



CITY OF SALEM PLANNING BOARD

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, April 14, 2022, at 6:30 p.m. via remote access. Public participation was possible via Zoom video and conference call.

Chair Bill Griset opens the meeting at 6:31 pm

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Bill Griset, Vice Chair Kirt Rieder, Tom Furey, Todd Waller, Sarah Tarbet, Carole Hamilton, Zach Caunter, (8)

Helen Sides arrived late

Absent: Noah Koretz (1)

Also in attendance: Elena Eimert, Beth Forrestal, Amanda Chiancola (3)

II. REGULAR AGENDA

Items taken out of order per Chair Bill Griset. Chair Griset also will limit applicants to 20 minutes for their presentation, excluding Q&A.

A. Location: 252R Bridge Street (Map 35, Lot 24)

Applicant: Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority with attn to: Kathryn Newhall-Smith

Description: Endorsement of a Plan believed not to require approval under the Subdivision Control Law (ANR).

Item heard third.

- Kate Newhall-Smith: Here as staff to the Salem Redevelopment Authority (SRA) and with the permission of MBTA, the property owner to represent the ANR request. The MBTA has agreed to sell a piece of land adjacent to the Crescent Lot that is currently part of the parcel containing the parking garage to the SRA. This parcel will be combined with the Crescent Lot as part of the larger redevelopment project. Here requesting your endorsement.
- Helen Sides: What is the notch shown on the plan?
 - Kate Newhall-Smith: It's the stairway, it is part of the sidewalk parcel and owned by the city. We did the ANR, and the City Council has declared it surplus, and it should be conveyed tonight and merged in with the Crescent Lot.

A motion to approve is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Helen Sides.

- Elena Eimert: Could I get a revision to the motion to allow Tom Daniel to sign as the Planning Director on behalf of the Planning Board?

A motion to approve and to allow Tom Daniel to sign on behalf of the Planning Board is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Helen Sides and passes 8-0 in a roll call vote.

Tom Furey	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Todd Waller	Yes
Sarah Tarbet	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Zach Caunter	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Griset	Yes

- B. Location: 9 and 11 Franklin Street (Map 26, Lot 375)
Applicant: 11 Franklin, LLC
Description: A continuance of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of 11 FRANKLIN, LLC for the property located at 9 Franklin Street (Map26, Lot 375) in the B1 and R2 Zoning District for a Site Plan Review and Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 9.5 Site Plan Review and Section 8.1 Flood Hazard Overlay District. Specifically, the applicant proposes to construct twelve (12) townhouse style units located in three (3) buildings on the portion of the parcel known as 9 Franklin Street and consisting of approximately 36,450 square feet. The proposed buildings are three (3) stories. Six (6) surface parking spaces and twenty-four (24) garage parking spaces are proposed for a total of thirty (30) spaces. Proposed vehicular access to 9 Franklin Street will be provided through a twenty (20) foot wide drive aisle from the existing westerly curb cut. Proposed pedestrian access will be provided through a sidewalk extending from Franklin Street into the site.

Item heard fourth.

- Attorney Scott Grover: I am representing the applicant in the project. The last of the engineering conditions have been resolved to everyone's satisfaction. We have nothing new to present, other issues are resolved. Once the public hearing is closed, we do have the team available to answer questions and comments. I think we will easily adhere to the 20-minute rule on this project.

- Bill Grisct: Are there members of the Planning Board with questions for the applicant? I think this has been before us for a while, so we are all familiar with it. Let's open it up for public comment.
- Elena Eimert: There are no written comments, if you would like to offer comments, please use the raised hand function and I will give you permission to talk.

Motion to close the public hearing made by Todd Waller, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes in an 8-0 roll call vote.

Tom Furey	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Todd Waller	Yes
Sarah Tarbet	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Zach Caunter	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Grisct	Yes

- Elena Eimert: The draft decision is in SharePoint. It shows any changes made in redline form. The majority of changes are to the engineering conditions, made by the Engineering Department, and have been seen and accepted by the applicant. The draft decision is shared on the screen for live editing.
- Kirt Rieder: Mr. Grover, did you address status of the Conservation Commission review?
 - Attorney Grover: I will defer to Scott Cameron on that.
 - Scott Cameron: We are running with Conservation Commission on a parallel track. The statute requiring us to close other permits first. They were waiting for engineering to be reconciled and we will see the same conditions here as in the order of conditions. It should be next week or the following.
- Kirt Rieder: I have a comment on paragraph 2 on parking. Can you quantify "small section of parking"? It seems wiggly.
 - Scott Cameron: Putting it by a square feet number is risky. Things aren't the same as you build it out. Suggest referencing as shown on a specific plan.
 - Kirt Rieder: I would be fine with x- sq. ft. rather than an acre. Our definitions of small may be different.
 - Scott Cameron: I'll calculate that now.

- Bill Grisct: Thinking about Boston Street and the AC units outside. Has that been adequately dealt with here?
 - Kirt Rieder: Is there specific language? I've seen it in the other conditions. But not here.
 - Elena Eimert: If this decision speaks to the screening of HVAC units and the like? Given its location, it is not subject to ECOD or DRB. if you want to set a site-specific condition ...I am willing to pull that language for shaping here.
 - Kirt Rieder: From my perspective, yes. We will hate to be surprised when we see two screaming white rectangles in the wrong location. This has been insufficiently addressed by other applicants.
 - Bill Grisct: Let's address it here. Suggested language?
 - Kirt Rieder: Mr. Grover, do you have an architecture representative here?
 - Attorney Grover: Sanir of Seger Architects is here. Could you comment on what we have for screening now?
 - Kirt Rieder: Where is the AC? Can you allay our concerns?
 - Bill Grisct: You may not be aware of the history. We have had HVAC units suddenly pop up in the front of a project.
 - Attorney Grover: Looking at language and think that would be acceptable for us to add to the decision if you can't find where they are located.
 - Sanir Lutfija, Seger Architects. Early stages of schematics and we don't have a concrete location. But there are spots in the roof to be screened, behind the roof line. Or in the rear as well.
 - Kirt Rieder: Do we have a drawing set to throw up and annotate?
Scott Cameron: There is no way to put it in the frontage so you wouldn't see it from the street
 - Kirt Rieder: We don't want it in the entry drive touching Franklin Street
 - Elena Eimert: I can pull up the drawings. (Civil Plan Sheet 12)
 - Bill Grisct: Could we put some reference that would be acceptable to board an applicant about where they will or won't be located?
 - Kirt Rieder: On the roof? Elevated above the ground? That's the first question.
 - Scott Cameron: Sanir says too early to know if they will be mini-splits or roof or ground mounted units. There is dedicated patio space behind all the units where they can be tucked in and around. The front of the property is narrow on Franklin Street. But it is also in flood plain so can't be there or in the front – obstructing egress/drive. Has to go behind.
 - Sanir Lutfija: There is room on back patios of each unit. We can't put it in front of the buildings. Architectural rendering may show roof top units are a possibility.

