

City of Salem Board of Appeals
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, February 17, 2016

A meeting of the Salem Board of Appeals (“Salem BOA”) was held on Wednesday, February 17, 2016 in the third floor conference room at 120 Washington Street, Salem, Massachusetts at 6:30 p.m.

Peter Copelas (Vice-Chair) calls the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

ROLL CALL

Those present were: Peter A. Copelas (Vice- Chair), Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, Jimmy Tsitsinos, and James Hacker (alternate). Also in attendance Erin Schaeffer, Staff Planner and Tom St. Pierre - Building Commissioner.

REGULAR AGENDA

Project	A public hearing for a petition of seeking a Special Permit from the provisions of <i>Sec. 3.3.2 Nonconforming Uses</i> of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to allow the change from one nonconforming use of a candy factory to another nonconforming use of residential dwelling units.
Applicant	SCHIAVUZZO REALTY LLC
Location	93-95 CANAL STREET (Map 33 Lots 164, 165)(B4 Zoning District)

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated January 26, 2016 and supporting documentation

Attorney Atkins presents the petition. The petitioner was before the Board in September 2015, with a similar proposal on the same property, but due to neighborhood concerns, the applicant withdrew the project without prejudice to be allowed to come back before the Board with a revised proposal.

Originally, the proposal was for twelve (12) residential units and had plans to build a third story. Councillor Turiel and neighbors had three (3) major concerns regarding this proposal including: 1) Privacy at the rear of the building with the addition 2) Parking overflow concerns onto Canal Street 3) Preference for commercial use rather than residential use. The petitioner has altered the proposal such that he is now proposing eight (8) residential units and without the previously proposed third story. As a result, the reduction of units has eliminated the need for a parking variance. Additionally, the petitioner is now proposing to use the existing structure and footprint with no change in height. The petitioner is proposing four (4) residential units with three (3) bedrooms each on the first and second floors.

Attorney Atkins states that the property is located in the B-4 Zoning District and food production is not allowed and a residential use is also not allowed. Therefore, the candy factory is an existing nonconforming use and under Section 3.3.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, a petitioner can request a special permit to go from one nonconforming use to another nonconforming use such that the Board finds that the proposed use is less detrimental to the neighborhood.

The petitioner is proposing to sell these residential units as condominiums with a price range between \$250,000 to \$275,000 per unit. The site plan and elevation plans are presented. Should the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a special permit the next step for the petitioner is to be reviewed by the Planning Board for a Site Plan Review special permit as the petitioner is proposing more than six (6) units on the parcel.

There are several criteria that the project needs to meet for the Board to grant a special permit. For community need served by the proposal, the petitioner makes the case citing an article in the Salem News that there is a significant need for more affordable housing options. Since the average price for a two (2) bedroom rental unit in Boston is \$2,900, people are looking for more affordable housing options. In a Boston Globe article, it stated that homeownership is in significant decline and has dipped below 60% for the first time on record due to an increase in the price of housing and the ability for young people to afford housing. As for Salem, the City conducted a Salem Housing Needs and Demand Analysis (July 2015). Salem is expected to see significant increases in housing demand over the next ten (10) years. It is clear that there is a need for affordable housing and this project gives the city this opportunity. The three (3) major employers in the area are Shetland Park, North Shore Medical Center and Salem State University.

The neighbors are really concerned about the possibility of Salem State students living in this proposed housing. The petitioner is not an agent of Salem State University and has no agreement with him and Salem State has no interest in purchasing this building from him. The intent is to sell these units to families. While this is a concern, this is a policing, building department, and health department concern that should not be related to this particular proposal.

There is a sentiment in the neighborhood that a residential use in this neighborhood is an imposition to the neighbors. This is where the type of ownership is important and condominium documents have rules, regulations and fines. There is also built in value in having eight (8) units rather than two (2). The cost of keeping up the building is shared over eight (8) units; mortgage lenders look at condominium documents carefully to look at the number of renters versus owners in a building. Condominium owners can rent their spaces, but it is now very difficult to get financing if over 30% of a condominium building is rented. There are some built in controls over negative connotations that the neighbors are concerned about regarding renters.

