

**City of Salem Planning Board
Approved Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 20, 2017**

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, July 20, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall Annex, 120 Washington Street, Room 313, Salem, Massachusetts.

Chair Ben Anderson opens the meeting at 7:06 pm.

I. ROLL CALL

Those present were: Chair Ben Anderson, Vice Chair Matt Veno, Tony Mataragas, Kirt Rieder, Noah Koretz (leaves at 7:48), Dale Yale, and Bill Griset

Absent: Tony Mataragas and Carole Hamilton

Also in attendance: Tom Daniel, AICP, Planning Director, Amanda Chiancola, AICP Staff Planner, and Stacy Kilb, Recording Clerk

II. REGULAR AGENDA

Noah Koretz leaves the meeting at 7:48 PM, before the regular agenda item to recuse himself.

A. Location: 293 & 297 Bridge Street (Map 26, Lots 634 and 635)

Applicant: Mark McLeod c/o The H.L. Turner Group Inc.

Description: A continuance of a public hearing for a Flood Hazard Overlay District special permit in accordance with Salem Zoning Ordinance, Section 8.1 – (Flood Hazard Overlay District) to construct a 7,600 square foot addition to the existing building on the property located at 293 Bridge Street (Map 26, Lot 634). The adjacent lot at 297 Bridge Street (Map 26, Lot 635), currently a municipal parking lot, will be used for employee and customer parking, tractor trailer access to loading docks, and exterior storage for products.

Joseph Correnti of 63 Federal St. is there to represent the applicant. Flood Hazard Overlay District (FHOD) impacts are the topic of tonight's discussion. Mark McLeod, site engineer, addresses comments and questions from the last meeting.

Mr. McLeod notes that FEMA's standard for flood zone is that occupied floors must be 1' above flood elevation; the existing building is 3' above, and the addition have the same first floor elevation. The existing electrical panel is in the existing facility; it can be relocated to alleviate this concern.

- Existing lot and slopes, and runoff are described. Run off gets collected at the low points. The applicant wants to maintain the current flow, as it works, and they do not want to disturb the cap. The existing overflow structures there will be replaced with deep sump catch basins that have hooded outlets, that provide stormwater treatment, that design is compliant with DEP.
- The infrastructure is described in more detail. At the last meeting a question was raised as to why there is more infrastructure on one section of the site. Mr. McLeod says that the area slopes from the rear toward Bridge Street, they needed to make sure they do not trap any stormwater behind the building. That required more infrastructure, impervious concrete pavers and some underdrains to slow down the runoff down and provide tension and treatment. When you have a flood event the project site will be wet, as will most of Bridge Street and several other parcels until flood waters recede because they all outlet into the canal or out in the street. Additional structures in the parking lot would not alleviate that because as long as the

municipal drainage system in Bridge Street and around there is full of water, there is nowhere for that to drain.

- The concerns about product in storage area are noted by Mr. McLeod. The storage is located at the high point on the site, so during a flood event you would be looking at 12 to 18 inches, maybe two feet of water in this area. Pipes will be stored there, which would fill with water and not have buoyancy, and is also constrained by a chain link fence that would let water through, not creating a dam; thus, any floating items in there would not be exerting a lot of force on it.

Mr. Correnti notes that additional information has been provided by City staff, including the City Engineer and that the project has been fully peer reviewed on behalf of this Board and by the Conservation Commission, so there has been a great deal of oversight. All engineers that reviewed the project agree it sufficiently meets the standards.

Matt Veno references the letter received by the City Solicitor. For instance, looking at the parking lot there would be a little over 1.5 feet of water during the 100 year flood plain. He points to the 100-yr flood plain line, and asks how can someone exist the building and get through dry land without having to go through 1.5 feet of water. He notes a reference in the City Solicitor's letter that pedestrian egress could go up the ancient way. But you still have to go through water, so he does not know how this accomplishes pedestrian access. He questions how someone in a walker or wheel chair who cannot go through a foot and half of water will exit the building.

Mr. McLeod points out that the entire site would be underwater, at that point, so no one could enter. There will not be any dry point on the site. Mr. Veno notes that he is not looking for the site to be kept dry, or flood proofing. He is looking for an area of egress. Mr. McLeod reiterates that there is no dry point on site, it is the least toward the back, but it will still have water.