- Kirt Rieder: The preference is for them to be on the roof unless Helen or Sarah tell me I'm wrong. Or in back.
- Helen Sides: Fine with them on the ground within precincts belonging to the unit. Naturally part of what each property has. We think things aren't visible on roofs, but they sometimes are. I like the language added – that it will be reviewed when it has been located.
- Kirt Rieder: It is not too soon to talk about this. We talk about this as a matter of course on many projects.
- Sanir Lutfija: These are individual units per town house.
- Kirt Rieder: As long as the board is okay ceding that qualitative discretion to the Planning director, I can move on.
- Helen Sides: It seems adequate to me.
- Kirt Rieder: Can we modify it to be within 10 ft. so there is flexibility of each unit. Allows it to be on the roof or adjacent to it but not distance. I get that it is more efficient to abut or touch the building.
- Scott Cameron: The patios are 13 ft. deep. I might say within 15 feet.
- Kirt Rieder: I think any owner would prefer the unit tucked on the building rather than centered on the patio.
- Helen Sides: It can be put off to the side.
- Scott Cameron: On the snow storage corner, it is actually an electrical transformer.

- Scott Cameron: I have the areas for the flood plain as well. There are 2 areas within flood plain elevation. Franklin Street driveway, extending back halfway down the drive, about 3500 feet. And back by dwelling units, about 1500 feet. About 5000 sq-ft of surface area.
 - Elena Eimert: Unless there is an objection, I'll return to the last finding of the FHOD permit, where we left off.
 - Scott Cameron: One more question on area. Intent is that we don't have to provide 5000 of storage but that you say 5000 sq-ft. may be flooded. 100-year flood plain may be flooded.
 - Kirt Rieder: Would you prefer that "may be subject to flooding" be added just so it's clear?
 - Scott Cameron: Good with it as written. There is no risk to vehicular and pedestrian impacts not capacity to provide storage.

- Kirt Rieder: Are there really only 2 architectural drawings in this whole set?
 - Elena Eimert: I think that's all we have.
 - Sanir Lutfija: We have provided more renderings previously but not as involved in these meetings once it was for engineering review.
 - Kirt Rieder: Is that typical Helen?
 - Helen Sides: I wouldn't know.

- Scott Cameron: Sheets 14/15 - All sides of building shown in elevation on all floors. But Sanir is correct, it doesn't include renderings.
- Kirt Rieder: The renderings are crucial to securing permits. So why are they eliminated from the permit set? Basis for permitting is jettisoned.
- Elena Eimert: Administrative oversight and I will drop them in now.
- Elena Eimert: In the engineering section – the applicant has accepted this slate of conditions.
- Elena Eimert: Changes in as-built section reflect a language preference by the Engineering Department in moving away from approved by to accepted by the Engineering Department in some sections.
Kirt Rieder: Does acceptance come with a written signature? Or how is that different than an approval.
 - Elena Eimert: Not what accompanies it, but more so that Engineering isn't offering a value judgement associated with their review.
 - Kirt Rieder: How does Mr. Grover feel about language making things satisfactorily resolved and not impermanent. When the Planning Board approves something, we think it is resolved and accepted in the way.
 - Elena Eimert: Not a process change, just language change. Attorney Grover and other applicants have had as much certainty as they will moving forward. And to alert everyone, found the architectural drawing in the submittal package and will add them into the plan sheets
- Kirt Rieder: No blasting given proximity to the water?
 - Scott Cameron: none anticipated.

Motion to accept as revised made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Tom Furey, and passes in an 8-0 roll call vote.

Tom Furey	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Todd Waller	Yes
Sarah Tarbet	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Zach Caunter	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Gris et	Yes

C. Location: 38 Norman Street (Map 26, Lot 0464)

Applicant: Christina Granese f/b/o 38 Norman Street LLC

Description: A continuance of a public hearing for all persons interested In the application of CHRISTINA GRANESE f/b/o 38 Norman Street LLC for the property located at 38 Norman Street (Map 26, Lot 0464) in the B5 Zoning District for Site Plan Review in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 9.5 Site Plan Review and 7.3 Planned Unit

Development Special Permit. The applicant specifically proposes to construct a four-story mixed-use building with approximately 1,583 square feet of retail space on the first floor and 1,419 square feet of related commercial space in the basement and 20 residential units above the retail space. The proposed work includes razing any existing buildings and improvements, construction of the new building, and pavement.

This item was heard fifth.

- Scott Grover representing applicant. Applicant is Kinvarra Capital. They have a POS to purchase the property. Bryan Whittig, Matt Boer (principals), Scott Cameron (civil engineer), Phill Sima (architect, Balance Architects) Bob Michaud (traffic, MDM Transportation)
- Scott Cameron: This is in a similar posture of the last one. We presented the most recent changes at the last meeting with comments from Planning Board, as well as Design Review Board (DRB) & Salem Redevelopment Authority (SRA). Pleased to tell you that the SRA voted to approve this project unanimously. We don't have anything new to present but have a draft decision and the full team here to answer questions.
- Bill Grisct: Planning Board questions or comments?
- Sarah Tarbet: Were we going to review an alternate or proposed concrete ramp on accessibility and maintenance of corner of Crombie and Norman?
 - Attorney Grover: We have accepted a condition relating to this, Elena...
 - Elena Eimert: Couple of conditions related to ramps. Sarah is referring to City Engineering department's preference for curb materials and what they would like to see on the site. What has been proposed is a brick curb from ramp to entry of building from Crombie Street to Norman Street. Currently brick ramp with cast iron tactile pads. Engineering prefers concrete ramp with brick ribbon and a composite tactile pad in brick red. The city feels one they take responsibility for this corner, concrete and composite have greater longevity and lower cost. But the brick and cast-iron design came from the preference of the board. I believe Scott was referring to condition in state code needs to be installed on reciprocal ramps as well.
 - Kirt Rieder: I defer to what the city would like in most cases but object to a polymer pad having greater longevity than cast iron. 1 season of snow plowing can destroy polymer material. It is dirt cheap compared to cast iron.
 - Bill Grisct: I agree. We see the plates downtown every day. Cast iron lasts forever, the plastic plates are cracked and broken. And a tripping hazard.

