



CITY OF SALEM PLANNING BOARD

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday October 20, 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 6:33 pm

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Bill Griset (Chair), Kirt Rieder (Vice Chair), Tom Furey, Sarah Tarbet, Carole Hamilton, Zach Caunter, Helen Sides, Josh Turiel, Jonathan Berk (9)

Absent: (0)

Also in attendance: Elena Eimert, staff planner, Beth Forrestal

A. Welcome New Planning Board Members

Jonathan Berk: Is a recent transplant to Salem but grew up on the North Shore Works in supporting community led initiatives across the country through crowdfunding with a placemaking lens. An urbanist, with a background as a lawyer.

Josh Turiel: Former City Councilor. Decided that it was important to get back into public service. The Planning Board work has been important to me as a city councilor and happy to contribute to the process now.

Bill Griset: I have never sat on a board of finer and more talented people in my life, so welcome!

II. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Location: 252 Bridge Street (Map 26, Lot 0408 and Map 35, Lot 0024), 32 and 34 Federal Street (Map 35, Lot 621)

Applicant: WinnDevelopment Companies LLC

Description: A continuance of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of WinnDevelopment Companies LLC for the property located at 252 Bridge Street (Map 26, Lot 0408 and Map 35, Lot 0024) 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, 7.3 Planned Unit Development Special Permit, and Section 8.1 Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit and Section 37

of the Salem Code of Ordinances, Stormwater Management Permit. The project will constitute Phase 1 of a two-phase project. Phase 2 will consist of the redevelopment and preservation of the historic County Commissioner's Building and Superior Court Building, located at 32 and 34 Federal Street (Map 35, Lot 621), which will be filed as an amendment at a later date. In Phase 1, the applicant specifically proposes to construct a mixed-use building with parking on the ground level, approximately 11,705 square feet of commercial and amenity space on the first level, and 120 residential units on the floors above. The proposed work includes razing any existing improvements and construction of the new building.

Attorney Joe Correnti is here for the applicants, WinnDevelopment. Along with Kristin Kolick and Ramie Schneider from WinnDevelopment.

- Attorney Correnti: Welcome to the new board members. We previously gave an overview on this project. We talked about Phase 1, The Crescent Lot. Phase 2 is still ongoing behind scenes. We have been busy since September 15 and have an aggressive schedule. On October 18, we were before the Conservation Commission (ConCom). One of the permits we have asked for was the Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit. We are here tonight with the Planning Board and back in front of the DRB next week. This is a joint Salem Redevelopment Authority (SRA)/Planning Board project. The SRA is intimately involved in looking at the site. In the next couple of weeks, we be back in front of the Planning Board, ConCom and Design Review Board (DRB) to pull this all together so that by the end of the year we will be ready to apply for the rounds of historic and federal tax credits, which requires wrap up of some of the permits. Tonight we have two presentations to make. One of the benefits of having a start with the SRA is that the Planning Department has been working closely with us on the ongoing peer reviews. We are currently working with Traffic and Civil Engineering peer reviews. Tonight we are giving you our traffic analysis presentation with Michael Santos of VHB. The peer reviewer is also on the call from HSH. We have gotten our materials to them through the Planning Department and have received our first round of comments. We will address these in future meetings. After, we will do a climate resilience PowerPoint. This is an important topic on properties like the Crescent Lot. If that sounds like a plan, then we can get right into traffic.
- Michel Santos (VHB): VHB are the transportation consultants for project. Will go over transportation elements. Project is a Planned Unit Development (PUD) so parking and loading requirements are established by the Planning Board. There are 120 residential units adjacent to the MBTA. There is 11650 square feet of ground level commercial retail space that is accessed from Bridge Street. There will be 60 parking spaces on site. The current Crescent

Lot has 70 spaces. All 60 parking spaces are for residents. There is no commercial parking. Modal and walkability accessibility. Trip generation will be lower than the existing lot during peak hours (7 am – 9 am and 4 pm – 6 pm). Complimentary to MBTA station as traffic flows are opposite of what is there now. There is enhanced pedestrian and bicycle networking. We are also proposing modifications to the Bridge Street Ramp to North Street to reduce speeds, serve as a new pickup, and drop off area for short term pickups and deliveries, i.e. Uber, Amazon, UPS, GrubHub. The purpose of this study is to quantify transportation metrics like trip generation. How much traffic will this project generate? We are reviewing current transportation conditions – intersections, parking, pedestrian facilities. We are working with project team to refine the site to accommodate the transportation needs of the project. We have adequate room for trash pickup and collection as well. Also, just to confirm, this project can be supported by the existing infrastructure. I expect to have some comments from the peer reviewer to address outstanding items.