The neighbors have legitimate flooding concerns in this neighborhood. However, the owners of the property have been operating the candy factory for more than forty (40) years without any flooding issues. If it is necessary to repave the existing parking lot it will be done at the

same grade. There is no intent to build and barriers that may reduce the ability of stormwater to flow from the site.

The neighbors were concerned about noise that future owners would encounter from the train and traffic on Canal Street. The petitioner has made a determination that the ambient noise from the neighborhood will not hinder the ability for the petitioner to sell the proposed housing units. The neighbors were also concerned about additional noise created from any HVAC units required for this building. There are currently three (3) commercial HVAC units. Although there will be eight (8) HVAC units associated with the proposed residence, the units will be shielded and the amount of noise is also restricted and regulated.

The petitioner is proposing to convert an existing candy factory into eight (8) residential dwelling units within the same building footprint. The allowable uses in a B-4 Zoning District include medical offices, auto repair shops, among other commercial uses. The small residential development would be an improvement.

A letter of opposition received by the Board and applicant suggested that the petitioner is requesting a change of zone. The applicant is not proposing a change in the underlying zoning, but rather requesting a special permit that is allowed under our Zoning Ordinance and the state statute that allows someone to change a non-conforming use to another non-conforming use such that the other non-conforming use is less detrimental to the neighborhood.

The same letter of opposition alleges that Mr. Schiavuzzo will construct substandard housing conditions. Mr. Schiavuzzo is an experienced contractor that has done 50-60 projects in other communities and will be a substantial improvement to the building with quality work.

Mr. Copelas (Acting Chair)- Asks the petitioner a clarifying question regarding the proposed addition on the rear of the building. Is there an existing addition?

There is an existing one (1) story addition on the rear of the building. The petitioner is proposing to add a second story to the existing one (1) story for a total of two (2) stories to square the building off.

Attorney Atkins- There was a building to the side of the property, a shed/storage building that was ordered by the building inspector to be taken down last year. If you look at pictures of the property on google maps, you will notice that the building still appears in the images, but note that it is no longer there.

Mr. Watkins- Who are the other direct abutters? Are they commercial properties?

Attorney Atkins- Two (2) commercial properties, one on either side. There are also residences at the rear of the property as well as along Canal Street.

Mr. Watkins- Parking that is proposed is more than required by zoning. Is this paved currently?

Mr. Corcum- The parking is asphalt and stone.

Mr. Watkins- So the petitioner is not proposing to have less green space than what already exists? Is there fencing proposed around the site or buffer?

Attorney Atkins- We have left this review to the Planning Board for when this project goes to site plan review. There is a two foot buffer all the way around the property.

Mr. Watkins- Is restriction of use to only condominiums a special condition that the petitioner would accept?

Attorney Atkins- Yes. The applicant intends to sell these units.

Mr. Watkins- Is there any decking or outside communal space proposed?

Attorney Atkins- No. Not on the present plan and it would be difficult to provide because of the parking requirements. There is also no proposed roof deck due to concerns about privacy for the neighbors.

Ms. Schaeffer- Asks the petitioner for more information regarding access to the driveway.

Attorney Atkins- The existing driveway is shared with the neighbors with the lot line that runs down the center of the driveway. The petitioner states that the commercial neighbors have shared this driveway for years, but anticipate having a formal easement for both parties and would accept the easement as a special condition.

Mr. Copelas- Opens public comment.

Councillor Turiel- Reads letter into the record and states that the preference is to see this building used as a commercial use, but understands that the building has been sitting vacant for a while and the owners were not able to successfully find commercial interest. Councillor Turiel requested that the Board consider a condition that the property would have a covenant restricting the use to only owner occupied residents or strict enforcement of unrelated tenant laws to prohibit the use of the building from a college student rental opportunity. Councillor Turiel also requests that there be a landscaping buffer to allow for privacy and the quiet enjoyment for abutters.