- Kirt Rieder: I must speak that polymer is trashy. I defer to city in terms of...7.5% slope. Is that relative to just this area?
 - Elena Eimert: I believe it is relative to driveway entrance. It is just an error on the plan street.
 - Kirt Rieder: I have no problem with that. I flagged it in the decision because I had no idea what it was talking about.
 - There is a back-and-forth discussion between Elena Eimert and Kirt Rieder on brick ribbon design/ramp design.
 - Kirt Rieder: Visual disconnect between what the applicant was told to go with and what this image show. Is this specific to this project
 - Elena Eimert: This is just meant to show brick ribbon at the corner, not meant to suggest that this is what the transition ramp on Crombie street would look like, illustrative purposes only.
 - Kirt Rieder: Don't want to be at odds with city on accessibility. If the preference is for concrete in that zone and brick everywhere else, then fine. I believe still that cast iron is the way to go.
 - Helen Sides: Could that cast iron be inserted in same method as the sketch? Because the drawing shows two pieces.
 - Kirt Rieder: We can go further than that. This drawing shows a continuous radius. Manufacturer provides cast iron or polymer with radius edges so you can match the panel to the curb of any street corner.
 - Helen Sides: Is it real brick that the city proposes as the perimeter.
 - Kirt Rieder: The City of Salem has used the standard city hall paver in the past
 - Helen Sides: Can you clarify Elena?
 - Elena Eimert: That wasn't clarified with my conversation with Engineering but what Kirt referenced is what I understand as standard.
 - Helen Sides: It would need to be real brick since it transitions to brick sidewalk
 - Kirt Rieder: The city hall paver is wire cut rather than molded.
 - Kirt Rieder: Is this a directive or recommendation from the City?
 - Elena Eimert: A recommendation, up to the discretion of planning board. I have the draft language drafted in a side sheet and we can elaborate on this in the decision
-
- Helen Sides: This project has progressed smoothly, successfully, and cooperatively. They have worked hard to get to a place that I am pleased with.
 - Tom Furey: This neighborhood has come a long way. The neighborhood will be enhanced by the project. Appreciate all the work.

Public Comment:

2 written comments: Chris Drucas, counsel to two abutters, rec'd April 5 and April 12

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

Scott Grover, counsel to the applicants, rec'd April 12

Pamela Zombeck, 19 Gedney Street

- Still very concerned with parking and traffic. View of intersection from home and its gridlocked many times during the day. How is this going to work with restaurant deliveries, parking? How will I cross or bike? More traffic, less parking. There is already insufficient parking. Very concerned with 40 units yielding 60-80 cars. I don't understand how this is going to work and the impact on both sides.
- Ryan Wittig: It is a 20-unit project may change the perspective. Residing parking no more impactful than the current use. And there is a public lot on Crombie Street that restaurant guests can use.

Ana Gordan, 12 Crombie Street

- Happy that a lot is going to be improved but concerned with design. Building elevations: 2nd roof level, 57' what is this referring to?
- Loss of natural daylight biggest concern. Has spoken about this in previous meetings. Did own shadow study. 4 time a year (solstices and equinoxes). What it shows 18, 16, 15 adversely affected, particularly in the winter. 18 and 16 (especially 18) will lose a lot of natural light regardless of height of building. No. 15 losing afternoon light. No. 16 has roof mounted solar panels, but the winter study shows that the shadow will hit in the afternoon in the winter.
- Wanted to add but didn't have time to model the stair head houses on the roof which would cast additional shadows.
- The impact of sunlight would affect planting, etc. renderings nice, but don't show loss of daylight.

Attorney Chris Drucas, 81 Washington Street

Represents Roberta Hussey and Dick Willis (18 & 16 Crombie Street)

- Want to talk about Site Plan special permit. It's important to point out that this structure is attractive, however not in keeping in architectural styles of the neighbors and not a positive effect on immediate abutters. We keep hearing that buildings in the area and under the bylaw can be higher. Irrelevant. It's what's appropriate to the site. This structure and uses are not appropriate for the site - they cause my clients direct harm. Not just financial loss and loss of sunlight, but their own wellbeing in the winter months. It's not like there aren't other uses. Wrong project for this site. Urge you to deny both special permits

Motion to close the public hearing made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Carole Hamilton and passes in an 8-0 roll call vote.

Tom Furey	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Todd Waller	Yes

Sarah Tarbet	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Zach Caunter	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Griset	Yes