Triangular shaped lot. Bridge Street on south side, the MBTA driveway is on the north and west side. Bridge and MBTA driveway primary access. Also adjacent to Bridge Street ramp. The project will create a Bridge Street streetscape – upgraded pedestrian amenities. Currently, access to existing parking lot is off the MBTA driveway. Our access point is closer to the underpass. The MBTA garage can hold 700 cars Main line of Bridge Street is approximately 27310 vehicles per day. And the ramp sees about 12450 vehicles per day.

Very friendly for public transportation. Not just the Newburyport/Rockport line, but also an MBTA bus depot also at the station with routes to Central Square in Lynn, Haymarket in Boston, and Wonderland T Station. There are good connections to downtown Salem. We expect people to be able to walk into town and not need a vehicle. Residents won't need a vehicle. Marked pedestrian crosswalks.

We looked at trip generating characteristics of the project. What this means is that we used data from the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual – a large industry standard database to get a sense of how many vehicles will be going in and out of any development. For this project, we looked at the daily at the 2 commuter peak hours, which are the peaks of the adjacent roadways and the site. This gave us worse case scenarios. We also looked at how people commute in this area, specifically only people who live near the commuter rail station. Expect transit usage to be a little higher. We expect the project to generate 384 trips over day. 30-32

during peak hours. Also showed transit trips and bike trips to get a feel of how many people will be using those.

Did traffic counts at the existing Crescent Lot. 48-hour count just a few weeks ago and we found the existing lot generates 295 trips a day. In the morning, there is heavy movement in and again the opposite at night. Our projected trips are a little greater during the middle of the day where residential generates more over time. The flows are in opposite directions. People using lot now will likely relocate to MBTA garages and our trips will be in the opposite direction of the MBTA garage.

There are two different levels, Bridge Street, and the lower level accessed off MBTA driveway. Bridge Street is the new short-term pickup and delivery area. 200-feet long and can handle 4 passenger vehicles and another 2-3 delivery trucks. Ubers, food delivery, FedEx, UPS, Amazon, etc. This area will be signed appropriately, no long-term parking. The ramp is 28-feet wide. This ramp was originally designed for two lanes but is used as one lane. We will reduce the width, extend the curb line, reduce the pavement markings. Will be upgrading the sidewalks on the Bridge Street ramp. Sidewalk will descend into a pedestrian plaza. Everything on the right side will be a large pedestrian plaza. There will be a ramp that connects Bridge Street to the lower MBTA level, an enhancement of the existing ramp.

The parking level is at the ground level with the MBTA driveway. There are 60 underneath parking spaces. Primary access to these spaces is moved to the MBTA driveway close to the abutment. Regarding the abutment, this was brought up during the peer review. There will be a loading area adjacent to parking garage and the trash room. More for trash/recycling/moving trucks. Use of this space will be scheduled through building management to make sure it is usable. 35-50 feet deep by 15-feet wide loading area, easily accommodating all trucks (including the typical moving truck). There will be an electric vehicle (EV) charging station on site for 4 vehicles. There will be storage for bikes in the garage for residents, it will be accessible to residents only with a key card. Exterior bike racks at lower and upper levels. This exceeds the guidelines put forth in the Salem Bicycle Guideline Manual

Pick up and drop off zone slide shown. Pulling curb southward by 8-feet. The existing conditions are - 11-foot painted areas, 16-foot travel lane, 5-foot shoulder and 10-foot buffer – approximately 28 feet total. But the markings are what are preventing it from being 2 travel lanes, but they get faded out easily. We are proposing extending curb line southward by 8 feet. Short term loading area is 200 feet long. This isn't going to be used for long term

parking or deliveries, primarily to serve the site. Those types of activities are going to happen, and we are trying to deal with it up front.