Michael Salerno of 2 Geneva Street- Speaks in opposition to the proposal as per comments submitted by Mr. Salerno and South Salem Neighborhood Association. Mr. Salerno also requests that comments submitted by Polly Wilbert, Chair of the South Salem Neighborhood Association be read into the record.

Councillor Turiel- Comments in relation to concerns about traffic and parking, construction is expected to begin in the spring for Canal Street improvements and will take about two (2) years to complete. During this time, there may be restricted parking along Canal Street due to construction, but there are no plans for long term parking restrictions along Canal Street. Through this project there will also be improved crossings at Hancock Street and Gardner Street and along much of the length of Canal Street. There will be safety improvements, but this is a two (2) year-long project that has not started yet.

Mr. Copelas- Asks Attorney Atkins to speak to the kinds of restrictions that may be imposed to restrict condominium owner from renting units and also asks to speak about the proposed parking, snow storage and removal.

Attorney Atkins- States that the biggest restriction that would control the ability for condominium owners to rent is financing restrictions without strict assurances around giving the trustees of the building power to take action should there be any violations. The condominium documents can also specify requirements that the owner is responsible for actions of the tenant and type of lease that a tenant can enter with requirements that can be extensive and give the trustees of the building a way to take action should there be violations.

As for snow removal, it is anticipated that the property owners will be responsible for removal. It is standard in Planning Board decisions to have a plan for temporary snow storage and a requirement for removal from the site as part of the standard maintenance requirements.

As for the driveway access, the zoning ordinance requires on 12' of width for residential parking and overnight usage. A residential use may see less use than a commercial property.

Mr. Copelas- asks for clarification on the driveway usage and width.

Mr. Corcum states that the driveway is about 15' feet wide with the property boundary through the center of the driveway.

Attorney Atkins states that with the City improvements to Canal Street and private investment like the proposal will help improve the neighborhood over time.

Denise Dragonis -18-20 Geneva Street- speaks in strong opposition to the proposal. Specifically, she stated concerns about noise and neighborhood safety concerns once tenants move into the proposed residences and states that she is worried about competition as she owns a rental income property in the neighborhood.

Mr. Solerno- 2 Geneva Street- States that the current building is no conducive to commercial a commercial use, but suggests that Fran and Dianne's kitchen is looking for space.

Mr. Copelas – Reads the a letter received from Polly Wilburt, Chair of the South Salem Neighborhood Association in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Copelas – The petitioner is proposing excess parking beyond the requirements. Is there a reason why the petitioner is including excess parking as opposed to providing green space or larger buffer zones?

Attorney Atkins- The sense was that the petitioner wanted to provide closer to two (2) parking spaces per dwelling unit to prevent people from parking on Canal Street.

Mr. Tsitsinos- States that the extra parking spaces could be used for temporary snow storage.

Mr. Copelas- Can you clarify the neighbor's concern in regard to the use of this property as rental housing? The Board understand that from an initial purchase point of view that mortgage lenders may look more favorably upon owner occupants. Is there any legal way that conditions imposed to restrict rental units?

Attorney Atkins- To my knowledge I do not believe that the Board can impose restrictions in that fashion. There would be eight (8) people who would be really concerned about the conditions in this building and the owners and trustees could make things very difficult for someone who is not respectful of other occupants in the building. Having eight (8) units as opposed to two (2) or three (3) units is also a benefit as there would be more people able to cover the costs of building maintenance.

Mr. Duffy- There is a need for the easement to be resolved for the driveway. There was some discussion about some fencing and/or buffing of the property from the neighbors. Can the Board make the determination that the proposal is not more substantially detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing use?

Mr. Copelas- Reviews the standard criteria for a special permit.

Mr. Watkins- States that all of the standard criteria are being met. However, Mr. Watkins states some concern regarding the neighborhood character criteria because there is commercial property on either side of this property. Although, this is currently a vacant building and this development would help clean up the site. Mr. Watkins states preference for having condominiums (ownership) versus rental units. There are community needs being met in terms of providing needed housing in the City, traffic flow and safety will not be that much of an impact from this development. Canal Street is a busy street anyway. The required number of parking spaces are met. There are no changes to the proposed utilities. There are no significant changes to the site regarding environmental impact or drainage. There is a positive impact on the City's tax base.