- Kirt Rieder: before we go to look at the final decision, I would like to share my screen and go back to the topic of brick and tactile pavers. Screen shows the roundabout and the granite edge on the brick curbs on the roundabout.
 - Scott Cameron: This is a Boston Electric and Light manhole, and it is a vault on that corner and will have to be dealt with.
 - Kirt Rieder: Meaning it will cause the ADA to shift up Crombie Street
 - Scott Cameron: We may have to reset the manhole or set a handicap friendly cover. The vault is not moving though.
 - Kirt Rieder: Recently installed cast iron tactile pads at MIT. I remain steadfast with going with cast iron. In terms of the manhole, I yield to Mr. Cameron.
 - Scott Cameron: There is brick and concrete over vault now. It's not quite handicap compliant. Resetting the curb. A lot of excavation and exploration to do before we can say how we will build this. No matter what, we need 4 inches of depth on top of a stable base.
 - Kirt Rieder: I'm game to go all in on the brick if the majority of the board agrees
 - Sarah Tarbet: I would advocate for concrete. I do know that for accessibility and maintenance, the concrete will last longer.
 - Kirt Rieder: I can't say one way or another. Heavy loads can destroy the concrete. I believe the city has a reason in terms of visibility for concrete. But the end of Chestnut Street is exclusively brick and it is fantastic.
 - Todd Waller: I'm a proponent of brick over concrete. Less manpower to repair. I have also used cast iron and polymer plates. Regarding ADA settings: cast iron blends in with a brick setting as it wears; concrete and polymer you see a contrast in color.
- Scott Cameron: The applicant is Kinvarra Capital, correct the application from Christina Granese.
 - Bill Griset: How do we handle that?
 - Elena Eimert: That is how it was noticed to the public and in the agenda. Will check with Amanda Chiancola on this.
 - Bill Griset: I'm sure there is language we can put in place.Attorney Grover: It was a function of the online portal – Christina

Granese is the attorney that filed out application. Kinvarra is the applicant all along.

- Attorney Grover: It will be helpful to add Kinvarra in decision. 38 Norman Street LLC is actual property owner.

Changes to Draft Decision discussed and made. Home v. Houses conversation (dwellings/residences). Conversation on concrete v. brick. Norman is concrete and Crombie is brick (don't want concrete to extend west of doorway to the building)

Kirt Rieder and Scott Cameron discuss brick sidewalk graphic. There are constraints per city ordinance on bisecting the tactile panels. The plans as proposed show a cast iron panel, but it will be specified as there has been extensive discussion. Raw cast iron should be used, untreated and will bleed then stabilize and patina.

- Carole Hamilton requests that the section (b.5) on trash/recycling doesn't impact bike or vehicular flow be read out.
 - Elena Eimert: This will go through Traffic and Parking, but the Planning Board keeps things together until that review.
 - Kirt Rieder: This board said we do not want a border striped on the street.
 - Elena Eimert: Traffic and Parking is not happy with what the team has brought forward in terms of sharing bike lane with vehicular traffic right before the roundabout
 - Kirt Rieder: Then the language will be sorted out on the technical end away from this board.

At 8:28 pm, Elena Eimert has technical difficulties – cannot interface with zoom.

At 8:33 pm, Kirt Rieder shared his word document on screen and the discussion continued.

- Discussion includes HVAC on roof being shielded from view. It will be screened and set in the middle of the roof.

At 8:38, Elena Eimert is back but Amanda Chiancola had to sign in as host.

Motion to approve the decision made by Helen Sides, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and passes in an 8-0 roll call vote.

Tom Furey	Yes
Todd Waller	Yes
Sarah Tarbet	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Bill Griset	Yes

Kirt Rieder	Yes
Zach Caunter	Yes

- D. Location: 73 Lafayette Street (Map 34, Lot 430), 75 Lafayette Street (Map 34, Lot 431), 85 & 87 Lafayette Street (Map 34, Lot 432), 89 Lafayette Street (Map 34, Lot 433), and 9 Peabody Street (Map 34, Lot 232)

Applicant: North Shore Community Development Corporation (NSCDC) & North Shore Community Health Center (NSCHC)

Description: A continuance of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of NORTH SHORE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORP (NSCDC) and NORTH SHORE COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER (NSCHC) for the property located at 73 Lafayette Street (Map 34, Lot 430), 75 Lafayette Street (Map 34, Lot 431), 85 & 87 Lafayette Street (Map 34, Lot 432), 89 Lafayette Street (Map 34, Lot 433), and 9 Peabody Street (Map 34, Lot 232) for a Site Plan Review, Planned Unit Development special permit, and Flood Hazard Overlay District special permit for a project in the Entrance Corridor Overlay District in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 9.5 Site Plan Review; Section 7.3 Planned Unit Development; Section 8.1 Flood Hazard Overlay District.

Specifically, the applicant proposes a project that will consist of three buildings, two of which will occupy the corner at Lafayette and Derby, and a third at the nearby site at 9 Peabody. At 73 Lafayette Street the applicant proposes a 6-story mixed-use building with commercial space on street level. Along Derby Street, the applicant proposes a new approximately 41,500 sf community health clinic. The applicant proposes that North Shore Bank will remain in its current ground floor location. Along Lafayette Street there will be 50 units in approximately 48,200 sf of age-restricted affordable housing with commercial storefront, resident lounge, pharmacy, urgent care, and art gallery space. At 9 Peabody Street the applicant proposes an approximately 38,300 sf arts and non-profit space, as well as 6 residential units.

Revised Project Description: The above properties will be purchased by a collaborative joint venture between NSCDC and NSCH. Specifically, the applicant proposes a project that will consist of three buildings, two of which will occupy the corner at Lafayette and Derby, and a third at the nearby site at 9 Peabody. At 73 Lafayette Street the applicant proposes a 6-story mixed-use building with commercial space on street level. Along Derby Street, the applicant proposes a new approximately 41,500 sf community health clinic. The applicant proposes that North Shore Bank will remain in its current ground floor location. Along Lafayette Street there will be 18 units of age-restricted affordable housing, 6 compact studios and support for artists, with commercial storefront, resident lounge, pharmacy, urgent care, and art gallery space. At 9 Peabody Street in lieu of the original approximately 38,300 sf arts and non-profit space, as well as 6 residential units, they are now proposing 29

units of age-restricted affordable housing, 2 micro-commercial storefronts, parking, and an art gallery. All buildings have been reduced in massing.

This item was heard first.

- Attorney Scott Grover representing the applicant. Hoped to discuss the engineering peer review. Last meeting was mostly traffic peer review. We are waiting for the civil and structural peer review letter from the city's consultant, Woodward & Curran. It's a much more extensive peer review than usual as it was extended to cover the culvert running beneath the building, it is developing slowly. Asking the board to extend to May 19, 2022, to get Woodward & Curran to get their report done and for the applicant to prepare their response.
- Bill Grisct: Are we likely to get what Attorney Grover needs in sufficient time for the May 19.
 - Elena Eimert: At the very least, the first turn of the memo from Woodward and Curran should be available. It could be that the traffic peer review is complete by this time. We think it is sufficient time to hammer out these issues.
- Bill Grisct: Questions or comments for the applicant? Or a motion?