Kirt Rieder responds to Mr. Veno that flood waters will come from river and move up, systematically and at some point when the water reaches the road, this operation will shut down, and people will leave in cars. Mr. Veno understands that real-world operation, and is trying to think of it in concepts of the Board's assignment, and reflects that maybe he divorcing the two more than he ought to. Mr. Rieder replies that the operative sentence for him is, "provides adequate provisions" not flood proofing. Mr. Veno asks if there are grade changes that could be created to create a situation where someone could exit. Mr. McLeod says it is not possible to change the grades to provide dry egress without going onto and abutter's property.

Chair Anderson notes that at that last meeting, he was thinking this is an instantaneous event where boom there are flood waters. He explains that earlier he did not make the connection that this is a gradual flood situation, not a sudden flood. As the water moves up, the street gets closed, so there is an opportunity for people to leave the building. He is not concerned, he appreciates the detail. He is more comfortable with how the building would be evacuated in that event. He is not concerned related to the flooding. But, he still has some concerns with the existing building though- However, after reading through the City Solicitors letter he feels they applicant has resolved the issues relating to the application- but he is still thinking through that.

Kirt Rieder provides an example of a project outside of Salem. That Planning Board (he is not part of the project, he is representing the City in that situation) that Planning Board has approved the reuse of a terminal warehouse into a microbrewery, where the 1st floor floods up to 18" of water. The assumption is that business will be able to get people out of there in a timely fashion. They are not flood proofing the occupancy for first floor. This is the opposite, where flood waters will come to 6-8" below the first floor. Kirt Rieder is totally comfortable with project, not based on anything the applicant has said, but based on the knowledge of how the site floods- he notes the applicant has not said anything in opposition to how he understands the site. Mr. Veno thanks Mr. Rieder, he says that his explanation is very helpful.

Mr. Rieder commends the applicant for reiterating over and over that the site is sloped, the water shall drain. There will be no standing water contained, there is no lip at bridge street that will cause water to sit for X hours, it is entirely dependent on the receding of flood waters, it is not localized to this property.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment

Justin Whittier of 10 River St.

- Concerned about adequate access over time, especially as tides will get worse with climate change and sea level rise. He does not think that people seeing the water coming is irrelevant. He explains drawings submitted to the board at the meeting.

Jane Arlander, 93 Federal St.

- echoes Justin Whittier's discussion, noting the 2014 Climate Change Vulnerability Study was done. Sea level rise, storm surge, heat and extreme precipitation events were explored. On Bridge St. extreme precipitation, sea level rise, and storm surge all come into play. All 3 involve property damage and are important. Do we want to expand a property like this in such an area? The final peer review by Bobrick had concerns about underground electrical conduits, that it should be further confirmed as not affected by storm conditions. This was not done.
- She is also concerned about the pipes in the storage space. She shows the Waterford, CT facility; with more than pipes stored there, it includes tanks, etc.
- Also concerned that calculations do not account for water entering the Webb property from Federal St. in a 100 year flood event

Meg Toohey, 122 Federal St.

- Questions storage of materials inside and outside
- Board should obtain in writing that utilities will be moved above the flood zone
- The information we have thus far adds up to 8,850 square feet, but other elements are unknown, thus the total of the existing plus addition will be over 10,000 square feet, so would trigger site plan review

Mr. Mapachuck, store manager:

- Responds that they do not store any tanks outside. There is a limited propane customer base, so any tanks would be empty, always have been, and will be inside. The storage area outside will contain cast iron pipes and fittings, plastic pipes will be stored; they are not planning to store anything else outside.

Mr. McLeod:

- Says the intention is to relocate the electrical service. The letter said "may." He says this would likely be a requirement of the building permit. Chair Anderson says it should be worded more strongly than may.
- Drainage calculations did look at the impacts of offsite properties, and did include surrounding areas
- Pervious pavers: vehicles driving there are forklifts, or snow removal equipment. They are not storing company vehicles, etc. it is mostly asphalt now.

An email from Ann Whittier is read into the record; it references a podcast the Board may want to review.

Amanda Chiancola notes that City Solicitor's legal opinion is provided. Within 2 weeks, tide gates will be installed in drain lines leading to North River as part of ongoing flood mitigation efforts, which will reduce flooding on Bridge St.