This project is transit oriented with a trip generation less than the existing use. We will be improving pedestrian facilities as well as the Bridge Street ramp. This will serve to decrease vehicular speed and enhance the pedestrian experience. We are still waiting for the peer reviewer to finish, but we did incorporate some items into this presentation. There are outstanding items we are going back and forth with them. We will have something to report back at the next meeting.

- Bill Griset: I would like to remind the applicants to keep timing in mind.
 - Attorney Correnti: Stephanie's presentation is 12-15 minutes long.
- Stephanie Krueel, Senior Resilience and Regulatory Advisor with VHB: Will identify current and future flood risks and identify resiliency options. We will address current flood risk, future flood risk, and resiliency measures. With the FEMA flood insurance rate models the 1% annual chance of flooding based on basic transect modeling. We wanted to look further and use other modeling to confirm the extent of the floodplain. So we looked at the Massachusetts Coast Flood Risk Model which looks at more items than FEMA models, like wave run-up, overtopping storm surge, winds. In particular it includes Nor'easters. It goes from 1000-year flood event to the annual event. 1% annual chance flood is in the light green on the slight. Mass Coastal Flood model shows that there is a smaller extent of flooding than the FEMA model. Next slide shows depth of flooding The depth of flooding would be 1-3 feet. Now same information for future events including 50 inches of sea level rise about 2013 by year 2070. Most of the site is subject to flooding in a 20-year event. Up to the 5% chance of flooding. The flooding will get deeper by 2030, ranging from 1.5 feet - 4 feet of flooding. In 2050 the extent of flooding gets larger still and subject to flooding from the 2-year flood event with the depth between 3.5 feet - 10 feet. By 2070, most of the site subject to annual flooding with a depth of up to 10 feet. We also wanted to look at tidal flooding, this not looked at as much. This is data from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). It shows elevated sea levels with 1-foot increments of sea level rise, with 1-6 feet of sea level rises modeled. This is what the mean high-water cycle would be. 4-feet of sea level rise is the approximate sea level rise in 2070 that is modeled. It shows us with as little 3-feet of sea level rise there significant impact on the site daily. This extends on to sites all around the project site.

One of the flood paths identified is includes the pedestrian path over the MBTA driveway. And later on with 4 feet it is right over the rail line and driveway and directly onto the site.

We also used information from the Resilient Mass Action Team. This is a requirement for anything going through a MEPA review. We have to look at different elevations of sea level rise, storm surge and extreme precipitation. considers criticality and risk level. It gives us information on projected water surface elevation, wave heights, water surface interaction, etc. It also tells us what the projected 24-hour precipitation depth will be in 2070.

What is involved in planning for resilience. Resiliency doesn't eliminate climate impact or risk. The timing of climate changes is unknown, and scenarios are not set in stone. All models are incorrect, but some are helpful. We have to have flexibility; projects have to be prepared for all futures. Monitoring and evaluation are important. We have to figure out when to implement additional measures. Both the public and private sector have a role to play.

We identified current and future water elevation. These are mean high or high water, meaning the daily higher tide, the highest astronomical high tide, 1% and 2% still water elevations and with wave water action plus existing site grades to inform the elevations of the project. This informed where we located the lobby and first floor elevation and the elevation of the residential units.

View shown looking southeast from the river

8' – elevation of the roadway

19.2' - elevation of the lobby

30' – elevation of the surface of 1st floor of the residential units.

11.2' – this is what we call the offsite protection elevation – this is the 2070 highest astronomical high tide we are expecting with 50 inches of sea level rise. This is where district scale protection solutions will be needed.

Additional resilience measures – landscape elements that can withstand coastal invasion; building elements will need to be wet or dry flood proof; stormwater management to understand future stormwater volumes and quality; operations plan to prepare and manage flood events.

- Attorney Correnti: That concludes our presentation. Happy to answer questions.