A motion to continue to May 19, 2022, is made by Carole Hamilton, seconded by Helen Sides and passes 8-0 in a roll call vote.

Tom Furey	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Todd Waller	Yes
Sarah Tarbet	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Zach Caunter	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Grisct	Yes

E. Location: 5 Broad Street (Map 25, Lot 0546)

Applicant: Charing Cross Realty Trust

Description: A public hearing for all persons interested in the application of CHARING CROSS REALTY TRUST for the property located at 5 Broad Street (Map 25, Lot 0546) for a Site Plan Review and Municipal or Religious Reuse Special Permit in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 9.5 Site Plan Review and Section 6.11 Municipal or Religious Reuse Special Permit. The applicant specifically proposes conversion of the former City of Salem Council on Aging building to 16 new residential units. This involves the interior

demolition and renovation of the existing 3-story building. The new work shall include but not limited to new framing, electrical, mechanical systems, structural systems, interior partitions and finishes throughout. This item was heard sixth.

Exterior work to the building will include windows, roofing, trim, re-pointing and sealing of existing brick facade. Associated improvements will be made to the parking lots, site access, utilities, and landscaping. Applicant proposes 28 parking spots for the residential units.

Bill Luster and Peter Pitman of Pitman & Wardley.

- Bill Luster: Charing Cross won the 5 Broad Street bid in 2019. The SRA asked if we would be willing to double our bid to meet the appraised value per city ordinance. We increased from 12 to 16 units, building individual units in the lower level. The city gave us access to the HDIP program. Then we waited a year for the zoning district to be approved. Then we had to discuss with 1 and 3 Broad Street to obtain easements in back. 1 Broad Street couldn't come to an agreement. Peter Pitman will run you through the plan tonight. We will have an engineering review when we next come before the board. There are 11 2-bedrooms and 5 1-bedrooms. We have 27 parking spaces. 24 required by zoning ordinance and the balance are compact car spaces. I wanted to shield the parking lot from passersby with a fence and try to divert attention back to the building.
- Peter Pitman: Before we go into the site plan, I want to call attention to the cupola. We are going to maintain the cupola and restore it. We got conditional approval from historic last month. A few minor details Historical Commission asked to change.
- Peter Pitman: Existing site plan. Long noncompliant ramp into the basement. Flooding is occurring from this ramp to the door. Not intact conduits or drainage systems on site. Will address that. And a large asphalt parking lot. The easement is across the back. They currently use that in both directions. The proposed plan of redoing bricks from sidewalk to front door. Replacing long ramp to 2 walkouts to basement units. We are going to do brick inlay across the easement for traffic calming. Window wells required to make basement units able to be occupied by having egress windows for light and ventilation. Big feature is that we make our accessible entrance. We do have bike racks. And a subsurface draining system. And residential parking. One compact parking space will be for a fenced in trash/recycling area. This will be picked up multiple times a week. There will be

greenspace available. Neighbors want lighting on sidewalks. Lots of sketchy things happen in this lot in the dead of night. Edge of sidewalk .5 - 1 foot candle. We bleed a little into the cemetery. Jim Emmanuel is the landscape architect, and he has prepared the drawing and planting list. And is working with the civil engineer and us for appropriate plantings. Dormers in front of building not original, added late 19th century. Added to make use of the attic space. Will restore balustrade around the roof and use it to mask mechanical equipment. We have maintained brownstone archway but removing granite steps and bringing the entrance on grade. This was all reviewed and approved by Historic. Taking original dormers and bringing them back 4 feet. Very little natural light in attic or ability to have code compliant egress windows and this makes it habitable. The Historical Commission asked for refined trim detail. We are proposing to reuse existing windows. Going to do a test – there a concern on the massiveness of the windows. May be inoperable and energy efficient. The Historical Commission wants a 4-panel door instead of single. Parking lot entrance bricked in with commercial vision panel metal door. Will make accessible route here. There is damage from vents over the years and the bricks will be restored.

- Bill Grisette: We are sticking to 20 minutes per presentation. This is a volunteer board, and we are 2.5 hours in.
- Peter Pittman: Small doghouse dormer. Maintained one but expand others for attic access. We are restoring granite staircase and uncover it and restore it. Will hold off on interior unless there are specific questions.

Planning Board questions:

- Helen Sides: Thrilled to see this happening. Waiting forever. So excited. I believe the fence in front of parking lot should be black iron, not white picket. Provides barrier but compliments the graveyard.
 - Peter Pitman: Greatly appreciated. Working with cemetery in restoration of fence.
- Bill Luster: We committed to donate to the cemetery commission in our proposal. No formal discussions yet.
- Zach Caunter: Echoes Helen on how exciting and attractive this project is. Wondering is about the sidewalk – it has a concrete sidewalk. Surrounding properties are all brick. Any plans to update this and bring it into cohesion.

- Bill Luster: As we were hastily figuring out cost between concrete and brick, I would like to think about this, we'd like to accommodate, but need to run costs out.
 - Bill Grisette: Agrees with Helen on the project. Appreciates the willingness to see about brick.
- Kirt Rieder: Echoes Helen and Zach on the fence. Snow removal will destroy a picket fence. Need you talk more in the future about tree removal, and how you have or will coordinate with the tree warden. Not a fan of pretend historic light fixture. The width of sidewalk - city sidewalk of 7 ft with granite curbing. How could you put in smaller street trees along the long frontage? Thrilled you are getting rid of ramp. Are you putting stairs back in?
 - Peter Pitman: Remnants of stairs are visible. We believe they are under there. Remove ramp, expose what's there, and hope to get lucky and clean and repurpose. If destroyed, damaged, or removed, we will use the ones from the side of the building.
 - Kirt Rieder: Bummed about stair removal. Will there be an internal lift? (yes)
 - Kirt Rieder: Solitary space off Broad Street – where the proposed stairs down, is there a wheel stop at the top of that step? Seems odd. But an errant wheel stop, actual granite columns.
 - Peter Pittman: For Kirt Rieder, if you have a recommendation for light fixture, happy to receive it and present to ownership.
- Sarah Tarbet: We have been focusing on mechanical units, are they showing on rendering but not visible or not showing yet.
 - Peter Pitman: Both. We have a roof plan that lays them out – they are further recessed.
 - Sarah Tarbet: There are a couple of vents shown on façade, are they staying? Are there additional vents you will need to add?
 - Peter Pitman: Vents are scheduled to stay. The Historical Commission asked for vents in pilasters being restored. Most everything is scheduled to be electric. We are looking to minimize wall penetrations through the wall and will try to bring them up through the balustrades. We will try and hide them in the cornice or the roof or use existing vents.
 - Bill Luster: We will review with the Historical Commission.
 - Helen Sides: Consider induction cooktops and not gas
 - Bill Luster: Peter is wanting to get away from gas ranges. Induction or high-end electric are acceptable now.