Darrel Lebovisci, 122 Federal St.

- Asks what federal permits are required and the state of the application? This is reviewed.

Anne Whittier, 10 River St.

- Holding areas for water – these will remain the same; they are three feet deep and are not fenced, but are not designed to hold a permanent pool of water

Fred Beavershiemer, 17 River St.

- Concerned about contamination on US lot, and risks of pumping water out of current basement if it floods more regularly
- Attorney Correnti notes that this is a question for the LSP who was and will continue to be available. The applicant is purchasing a highly contaminated site, but it is safe to move forward. He notes that FW Webb has never shut down due to flooding in the past 27 years; the parking lot itself has never flooded and no one has been stranded, so the Board should take comfort that we have had several 100 year storms in the past several years, and one of busiest sales days was Mother's Day storm in 2006 when 800 pumps were sold to people who came during the storm, picked up pumps, and drove off. When the street does flood, it only lasts until the tide recedes. Cars, etc. never been damaged, nor have their materials been damaged or floated away. Access has not been an issue. They would not make the investment if they thought they were not going to be able to open in these types of situations.
- Mr. Beaversheimer is still concerned that the Board will approve the project without having the full information they need regarding contamination on the existing Webb lot, only the US lot

Jane Arlander notes the findings of testing done in the rear of the Webb lot, and some soils were removed but the status of what is still there is uncertain.

There is some question about the ongoing vs. new/expanded use of the area.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Matt Veno, seconded by Dale Yale, and passes 6-0

Chair Anderson notes that at the last meeting, he had several concerns after the first meeting, but is happy to see follow up information in layman terms, along with the City Solicitor's comments related to the special permit conditions and other information provided by the City. No other members have questions or concerns, the board goes on to review the draft decision.

Chair Anderson reviews the Draft Decision.

- Chair Anderson recommends adding a condition that the existing electrical utilities be moved out of the basement, above the flood plain to the first or second floor.
- The Chair asks whether backflow prevention will need to be upgraded as it is required in the new construction, and the existing construction will need to match it. The applicant responds that is the case for all utilities.
- Amanda Chiancola reads the comments from the Building Inspector into the record. Building code requirements would only apply to the addition, but the Board can put on a special condition that they apply to existing building as well.
- Kirt Rieder is concerned with getting into technical details of a scope this Board may not have; responsibility re utilities should remain with the permitting authority, and he is not sure about the language
- The Applicant notes that all new utilities will have to run through the existing building; the language says they must comply with all building code, so if connecting into an existing system and that requires them to upgrade everything, they will do that, if it doesn't, they will look at it. They want to be here long term, so

will preserve and maintain the building. However, they cannot go beyond, “We will comply with all current regulations.”

- Kirt Rieder comments on 7(a) damage to roadways, sidewalks, curbing, driveways... (ADD: and any existing vegetation) damaged during construction shall be replaced)

Site Specific Conditions:

- Electric utilities in the existing building to be moved above the floodplain as a prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy
- FW Webb will develop a policy guide for flood conditions before issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy

Joseph Correnti asks for clarification on 7a, Kirt Rieder notes his disappointment to the Chair regarding this project not being a site plan review. Mr. Rieder explains his frustration that the Board is put into the position of not being able to talk about the site plan review criteria. He recognizes that there is landscaping plan by others, and that they are not able to comment on it, but he is not happy with doing so.

Dale Yale asks about the City Solicitors recommendations regarding the policy to address the adequacy of circulation. Ms. Chiancola explains. Dale recommends that a condition be included that requires the manager to monitor flow into street, implement removal of employee vehicles when flooding imminent, close access to business when flooding will occur. Ms. Chiancola says this could be wrapped up into a policy guide provided to employees, and to the city prior to CO.

Ms. Chiancola makes a note regarding the landscaping condition recommended by Mr. Rieder. She does not see an issue to include “and landscaping” to that condition (7a). Because if landscaping is damaged during construction, it should be put back to the way it was before- as part of standard conditions for construction practices. Mr. Griset notes that he would want to make sure it is consistent with the landscaping plan.

Mr. Griset asks how many folks are needed to pass the special permit. Ms. Chiancola responds six, the board reflects that there are only six members in attendance.