Planning Board Questions:

- Kirt Rieder: Stephanie, first question is for you. Can you go to the slide with the 11.2 elevation, I am curious as to why the tip of the arrow goes below the 8-foot elevation, you said it was offsite seaward protection that doesn't exist yet?
 - Stephanie Kruel: It's not pointing out elevation. The idea was to show the location it would need to be, offsite either landward or seaward of the tracks. It is outside project site since we can raise the elevation of the roadway. We could create a berm either landward or seaward of railroad tracks, elevate the seawall, or install longer term district improvements.
- Sarah Tarbet: I heard that those district improvements need to be made. Can we think of anything now that we could contribute to this? Retention or something to better that area, which we know is vulnerable.
 - Stephanie Kruel: Like stormwater retention?
 - Sarah Tarbet: You mentioned that this regional protection should be led by others. What is this project doing?
 - Stephanie Kruel: The exact nature of the protection hasn't been determined. It is best if this is done at a municipal level as it involves multiple property owners. This is an offsite improvement needed in the future. Nothing we are proposing would preclude district scale of flood protection.
- Jonathan Berk: Regarding bike access... how is bike parking in back of site accessed?
 - Michael Santos: Two places, the room in the garage is keyed for residents only. Not sure how it will work but will be with key card/key or some other component. There will be racks for visitors to lock bikes up. They will access from street.
 - Ramie Schneider: Residents with registered bikes can access bikes internally and externally from the garage room with a fob.
 - Jonathan Berk: How will someone from Bridge Street get down to the parking grade?
 - Ramie Schneider: There is a large shared used path at a bike friendly grade. This is both universally accessible and bike accessible.
 - Kirt Rieder: To nitpick, this is not a ramp, the grade is less than 5% so this is even better.
- Josh Turiel: Looking at the plan, I have no issues. I have couple of things: 1. I read that one of the things this project is proposing is to have spaces in the Museum Place Garage, we are running out of spaces in the garage. It is really

for visitors and commuters. This is a concern that we need to dig into. 2. You have 4 spaces for EVs. Knowing the direction the Commonwealth is going; I would hope we have the ability to expand that rapidly. We will need more than 4 by the time this building is finished.

- Ramie Schneider: The Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) is requiring that 20% of parking spaces are future-proofed for EV spaces.
- Josh Turiel: On the bike storage, and I know this is a concern for people. I would hope that there is monitor in the space. I like the general traffic flow and plan; it is not intrusive on the site itself. We have decent parking on this site, and I am concerned with overflow. I would really rather not see people in the garages.
 - Attorney Correnti: Mr. Turiel's points are part of an ongoing conversation with the SRA. An RFP has been sent out for parking. It may be more than just the Museum Place Garage. We will be able to report back in future meetings.
 - Josh Turiel: This project will probably generate less traffic due to the proximity of the train.
- Zach Caunter: It is not ideal to offload residents to area garages. My question is about the Bridge Street Ramp. I think I recall that there is a retaining wall that the building cannot be built up against. How is the Bridge Street ramp connected to the building and where does it connect to? I need a better picture on how this pick-up and drop-off short term parking area will be utilized and connected.
 - Ramie Schneider: It is not touching the existing retaining wall. We are cantilevering over the retaining wall to create connection between Bridge Street and the pedestrian plaza. The lobby is accessed by elevator, creating a safer connection. We didn't want and heard feedback from UPS and USPS that parking on river level and using a cart up ramp isn't feasible. This will create a safer connection.
 - Kirt Rieder: Walking in and doing that *draws on screen*
- Carole Hamilton: There are no parking spaces provided for retail space? Are there guest parking spots?
 - Michael Santos: No . All parking is for residents.
 - Carole Hamilton: Where will guests park?
 - Michael Santos: The MBTA Commuter Rail garage seems most convenient. We did take a preliminary look at the capacity of the garage and there is plenty of space, except in October. There will be a small parking demand and that garage should have enough capacity.