- Sarah Tarbet: Accessible parking; are you planning to put any indicator or crosswalk from accessible space to the accessible entry? To give it more ...
 - Bill Luster: Like a paving change?
 - Sarah Tarbet: How will this be addressed?
 - Bill Luster: We will bring something back.

Public Comment:

Kimberly Lord of Leslie Management, managing agent for 1 Broad Street submitted a written comment available in the SharePoint folder.

Linda and Tim Jenkins, 18 Broad Street

Comments about brick sidewalk – sure hope you can find a way.

- Elena Eimert: This board is asked to refer to the DRB for the review because of this is a use of the Municipal or Religious Reuse special permit.

Motion to refer the project to the Design Review Board made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Helen Sides and passes in an 8-0 roll call vote

Tom Furey	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Todd Waller	Yes
Sarah Tarbet	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Zach Caunter	Yes
Bill Griset	Yes

Motion made to continue to May 19, 2022, made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and passes in an 8-0 roll call vote

Bill Griset	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Zach Caunter	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Sarah Tarbet	Yes
Todd Waller	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Tom Furey	Yes

- Bill Luster: We have a deadline on our HDIP Application – may need an agreement of # of units on May 19th. The city needs to go to council before application deadline. Will talk to staff about this well in advance.

III. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

A. Update on Witch Hill Subdivision

Description: The applicant will attend to provide an update on the existing conditions, clerk of the work inspections, and a timeline for completion of the project.

- Ken Steadman: Stantec, the Clerk of Works, gave us a punch list last fall and we have planted over 80 trees. Couple of issues: when original plan was approved, it showed trees around the cul-de-sac, but trees ended up on private land. Most homeowners had done plantings and didn't want more trees in their yard. Elena Eimert and Amanda Chiancola and I spoke with Bob LeBlanc and found areas on the subdivision that weren't on private property and part of the open spaces, like the entrance to the walking path. Sketch done with the locations approved by the Tree Warden. The walking paths are enhanced. Trees will be planted next week. Elena got comments from Engineering Department – we have to move a few of the water gates – some in lawns of houses. They will relocate to the sidewalk area. Everything else is basically complete and will do a final walk through with Elena Eimert and Bob LeBlanc to approve the new trees once they are planted. Any questions?

B. 16, 18, 20R Franklin - Extension request This item was heard first.

- Attorney Joe Correnti: 6-month request on behalf of Juniper Point Investment Company for Ferris Junkyard property. This is for all the permits coming up in the next month or so. The request is to allow us to continue and finish state permitting. MEPA process completed with final environmental report certificate issued. Chapter 91 license application is months in process and public hearing was last month. Hope that certificate is issued this summer. Working with DEP on a superseding order of conditions. Appeal taken by DEP to ensure coastal bank issues are sorted. Hope to issue superseding order in the next month or two. Hoping this is the last request for extension. We are requesting an extension 6 months from the end date of the current permits.
- Elena Eimert: That brings its expiration to November 21, 2022.

A motion to extend to November 21, 2022, is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Tom Furey and passes 8-0 in a roll call vote.

- Helen Sides: Is this the Derby Project?
- Bill Grisct: No, Ferris Junkyard

Tom Furey	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Todd Waller	Yes
Sarah Tarbet	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Zach Caunter	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Grisct	Yes

C. Deliberate and vote on a recommendation to the City Council on a Zoning Ordinance Amendment relative to Bridge Street Neck Overlay District

- Elena Eimert: This item was covered in Joint Public Hearing last night. Referred to this body to issue a recommendation back to Council. I have the draft letter ready for edits. Amanda Chiancola is on the call if there are any board questions
- Bill Grisct: Thank you, please share the letter.
- Elena Eimert: this is the standard form; we can try line edits, but it is a lengthy ordinance.
- Helen Sides: Don't need ordinance shared Amanda can answer questions.
- Zach Caunter: Can you put up the map of the overlay?
- Bill Grisct: I attended the meeting. It was a thorough job done by the Planning Department.
- Zach Caunter: It seems from the ordinance that Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) are categorically banned throughout the overlay. Is that by design? Are we not looking to put large multifamily at the Clipper Ship?
 - Amanda Chiancola: There are 2 or 3 parcels where PUD would be allowed with the underlying zoning district. The Clipper Ship was the transformative parcel. Comments from residents were: would prefer for the PUDs to go through the ordinance. We want the standards and guidelines carry though. Okay to have the PUD but done through ordinance. Maximum 90 units on that site (Clipper Ship) but could you actually get 90? Not saying you can have a large-scale development, just that if PUDs are not allowed then you have to go through the design standards.