Helen Sides explains that she is still disappointed that there will be no site plan review, and is inclined not to vote in favor of the project. She cannot approve it without knowing what it is. But the Chair notes that is not what the Board is being asked to review. Matt Veno notes that in order for the Board to deny petition, it would have to demonstrate that it failed to meet the 4 requirements of the permit, and he does not see it. Kirt Rieder asks if there is a need to provide a rationale for a no vote. The record of the meeting would reflect that conversation.

Attorney Correnti notes that as much as addressing design review concerns is desired by the applicant, this is not the forum, however the Peer Reviewer, City Engineer, City Solicitor and Planning staff all agree that conditions for this permit have been met, but if more information is required, they will certainly be provided.

Chair Anderson reviews the FHOD requirements. He feels the applicant has met the requirements; other concerns related to those requirements should be voiced now, to let the applicant can address them. Matt Veno notes that they City or the process are not well served if we don't do the assignment, which is to apply criteria to the proposal; the process and the assignment in applying the provisions are important, and the Board should not feel that it has the opportunity or that it would be appropriate to make a decision here on anything other than the application of these criteria. The process and the Board's ability to make judgements is compromised if they are not based on the items currently before the Board.

Ms. Sides says that she appreciates Mr. Veno's comments and notes that while the situation they are in is disappointing, she understands.

A motion to approve a Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit in accordance with Section 8.1 for the site located at 293 Bridge Street and 297 Bridge Street (Map 26, Lots 634 and 635) to construct a 7,600 square foot addition to the existing building on the property located at 293 Bridge Street. The adjacent lot, 297 Bridge Street, currently a municipal parking lot, will be used for employee and customer parking, tractor trailer access, and exterior storage for products of the H.L. Turner Group Inc. for a Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit, as conditioned, is made by Matt Veno, seconded by Dale Yale, and passes in a roll call vote with Ben Anderson, Matt Veno, Kirt Rieder, Dale Yale, and Helen Sides, Bill Grisct (6) in favor, unanimously and (0) opposed, 1 abstained (Noah Koretz) and 2 absent (Carole Hamilton and Tony Mataragas)

Location: 370 Highland, Town Fair Tire

A motion to continue to the September 21, 2017, is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Dale Yale, and passes with 6 in favor and none opposed

III. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

This item is taken first.

- A. Planning Board discussion and recommendation to City Council on a Zoning Amendment to change the zoning designation for 204, 206, 214 & 222 Derby Street to Central Development (B-5).
 - Chair Anderson notes it is NOT a public hearing, so will be no public comment, will be referred to City Council.

Discussion:

Noah Koretz agrees with the point that several people made at the public meeting regarding onsite parking is the B-1 zone being a bad idea. This is antiquated and must be revisited, in a downtown area you want to have a shared parking strategy. As for the proposal in front of them he makes the following points:

- Under current zoning, he is sympathetic that they are unfairly limited compared to their neighbors that do not have parking requirements. Some concerns brought up at the meeting are misguided; if preservation is the goal, he would be more concerned about B1 than B5 because if requiring onsite parking, these are small lots, the type of thing that could be picked off by Domino's with parking in front or a T-Mobile Store. If we want to maintain the buildings there are now, there is not place to park onsite, which is a serious issue with B-1.
- As a general public policy issue, he does not agree that the zoning should be maintained because it seems to be working now. Having nonconforming uses is bad policy so just because it has worked so far overly complicates things, and creates a bad regulatory environment. Especially when there is a movement to make those parcels conforming.
- He supports recommending that they approve this to be B5 and as an aside, recommends later examining the issue of less intensive business zones requiring onsite parking for businesses

Dale Yale is interested in expanding the Urban Renewal District, as this might alleviate some public and Council concerns. She does not think the timeline is that bad.

Chair Ben Anderson notes that he is torn. He is sympathetic to property owners, and to the discussion for the expansion of Urban Renewal Area. He agrees with Noah, he feels B5 is the correct designation for this area. It is exciting to see what happens in the Derby Wharf area. Limiting these property owners to getting special permit to

change tenant or use, or find similar use, is difficult. He feels a positive recommendation to change to B5 is appropriate.