- Jonathan Berk: I hope the residents self-select not to own cars. Are there zip cars available? Or a building owned rideshare for residents only? To encourage less car ownership.
- Kirt Rieder: One of the other features we have seen in prior projects is that the parking is not assigned per unit but is for sale/lease for whomever wants it. So 1 unit could buy multiple spaces. What are the standards for this project?
 - Rami Schneider: If a resident is interested, then they lease a space on an as available basis. One unit cannot have multiple spots.
 - Kirt Rieder: what happens if half the people lease them, and the other half do not.
 - Attorney Correnti: parking is at .5
 - Ramie Schneider: Residents will have to pay for parking, but hopefully public transit is used.
- Kirt Rieder: I'm calling out the decorative railing. I want to make sure you involve the landscape architect with this, so it is modern and not decorative in a historical "ye olde" way. Let's make sure this is a durable guardrail, even though it is decorative.
 - Michael Santos: We will come up with something with our landscape architects – durable and decorative.
- Kirt Rieder: looking at Google Earth, this is striped as a bike lane.
 - Michael Santos: It's not touching bike lane. More of an information graphic.
- Kirt Rieder: Can you speak to the sidewalk dimension
 - Michael Santos: I believe the sidewalk here is 5-feet wide and flares out to meet existing conditions. In front of site is 5-feet and meets up with existing sidewalk which is a little wider, 8-10 feet wide.
- Kirt Rieder: It's about 7.5 over there now, just making sure you aren't going below 5. Can you take it to 7-feet along the entire frontage?
 - Michael Santos: We will have to look at how that impacts the design and see if we can squeeze in another foot or 2
 - Kirt Rieder: even 6 inches. There will be two-way pedestrian traffic at this site.
- Kirt Rieder: Will this be a granite curb relocation?
 - Michael Santos: Right now yes. *Shows slide with existing curb and new curb with existing curb line and then curb extension that meets with loading area, creating a truly defined pickup and drop off area. You get the benefit of narrowing the roadway. So there will be new curb.*

- Kirt Rieder: On board with this, but why would you not continue this upwards to not accommodate the urgent parkers.
 - Michael Santos: good point, this is the least disruptive to the existing roadways. You would have a smoother curb too .
- Kirt Rieder: In the last meeting, we asked about planting trees and the landscape architect said you as a team would look at it. Trees will not block building, I like the building, this building will be exposed. Knitting this building to North Salem will benefit from more trees. And reacting to team members about making positive improvements to the street scape. Trees, curbs, and vegetation are crucial to this. Your renderings continue to show improvements. I have to advocate for improvements.
 - Attorney Correnti: A point well taken. The areas are in public and in private domain. We have great coordination going forward with the SRA, DRB, and Planning and how this all will fit. Because we are going across the street and the opportunity for tie-in is there. We have a great landscape architect team on board.
- Sarah Tarbet: With the drop-off area, I think 5-feet is too small a sidewalk area. It makes me concerned for pedestrian safety getting out of cars. 5-feet is fine for a couple of people to pass, but this is a populated area and it's too narrow.
 - Rami Schneider: We can look and see if we can accommodate more sidewalk.
- Sarah Tarbet: No guest spots might be a problem but not having accessible spots for retail is not ideal? Where are the accessible spaces for retail?
 - Michael Santos: We don't have any spaces for retail uses, all parking is residential. We have to make sure everything is accessible. But there is no commercial parking. The ramp and the upgraded sidewalks will all be ADA compliant.
- Kirt Rieder: Can you clarify that there is no commercial retail public facing?
 - Michael Santos: There is no parking for commercial spaces.
 - Kirt Rieder: But there is commercial space on site?
 - Michael Santos: Yes, a little over 11000 square feet.

Public Comment:

No written comments since last presentation

No public comment

- Kirt Rieder: Michael can we go back to the drawing with the bike access route. How do I get from end of ramp to the location?
 - Michael Santos: That is something we are still exploring. As it is right now, there will be a little ramp. We have to look at it to get people across safely.
 - Kirt Rieder I would do a curb cut or raised intersection here. But that may not be the safest way. Less supporting of doing a massive s-curve. This needs some attention.
- Bill Grisct: I am not here on November 3. Kirt will be chairing.
 - Josh Turiel: I will not be here on November 3. It may be better to go to next November meeting.
- Attorney Correnti: Thanks for letting us know. Could we digest this and schedule for November 3 and see where we are at next week?
- Bill Grisct: Have I missed a meeting?
 - Elena Eimert: You haven't missed anything.

Motion to continue to November 3, 2022, is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Tom Furey, and passes 9-0 in a roll call vote.

Bill Grisct	Y
Kirt Rieder	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Carole Hamilton	Y
Zach Caunter	Y
Sarah Tarbet	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Jonathan Berk	Y

- B. 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), 315 Derby Street (Map 34, Lot 444), 9 Peabody Street (Map 34, Lot 232), and 15 Peabody Street (Map 34, Lot 435) Applicant: North Shore Community Development Corp (NSCDC) and North Shore Community Health Center (NSCHC) Applicant: North Shore Community Development Corp (NSCDC) and North Shore Community Health Center (NSCHC)**
Description: 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), 315 Derby Street (Map 34, Lot 444), 9 Peabody Street (Map 34, Lot 232), and 15 Peabody Street (Map 34, Lot 435) for a Site Plan Review, Planned Unit Development special permit, Drive-Through 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 6.7 Drive-Through Facilities; Section 8.1 Flood Hazard Overlay District.