Mr. Copelas- As for the neighborhood character, it is difficult to have a commercial reuse of this building. There are some pretty big impediments to using this building as a commercial enterprise in its current form.

Mr. Hacker- Can the Board require as a condition that the condominium documents require occupant ownership in perpetuity and prohibit rental units?

Mr. Copelas- No. This is not a legal condition that the Board could request.

Ms. Schaeffer- This is beyond the purview of the Board.

Mr. St. Pierre- Does not agree and recommends that the Board seek a legal opinion from the City Solicitor.

Mr. Hacker- States that the Board has restricted ownership in the past.

Mr. Copelas- Asks for information from Attorney Atkins on the subject.

Attorney Atkins- States that it would not be a restriction that could be legally upheld regardless of the Board imposing it.

Mr. Copelas- Mr. St. Pierre has a different opinion.

Mr. St. Pierre- Has seen restrictions in condominium documents.

Attorney Atkins- That has probably not been tested in court.

Mr. Copelas- As a resource to the Board, the Board would like to further investigate this question.

Attorney Atkins- The petitioner may not have any objection to a special condition like this because the intent of the developer is to sell the residential units, but Attorney Atkins does not give an opinion about the quest of whether the Board can impose restrictions regarding the prohibition of rental units.

Mr. St. Pierre- Advises that the Board can include these restrictions as Special Condition as long as it is found to be legal with the City Solicitor and suggests that the Board can make a decision with the special conditions of ownership included and then later omitted if the City Solicitor finds that it is not a legal condition.

After further discussion from the Board members on whether or not the Board has this authority, Mr. St. Pierre advises the Board to seek a legal opinion and restates the suggested option that the Board can include these restrictions as Special Condition as long as it is found to be legal with the City Solicitor and suggests that the Board can make a decision with the special conditions of ownership included and then later omitted if the City Solicitor finds that it is not a legal condition.

The Board requests to seek a legal opinion from the City Solicitor before making a decision.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Watkins makes a motion to continue the petition to the next regularly scheduled meeting on March 16, 2016. The motion is seconded by Mr.

Jimmy Tsitsinos. The vote was unanimous with five (5) (Peter A. Copelas (Vice-Chair), Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, Jimmy Tsitsinos, and James Hacker (alternate) in favor and none (0) opposed.

Project	A continuation of a public hearing for a reapplication seeking Special Permits from <i>Sec. 3.3.3 Nonconforming Structures and 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single and Two- Family Residential Structures</i> and a <i>Variance per Sec. 5.1 Off- Street Parking Requirements</i> of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to allow the conversion of a single-family dwelling unit to a two-family dwelling unit and associated parking.
Applicant	BLUE WATERS VERO LLC
Location	11 HERBERT STREET (Map 35 Lot 320) (R2 Zoning District)

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated December 26, 2015 and supporting documentation

Attorney Atkins presents the petition and makes a request to withdraw the petition without prejudice.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to approve the request to withdraw without prejudice. The motion is seconded by Mr. Watkins. The vote was with five (5) (Peter A. Copelas (Vice- Chair), Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, Jimmy Tsitsinos, and James Hacker (alternate) in favor and none (0) opposed.

Project	A continuation of a public hearing for a petition requesting a Special Permit per Sec. 3.3.2 Nonconforming Uses of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to change and existing nonconforming use of a social club to another nonconforming use of eighteen (18) residential units. The petitioner is also requesting Variances for relief from Sec. 4.1.1 Table of Dimensional Requirements for minimum lot area per dwelling unit, minimum lot frontage, minimum lot coverage, front and side yard setbacks, minimum distance between buildings, and number of stories.
Applicant	MICHAEL MEYER
Location	1-3 EAST COLLINS STREET (Map 36 Lot 277)(R1 Zoning District)

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated September 25, 2015 and supporting documentation

The petitioner requested a continuation to the next regularly scheduled meeting to allow for more time to respond with architectural and site plan revisions.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to approve the request to continue to the next regularly scheduled meeting on March 16, 2016. The motion is seconded by Mr. Watkins. The vote was with five (5) (Peter A. Copelas (Vice- Chair), Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, Jimmy Tsitsinos, and James Hacker (alternate) in favor and none (0) opposed.