- Zach Caunter: My understanding was that PUDs were not allowed in overlay district.
 - Amanda Chiancola: In August, we allowed it, but feedback was that they didn't want PUDs.
- Helen Sides: I am opposed to design guidelines in a zoning ordinance. This is not appropriate for Planning Department to review. We can see by looking on Bridge Street that the design elements are poorly done, disappointed in that. This is a dangerous precedent. Where the muffler place was is a good example of good design. And putting restrictions on a potential interesting project (Clipper Ship) makes no sense. It is appropriate to form a historic district and that is where the control should be. The people in the neighborhoods should be held to the same standards, if you live there already, you should be susceptible to the same rules as the new people. Makes the future follow what you want at this point and time
 - Sarah Tarbet: It is worrisome to me too. They seem strict and it may make the neighborhood static and homogeneous. It's hard to write design standards to retain character of the neighborhood. Every construction project over 2000 sq ft would go before Planning Board and DRB?
 - Amanda Chiancola: Every project subject to Bridge Street Neck Overlay District. It depends on the use. Conforming use to conforming then underlying district likely to be chosen. But nonconforming to conforming in BSNOD, then it requires Planning Board and DRB review. If a property owner has a conforming use in zoning ordinance and a conforming use in BSNO, then they will likely choose the path of least resistance and just pull a building permit.
 - Sarah Tarbet: If its conforming to conforming, not subject to the Bridges Street Neck design standard.
 - Amanda Chiancola: Or nonconforming going to conforming.
 - Sarah Tarbet: I would advocate to remove that requirement and have everything go before a board. Design standards seem too restrictive. And facade improvement are worth a review by the DRB. If everything comes before the boards its less scary.
- Sarah Tarbet: About density. Minimum density – I think it's not dense enough, what being proposed as the maximum – 1700 sq ft/dwelling. This neighborhood needs more flexibility, future proofing. That maximum restricts what could be in the future.

- Kirt Rieder: Amanda, can you give us compare and contrast between NRCC and this?
 - Amanda Chiancola: The North River Canal Corridor Overlay District is a district in itself, not an overlay so you have to use that. It also has some use special permits. There are not standards, just guidelines. Bridge Street Neck didn't like guidelines, they wanted more structure. The issue is that we can't require certain materials in a zoning ordinance. But you can add them as guidelines
 - Kirt Rieder: That's subjective. I loved everything but I am left worried that it becomes too prescriptive/paint-by-numbers. We've seen that with some of the projects. I don't know how to get around that other than listening to Sarah – 2000 sq. ft threshold improved by 1000 sq. ft. threshold. How can we capture more for a board review?
- Kirt Rieder: Substitute hedging for shrubbery.
- Helen Sides: The other thing is that I wonder if this is attached. Idea that projects need to be streamlined. Is this an effort to make things move faster? It's not us that are slowing the process – it's the applicants. I also was on the original review for Bridge Street in 2009. It had to do with a lot of neighborhood opposition. There should be greater density possible as there should be all over the city. I don't think design guidelines belong in zoning and I wonder if other towns have that. Wellesley reviews every building built in their downtown.
 - Kirt Rieder: Outside of Massachusetts, it is the perception that the Planning Board that are the impediment to development.
 - Bill Griset: Helen, what would you have us do in our City Council recommendation?
 - Helen Sides: I can't approve the design guidelines written into zoning or handled through a city department. The overlay district is fabulous and needs to happen and grateful that it is almost there. I can't agree with it.
 - Bill Griset: it's the design guidelines that you have a problem.
 - Kirt Rieder: Standard or guidelines?
 - Helen Sides: Guidelines are fine, standards are not.Kirt Rieder and Todd Waller concur with Sarah Tarbet and Helen Sides.
 - Bill Griset: Where do we go with that?
 - Sarah Tarbet: all projects come before the board? Standards are there but if the project needs criteria in a different way, we can say it is acceptable. Would this eliminate unintentional consequences? Combination Planning Board and DRB

- Helen Sides: It connects to entrance corridor where we had to decide that anything over six units and excluding anything under 6 units and under 10000 sq. ft. We wished that we could have done something about the small buildings that matter in the Entrance Corridors. Options are historic districts or design review. We have those boards
- Bill Griset: Would you have them all go DRB?
- Helen Sides: I can't construct language to make that happen or if it is possible to make it happen that way.
- Bill Griset: How do we deal with our obligation to make a recommendation to City Council?
- Amanda Chiancola: Planning Board recommends striking administrative plan review. Design standards – do you want to strike or to move to those into guidelines?
- Helen Sides: I would be more accepting of guidelines if that helps not kill the ordinance. I think it's very important.
- Bill Griset: We agree to strike Administrative Review.
- Amanda Chiancola: What would you like to do with the design standards (8.7.3)
- Helen Sides: What do others think for substituting guidelines for standards. I don't want to kill this but its more comfortable as guidelines. This is more prescriptive than it should be but maybe that is a concession to the neighborhood.
- Carole Hamilton: We should shift to guidelines. I think the rational is that as design evolves, you have to go through a change to the ordinance to have it reflected in the district. I don't think the neighborhood realizes that.
- Bill Griset: Guidelines to me don't necessarily differ from standards like they do for others.
- Helen Sides: If you look at the Historical Commission booklet or the historic districts, there are standards. You are looking for that here. But it's appropriate for a historic district and Historical Commission enforces those things. I don't know why we don't have more historic districts.
- Tom Furey: I disagree. I don't think Historic District is right for this neighborhood. I think you're killing a whole process that the neighborhood wants. This is time to set the guidelines and standards.
- Kirt Rieder: That may be true, but micromanagement is missing the obvious, standards prescribe what people can and cannot do and undermining your argument
- Bill Griset: Helen is working not to kill this. This is terrific discussion. How do we make our recommendation?

- Helen Sides: Maybe its splitting hairs guidelines v. standards, but it exists in the NRCC as guidelines, I say we call it guidelines not standards.
 - Amanda Chiancola: Its broad enough, but I understand the intent.
 - Kirt Rieder: Does it make sense to add recommended guidelines. My goal is removing 9 different interpretations.
 - Amanda Chiancola: Guidelines are advisory in nature in ordinance.
 - Carole Hamilton: Should we include reasoning for why we want to do this? Are you working with Council to explain why we are making this recommendations?
 - Amanda Chiancola: it think it is helpful to have Planning Board provide language and not misrepresent the conversation.
 - Carole Hamilton: We should be upfront about being in favor of what is proposed but we have a couple of reservations around standards to guidelines. Any change to those standards requires an amendment to the ordinance. Guidelines give the reviewing board some latitude.
 - Kirt Rieder: For the tree manual, we keep the nitty gritty out so it's a living document.
 - Carole Hamilton: We try to do that with zoning too. So, we don't have to go back every time there is a minor change.
 - Amanda Chiancola: The neighborhood wanted the guidelines in the zoning ordinance.
- Kirt Rieder: Isn't Bridge Street part of the entrance corridor. It already triggers review. You have underlying zoning, Entrance Corridor Overlay and adding a second overlay? Is that the only place that occurs?
 - Amanda Chiancola: Yes. But in this overlay, the applicant can choose Bridge Street Neck Overlay District instead of the ECOD standards. These standards take precedence. It says this in section 8.7.3. Site plan review kick in is different. BSNOD 2000 gross sq. ft. residential and commercial. ECOD it is 6 units or more or 2000 sq. ft. of commercial. BSNOD catches a lower residential count.
 - Amanda Chiancola: Could you discuss the Planned Unit Development again? Should it be removed from the use table and allowed in the underlying district.
 - Helen Sides: Why are they fearful of PUDs?
 - Zach Caunter: That's my question too. I feel like more homes can be built there.

