding comments about the public/community space, under cluster residential zoning, public open space is required, and this is outlined. The project includes 96 dedicated acres of open space. Legal boundaries are to be defined, but it does not have to be a "park." In this case, the space is just protected woodlands. Kirt Rieder asks if it is possible to reject the application for an extension, thus stopping this applicant from further subdivision work and forcing the City to accept that which is completed to City standards, and then start fresh for further subdivision work. This would put residents under City care and give the developer new lease to do what he wants. Amanda Chiancola states that it is possible to deny the extension; the Board has a surety bond that puts developer on the hook for rest of work to be completed. Matt Veno feels this is too dramatic. Kirt Rieder wants to work for the homeowners rather than applicant, as their frustration is palpable.

Carole Hamilton comments on condition #12 re trails. There is the requirement that after the 10th occupancy permit is issued, there should be a plan submitted for how the trail network will be developed. A plan has been submitted but no work has been done. This work is not required to be done until the developer gets to RC zoning, on the other side. The trail system has already been begun to be improved; it already exists, but the subdivision must be tied in. There is an entrance to the trail system off of Amanda Way, but it must be cleared every spring. That system now connects to a broader trail system to Spring Pond in Peabody. The developer has also installed a maintenance road (a power company requirement) to access the power lines.

DJ Napolitano asks if he would be able to find the trail easily. Mr. DiBiase states it is not yet marked. DJ Napolitano wonders what the point is of having completed but unmarked trails. He also notes that this is year 12, and while brand new construction is starting, current homeowners are already suffering. From year 6 on, progress was haphazard, so he questions the desire to continue building when the first phase took so long and is still not complete. He feels a show of good faith effort is needed to correctly move forward.

Mr. DiBiase will commit to fixing all the issues on the list, immediately where possible. He was there recently during the day. Dale Yale asks how often Clerk of Works inspects. Chair Anderson suggests moving forward in a methodical manner:

- Continue tonight to the next meeting
- During the continuance, the Clerk of Works or someone designated by the Planning or Building Inspector should provide a punch list for this Board, including completed sidewalks and all items mentioned in this meeting
- The neighborhood group should prepare comments, and submit them to Amanda Chiancola and the Board
- Comments from the neighborhood and City will allow the Planning Board to consider conditions and whether to allow this project to move forward. This is not to preclude developer from taking action on the items on the list submitted tonight
 - Noah Koretz notes that the neighbors should submit the long list, not the short
 - Matt Veno comments that if the Board feels that certain situations are priorities (i.e. issues of noncompliance), those items may be added to the conditions of approval. The Board along with the

Applicant should evaluate whether five years will be enough to complete the project, so that the new deadline should there be an extension granted will be met

- For the next meeting, the Board should be provided with a notice of how long it will take to complete the next phase, along with an estimate of future phases, though this will have to do with market conditions. It is noted that the Board is not willing to grant extensions in perpetuity
- Kirt Rieder notes that the Board is not trying to trade an extension for the items to be completed, but rather, to describe an avenue for him to get back to neutral before considering an extension

Matt Veno comments that it would be helpful to have a briefing from Amanda Chiancola regarding the consequences if the Board did not extend the Form C, and what this would mean for current homeowners and future work on the project.

Noah Koretz asks about the project as a whole. There will be 10 total phases with 130 total homes; 52 homes have been built and sold. The only connection point is to Marlborough Rd. There is some discussion as to why this was and if it was based on a waiver, as it seems like a decision based on former City councilors' or neighbors' desires. Noah Koretz is concerned about initial homeowners and about reaffirming a previous plan that is grievously in error.

In order to move forward, the applicant is amenable to a continuation and meeting some requirements for punch list items, completion of work, evaluation, etc.

Amanda Chiancola describes the Clerk of Works and process. A scope of work with punch list must be provided, a proposal of work obtained, then the applicant will arrange for them do an inspection, but in the meantime he can work on the list he has. An extension to at least May 3rd for this to happen is suggested. Mr. DiBiase asks if the Assistant City Engineer can do the inspection, but he cannot. While he would like to continue work in the spring, the Board needs professional evaluation of conditions and assurance that issues thus far will be addressed first.

A motion to continue to the May 3, 2018 meeting is made by DJ Napolitano, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and passes unanimously 8-0.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular Planning Board Meeting held on March 1, 2018

A motion to approve the March 1, 2018 minutes, with a minor correction, is made by Dale Yale, seconded by DJ Napolitano, and passes 6-0 with Matt Veno and Carole Hamilton abstaining.

III. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

A. Staff report back to Planning Board regarding the expected completion date of the gabion wall (including landscaping and public pathways) at the Footprint Powerplant site.

Public access and landscaping with the gabion wall will be complete in the fall. Chair Anderson is satisfied with the response.

Noah Koretz asks about changes to the plans for the industrial building being rehabbed on Buffum St. Ext. There was an insignificant change to the footprint accepted by the Board previously. Since then, the Applicant has proposed additional changes. The applicant went to the DRB with these additional changes. Comments from the DRB were obtained, but it was not a favorable recommendation, so the Applicant is holding off until they have

DRB approval before returning to the Planning Board. Thus, this is a subsequent change not yet presented to this Board. Helen Sides describes what was presented to the DRB.

On a separate note, Chair Anderson wants a letter from the Planning Department to be sent to the CVS developer at the corner of Jefferson and Canal, since they routinely neglect the replacement of bollard lights on the access drive to Jefferson Ave. This is a safety issue. Amanda Chiancola will follow up.

Dale Yale asks about a corner not being developed off Traders Way. Amanda Chiancola states that a PUD is being proposed, but no details are available yet.

Amanda Chiancola reminds Board Members that City Hall Annex is moving. April 5th is last meeting at this location; the meeting on April 17th will be at 98 Washington St. Helen Sides notes changes to the signage on the new building.

Noah Koretz asks if there is a way to provide additional material/input to the Board outside of a meeting. Information sharing (such as a document) through Amanda Chiancola via email is acceptable, but there cannot be discussion or comments. Noah Koretz has made strong comments about a particular project, and notes that he is feeling even stronger now, and has additional comments for the Board. These can be written out and distributed at the meeting to Board members to avoid conversation outside of the meeting. He does not want it to be confrontational with the applicant.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Noah Koretz, and passes 8-0.

The meeting ends at 9:10PM.

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 04/05/2018

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