Noah Koretz asks if the Board could add a note that the City consider extending the Urban Renewal Area. The Chair says yes, Noah suggests that this should be part of the Board's recommendation.

Helen Sides asks for clarification on why B1 is not desirable and Noah Koretz elaborates. There is no way to build or maintain these buildings as dense urban buildings because there is no onsite parking. If we want a dense, urban, walkable landscape that is all a public amenity that can be shared, to obtain it we want a shared public parking strategy, not spread out businesses with parking. Residential and commercial parking should be able to use the same spaces. B1 parking downtown would lead to strip malls with lots of parking. Onsite parking requirements were probably writing in the 70's. Salem was built prior to that. What's downtown is more conforming to what we want to see than what was built in the interim. B5 is more conducive to preservation than B1.

Chair Anderson is also sympathetic to neighbors, so if we recommend B5 it does not mean a monstrosity will be built. The Planning Board is here to help avoid that from happening. There is the risk of us recommending that they adopt this but the urban renewal expansion recommended may lag behind B5, so in the interim a project may go through that does not get Design Review Board oversight. Helen Sides asks why not wait? Chair Anderson says we can qualify that by saying a certain board members think it should be concurrent, not consecutive.

Noah Koretz notes that the urban renewal area is more about design, not height, etc. The main issue is design control if something gets built, if we get it great, but it is not fatal if we do not, not very concerned given that redevelopment is not likely in the near future.

Kirt Rieder asks the Planning Department if it is preferable to condition the recommendation so the change to B5 does not occur without Urban Renewal or not does go into effect for 6 months, independent of the SRA. The Planning Director, Tom Daniel responds that if zoning was passed and the Urban Renewal boundary not amended, and overnight there was a proposal to demolish a building, there would be a 6 month period of demolition delay when an Urban Renewal amendment could happen. Practically, the Board can look at other Urban Renewal amendments, but that is a bigger process, so it may be desirable to look at this as just one piece to move forward with. The objectives in the urban renewal plan are consistent here, and one of the powers is preventing demolition along with design review controls. To answer Mr. Rieder's questions, he is uncertain how the Council could delay putting it into effect, even though much other legislation does not immediately go into effect. Matt Veno thinks that because we have elections this fall, it would be this Council's decision, and wonders if it would be binding on a subsequent council.

Mr. Daniel describes the procedure for updating Urban Renewal Area. It is not onerous, but there is a timing of hitting all the cycles, he has not mapped that out yet. We could probably get back to the Council in Nov. or Dec., but he would want to embark on this knowing we could get it done with the current Council.

Matt Veno agrees with Noah that it is unlikely that these properties will be redeveloped given their characteristics. He does not see a downside to doing it in the proper order that would give this Board the confidence that whatever redevelopment was going to be consistent with B5 would have the necessary review. We want design review for this lot, so there is no reason to not do that first. The Applicant did not express any sense of urgency, so why not do the Urban Renewal expansion first, then change to B5? Is that sequence consistent with the process?

There is a time limit of 21 days for Planning to make a recommendation, so the Board could say no, but recommend that the City Council not approve rezoning with the reason being that the Board want to see the urban renewal area expanded to encompass properties in advance of the zoning change. That would give clear direction to property owners. He does not see a reason to not do it in that order.

Matt Venio asks if there could be a legal/procedural issue if denied? When can they bring it back? That would be at the next session of the City Council. Noah asks for a map of the Urban Renewal Area. Mr. Daniel shows him the map from the Urban Renewal Plan. He is concerned that there is risk involved in the urban renewal area expansion not be approved. The applicant is asked to be put on an equal footing. If we add on the urban renewal area, it would put them on a more onerous review category than properties across the street, which is how it is now anyway. It seems punitive to say, "You are requesting zoning that matches your use, but we won't recommend it unless urban renewal is extended," when rest of street is not subject to that. He would rather the council recommendation include a suggestion to expand the urban renewal area rather than a requirement.

Helen Sides comments that something has to trigger this; not the first design review oversight discussion, so this is an opportunity. She agrees with Matt Venio, in that the Board should put what comes first, first, e.g. Urban Renewal Area.