- Amanda Chiancola: The fear is that the project will go to land use boards and not follow the standards the neighborhood has requested.
 - Kirt Rieder: So a one size fits all PUD on Bridge Street would be same as on Highland Avenue.
 - Helen Sides: What does the establishment of something like that do to the whole city?
 - Kirt Rieder: Then a declarative statement “Our concern is xxx”
- Helen Sides: We need to be open in our language. I think that the key things are guidelines, and we remove the planning department review. And another clarification on the density. 1700 sq. ft. lot – there could be many more units in that size building. Not dense enough yet. Most people see density as about car, but we can work with that.
 - Sarah Tarbet: This is prohibitive for affordability as well
 - Zach Caunter: Density creates walkable neighborhoods.
 - Carole Hamilton: That was part of the goal – a walkable neighborhood and they are undermining this.
 - Amanda Chiancola; we started at 15 units/ acres. First meeting – no denser. Second meeting wanted denser. So we have been trying to find the midpoint. So that is how we found 1700 sq. ft. This will be the densest area in the city.
- Bill Grisct: Under PUD, what do we want to say? The Planning Board does not recommend prohibiting PUD.
 - Kirt Rieder: What’s our rationale?
 - Bill Grisct: Do we need a rationale?
 - Kirt Rieder: If they don’t understand our thinking, it is easier to discard. It is unnecessarily restrictive to the few parcels eligible for PUD.

Conversation on the positiveness of the development of Rantoul Street.

- Amanda Chiancola: Would the Planning Board opine on DRB recommendation? The DRB recommendation is a recommendation but requires a positive recommendation when there is a design waiver special permit. Without design standards, a design waiver special permit is nonapplicable so it would be helpful on how you want DRB involved. Do you agree that DRB should review all projects and if you so, does it have to be a positive recommendation?
 - Kirt Rieder: Recommendation as in what DRBs conclusion is or someone recommending it should go to DRB?
 - Amanda Chiancola: Recommendation and conclusion.

- Kirt Rieder: You think the DRB need a positive recommendation as opposed to just a recommendation that can be shelved?
 - Amanda Chiancola: The ordinance was written so that we need a positive recommendation if there is a design waiver special permit, but the board is recommending not to have standards, just guidelines. How does the board want to proceed with DRB. Do you agree that DRB must review all projects? Do you want a recommendation or a positive recommendation
 - Bill Grisette: Is the recommendation binding?
 - Amanda Chiancola: Correct, so under everywhere else in the city, the DRB provides a recommendation that is just a recommendation but Planning Board doesn't need to accept it.
 - Helen Sides: They would positively approve the diversion from standards.
 - Bill Griset: Everywhere else it is a recommendation. Why would we go beyond the norm?
 - Helen Sides: I think we stick with recommendation. That is the role of the DRB. Though I have thought the DRB needs more tooth, this isn't how to do it.
 - Amanda Chiancola: If it is not in council recommendation, I just needed to know that going forward.
- Elena Eimert: Interest in adding an additional sentence on density? It's a little sparse right now.

Discussion on amping up the language on density and the true meaning of 1700 sq. ft. lots, etc. Changes made.
Further discussion on changes.

A motion that City Council approve the ordinance with the discussed recommendations and edits, is made by Carole Hamilton, seconded by Helen Sides and passes 7-1 in a roll call vote.

Roll Call:

Bill Griset	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Zach Caunter	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Sarah Tarbet	Yes
Todd Waller	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Tom Furey	No

D. Deliberate and vote on a recommendation to the City Council on a Zoning Ordinance Amendment relative to ECOD Language

- Elena Eimert: This was an item was jointly filed by the Planning Board with Councilor Cohen. This amends language in section 8.2 of the zoning ordinance allowing for flexibility for developers for planting plans while providing a shade canopy and some dimensional changes for healthy planting.
- Kirt Rieder: No further editorial ready for a vote.
- Elena Eimert: Comment received by board member proposed to strike some language in purpose and add other language.
 - Kirt Rieder: It was a request to make a declarative sentence.
 - Amanda Chiancola: I have a statement that says “Trees are a crucial component of the entry corridor available in a broad range of species and sizes. Shade trees are preferred for their medium to large canopy width and height for a full range of community benefits identified in the tree ordinance including cooling and stormwater uptake.” And then there was a sentence that didn’t seem necessary.

A motion that City Council approve the ordinance with the discussed recommendations and edits, is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes 8-0 in a roll call vote.

Tom Furey	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Todd Waller	Yes
Sarah Tarbet	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Zach Caunter	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Bill Grisct	Yes

E. Updates from Staff

Elena Eimert: I have 3 quick items:

- 1.) Some of you own me conflict of interest forms.
- 2.) May 25 will see a joint ZBA and Planning Board hearing for Leefort Terrace.
- 3.) Beth Forrestal joins as clerk for Planning Board.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of the March 31, 2022, Regular Planning Board Minutes

This was pushed to a future meeting as the hour was late.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made by Carole Hamilton, seconded by Sarah Tarbet, and passes in an 8-0 roll call vote.

Bill Griset	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Zach Caunter	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Sarah Tarbet	Yes
Todd Waller	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Tom Furey	Yes

Meeting adjourned at 10:37pm.
Approved by the Planning Board on 5/19/2022.