The above properties will be improved through 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 St., applicant proposes a 6-story mixed-use building with commercial space on street level and 19 units of 100% affordable, supportive housing for the elderly above. Along Derby St., applicant proposes a new approximately 41,500 sf community health clinic. At 9 Peabody St., applicant proposes 29 additional age-restricted units and a small gallery and commercial space. Additional site improvements include improvements to the underlying culvert, the harbor walk, and Peabody Street Park, the latter two of which the applicant would be responsible for ongoing maintenance.

*** This item was heard first***

Elena Eimert: The applicant wants to continue to November 3, 2022, due to staff oversight regarding the public notice.

Motion to continue to November 3, 2022, is made by Zach Caunter, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes 8-0 with one abstention in a roll call vote.

Bill Grisct	Y
Kirt Rieder	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Carole Hamilton	Y
Zach Caunter	Y
Sarah Tarbet	A
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Jonathan Berk	Y

III. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

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

A. Woodlands Subdivision, Clark Avenue (Map 6, Lots 7, 8, and 9) - Vote on an Extension request

*** This item is heard 2nd ***

- Elena Eimert: Nick Menino of the Woodlands development team to speak. They are seeking retroactive extension to end of November for final close out of all work, including review and acceptance of as-built drawings by November 30, 2022. Since this project last appeared, final overlay paving has occurred, and street signs and streetlights were installed
- Nick Menino: The current extension expired on September 30, and we are seeking a retroactive extension from September 30 through November 30. Waiting to coordinate with the city and with the city's preferred vendor, DNR.
- Elena Eimert: So the last extension ran out at the end of September and this item was not before the board until after the deadline, so this is now covering back to that period and ensures that the approval has not faltered.
- Carole Hamilton: Why does the offsite work requires an extension for the subdivision?
 - Nick Menino: Not entirely sure. The subdivision approval was contingent on offsite work, and I assume it was lumped into the subdivision work.
 - Elena Eimert: There are improvements to Clark Avenue that would be considered the applicants responsibility and additional onsite pieces to be completed, i.e. installation of signs for trails network. The offsite work was a condition of approval. The extension will cover this and any administrative closeout.
 - Carole Hamilton: I know the paving is requiring an extension, but signage should not hold this up. We have already extended a few times. This is torture by dripping water.
 - Kirt Rieder: Can you clarify Carole? Should we release or hold until signage is installed?
 - Carole Hamilton: There is no excuse for signage not being installed.
- Bill Griset: What date is the extension for?
 - Elena Eimert: Until November 30.
- Bill Griset: Is it staff's position that the extension is needed for this work?
 - Elena Eimert: From a practicality standing, we would need an update from the woodlands team as to how far along they are in regard to their

as-builts, then we would need to do a site visit and give time for corrections. site visits, etc. Anything shorter might not be appropriate.

- Carole Hamilton: I want it done by the end of November. If we give another month then it needs to be done.

Motion to extend to November 30, 2022, is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Helen Sides, and passes 8-0 with 1 abstention in a roll call vote.

Bill Grisct	Y
Kirt Rieder	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Carole Hamilton	Y
Zach Caunter	Y
Sarah Tarbet	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	A
Jonathan Berk	Y

B. Review and vote on the 2023 Planning Board Meeting Schedule

- Elena Eimert: Here is the draft meeting schedule for 2023 This is also available in SharePoint. Formatting will be worked out after the fact. There are a few variations.
 - In March and April, there is Passover beginning April 5 and ending April 13. Staff suggested to host 3 meetings in March to not interfere with high holy days (March 2, March 16, and March 30).
 - July 6 is the week of July 4, many of the board are on holiday then.
 - No meeting will be held on October 5 as it will interfere with the Haunted Happenings Parade. The suggestion is to shift this meeting to the middle Thursday of October to not have such a large gap between meetings
- Helen Sides: I agree
 - Bill Grisct: Looks fine.
- Kirt Rieder: Do we know when zoom goes away and in person resumes?
 - Elena Eimert: As of now, we are remote until March 2023. Efforts are being made for permanent remote or hybrid options to be permanent.
 - Kirt Rieder: If we are in person, I suggest moving the meetings to 7 pm. 6:30 would be a struggle for in person.