Mr. Daniel explains how the Urban Renewal Area outline came to be. Changes to the Urban Renewal Area occurred over time, which is shown in the Urban Renewal Plan. In 2011 we added the Post Office and Riley Plaza. We didn't look at other properties because we had a constraint of time. It would be more intensive if looking at other properties. In this instance the applicant is open to being included and there is a connection to public objective, and it is not an onerous process, unless the Board is looking at other things that would require more time and department dedication.

Chair Anderson says it feels piecemeal that we are cherry picking these four properties. While he agrees design oversight is important, he questions whether that this study be more in depth, or should the Board repeat the process as properties come before us? He wants to want to recommend approval of B-5. Expansion of the Urban Renewal Area, and expanded design oversight, need to be examined but not contingent on this application.

Noah Koretz reiterates that Urban Renewal Expansion, if all goes well, is not an onerous process, and if there was opposition to a project, would provide procedural points to prevent the process of it being resumed. The Salem Redevelopment Authority, Planning Board and City Council all need to take action to expand Urban Renewal Area, and after those, the state. People could prevent this from going forward at any of those steps.

Chair Anderson reiterates that the Board should "do it right," more indepth. Tom Daniel responds that this is a much more involved process that we cannot undertake in the near term due to resource and time constraints, and would need funding to support the study, and the resources to go bigger, so if the Board recommends approving the zoning and examining the Urban Renewal expansion, many months will intervene in that time.

Kirt Rieder says that historically the review area has changed incrementally. He asks Mr. Daniel if his attitude regarding the greater duration, effort and funding triggered by looking to include the Church parcel. Mr. Daniel says that does complicate things because that property owner has not stepped forward and said they want to be part of the Urban Renewal Area. When we added the Post Office and Riley Plaza in 2011- they are both government entities. We did not look at other properties owned by private individuals at that time because they might not want to be part of it. Absent of someone stepping forward, the process is more involved. Kirt Rieder agrees with Helen Sides and Matt Venio, in that there is no time like the present, yet he agrees with Noah that it is not overly exposed. Rather than being torn yes or no, it's how to craft the recommendation. He opines that the Board should recommend approval but also strongly recommend expansion of the Salem Development Authority.

Noah Koretz notes that what the Board says is not binding. He comments that that there is a lot of as it has substantive but not procedural agreement. Some of the issues the City Council has are very different than the issues the Planning Board has.

Mr. Koretz suggests that the Board could recommend approving the B5 zoning change, explicitly state that it DOES NOT recommend a change to B1, and note they strongly suggest the urban renewal area be expanded.

Mr. Daniel notes that there is time, as procedural questions can be answered before the City Council acts upon any recommendation.

Helen Sides says there has to be a test case, and that the Board should not defer, saying "it has to be a bigger issue." She opines that the zoning should be changed, followed by an expansion of the Urban Renewal Area. All Board members do not have to agree, and the recommendation can note that. The applicant can withdraw and not have to wait a year to re submit.

So it would look like this:

Applicant withdraws

City immediately acts to expand urban renewal area

Then the applicant resubmits and the City changes the area in question to B5

Demolition is as important as design review.

The recommendation to withdraw can be a note, but the Board has to recommend to approve or deny the rezoning.

Helen Sides motions to deny rezoning, noting that this is because the Board would like to see the Urban Renewal Area extended first, at which point it would be supportive of changing the zone to a B5 designation. The Board also notes that a zoning change, absent Urban Renewal Area expansion, presents risks in the areas of design oversight and control of demolition. The Board notes it is in no way supportive of a B1 zoning change because of the onsite parking requirement for commercial uses. She is seconded by Dale Yale, and the motion passes in a roll call vote with Matt Veno, Bill Grisct, Kirt Rieder, Dale Yale, Helen Sides, and Noah Koretz (6) in favor and Ben Anderson (1) opposed.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. July 6, 2017

A motion to approve the minutes with minor corrections is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Matt Veno, and passes 5-0 with Bill Grisct abstaining. Ben Anderson, Matt Veno, Kirt Rieder, Dale Yale, and Helen Sides vote in favor in a roll call vote.

V. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn is made by Matt Veno, seconded by Bill Grisct, and passes unanimously, 6-0.

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: <http://www.salem.com/planning-board/webforms/planning-board-2017-decisions>

Respectfully submitted,
Stacy Kilb, Recording Clerk

Approved by the Planning Board on 9/7/2017

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