- Helen Sides: I suggest that we create another April date rather than load up March. I think we would find that too many people go away and 3 in one month can't happen.
 - Bill Griset: Don't want to interfere with High Holy days.
 - Helen Sides: There must be another day within a whole month to plan this far in advance.
 - Elena Eimert: I think the concern is that Passover is April 5-13 so that takes out the first two Thursdays in April. That would mean back-to-back April meetings on the 20th and 27th.
 - Helen Sides: It's better to not overload one month. And best to get on calendars early.
- Bill Griset: How about taking a March meeting to April?
 - Elena Eimert: That may result in a shorter meetings as projects won't have updated materials, as deadlines will have passed. but we can address projected out.
 - Kirt Rieder: And the downfall to shorter meeting?
 - Elena Eimert: I just want to take the language back to other staff about the remote v. in person. to next meeting for a vote.

C. Receive and File: Report on Net Zero Energy Plan and Green Building Training

- Elena Eimert: The City's Department of Sustainability and Resilience engaged a consultant, and they offered a net zero training to board members and staff on October 11 and gave overview of green technologies, etc. Slides are available in SharePoint. Sarah Tarbet attended if she would like to comment.
 - Sarah Tarbet: Yes, it was great and very informative. I learned something about more resiliency and more sustainable features we should be looking for. And there is a checklist we should be paying attention to that will be available soon.

D. Receive and File: Notification of Filing, Expanded Environmental Notification Form and Proposed EIR Submittal for 342 Highland Avenue and 2 Barcelona Avenue

- Elena Eimert: Planning Board received notice of this project's intent to file an expanded Environmental Notification form and Environmental Impact report as part of their MEPA review, will be here in November 15. You will be able to give comment as a board or as individuals and there will be a MEPA contact that you can direct those comments to.

E. Receive and File, Notification of Filing, Expanded Environmental Notification Form for El Centro in Salem, MA

- Elena Eimert: This is notice that they have filed with the DEP expanded environment notification form. The comment period is until October 24. If you would like comments to come from the board, you can provide them to me now. If you want to comment as individuals, you may do so, information is in SharePoint.

F. Updates from Staff

- Kirt Rieder: Happy that Josh and Jonathan have joined us.
- Elena Eimert: Citizen Planner training collaborative has released fall series of training. This is a great resource for new and returning board members. ANR/Subdivision law/Site plan review trainings available. City will cover cost. If you register and let me know and I will start on reimbursement. These run throughout the fall. You have all received links so please take a look.
- Elena Eimert: There are amendments to the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinance. I will put out some polling for Joint Public Hearing dates with Council. We are currently looking at the dates of November 2, 29, or 3 and again the week of January 16, 2023. If you want to see language of the proposed amendments, it is currently in the backup docs for tonight's council meeting.
- Elena Eimert: Will have an update on the 4 Franklin Street project at the November 3 meeting.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of the September 1, 2022, Regular Planning Board Minutes

Motion to approve the September 1, 2022, Regular Planning Board minutes, is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and passes 9-0 in a roll call vote.

Bill Grisct	Y
Kirt Rieder	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Carole Hamilton	Y
Zach Caunter	Y
Sarah Tarbet	Y
Helen Sides	Y

Josh Turiel	Y
Jonathan Berk	Y

B. Approval of the September 15, 2022, Regular Planning Board Minutes

Motion to approve the September 15, 2022, Regular Planning Board minutes, is made by Carole Hamilton, seconded by Josh Turiel, and passes 9-0 in a roll call vote.

Bill Grisct	Y
Kirt Rieder	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Carole Hamilton	Y
Zach Caunter	Y
Sarah Tarbet	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Jonathan Berk	Y

V. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made by Kirt Rieder, and seconded by Sarah Tarbet, and passes in an 9-0 roll call vote

Bill Grisct	Y
Kirt Rieder	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Carole Hamilton	Y
Zach Caunter	Y
Sarah Tarbet	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Jonathan Berk	Y

Adjourned at 8:29 pm
Approved by the Planning Board on November 11, 2022