Project	A public hearing for a petition seeking Variances requesting relief from <i>Sec. 4.1.1 Table of Dimensional Requirements</i> of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, for relief from rear and side-yard setbacks, minimum lot area per dwelling unit and minimum lot area to construct a rear addition.
Applicant	KIM YOUNGWORTH
Location	14 WINTER STREET (Map 35 Lot 88)(R2 Zoning District)

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated January 25, 2016 and supporting documentation

Ms. Youngworth, petitioner presents the petition and states that there is a historic rear addition on the home that was built on dirt with no foundation and is now beyond repair. The petitioner proposes to demolish the rear addition and reconstruct the rear addition within the same footprint and construct to modern standards. The modern construction standards also require that the addition be slightly extended by an additional 1.5 feet toward the rear yard lot line beyond the existing dimensions.

Mr. Copelas- Clarifies with the petitioner that the original application was for Variances, but upon further review from the Building Commissioner, it was his determination that the petitioner could request a special permit Sec. 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single- and Two- Family Residential Structures.

Mr. Copelas- Asks for clarification on whether the petitioner is going to demolish the addition or restructure the existing addition.

Ms. Youngworth- Unfortunately, there is not much of the structure left. The corner posts are sagging and there is no foundation. Ms. Youngworth intends to build the new addition with historically accurate materials including constructing a new slate roof from materials that came from the demolition of a nearby roof.

Mr. Copelas- Confirms that the petitioner is extending the addition 1.5 feet further toward the rear yard setback.

Ms. Youngworth- Any change to the roofline is not higher than the existing house.

Mr. St. Pierre- States that he has visited the site and made a recommendation to the homeowner that the existing addition is beyond repair and in need of reconstruction. The special permit requested would allow the petitioner to build a code compliant addition to the structure.

Mr. Watkins- Is there an existing foundation?

Ms. Youngworth- There is no existing foundation, but Ms. Youngworth plans to construct a foundation and addition that has clapboard siding in keeping with the materials of the existing house.


Mr. Copelas- Opens discussion for public comment.

Mary Manning -16 Oliver Street- Speaks in support of the petition.

Mr. Copelas- Reads two letters into the record in support the petition from residents at 16 Winter Street and 18 Oliver Street.

Mr. Copelas- closes the public hearing.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to approve the request for a special permit *Sec. 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single- and Two- Family Residential Structures* to allow the reconstruction and the slight expansion of the rear addition. The motion is seconded by Mr. Tsitsinos. The vote was with five (5) (Peter A. Copelas (Vice-Chair), Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, Jimmy Tsitsinos, and James Hacker (alternate) in favor and none (0) opposed.



Project A public hearing for a petition seeking a Special Permit from the provisions of *Sec. 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single and Two-Family Structures* of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to extend, alter or change the structure to allow the construction of a rear deck.

Applicant **MAURA MCGRANE**

Location **29 CHESTNUT STREET (Map 25 Lots 240)(R1 Zoning District)**

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated January 26, 2016 and supporting documentation

Peter Cohen presents the petition on behalf of the petitioner. The property is a nonconforming structure located in the historic district. There were a number of alterations made to the historic home in the 1950's including the addition of sliding glass doors off of the kitchen that do not lead to anything. The petitioner is proposing to construct a rear deck that is in keeping with the architectural style of the house.

Mr. Copelas- Although the deck is not visible from Chestnut Street it is visible on Warren Street.

Ms. McGrane- It is only visible from Warren Street when the gate to the driveway is open.

Mr. Cohen- States that the applicant will be applying to the historic commission for consideration.

Mr. Watkins- What is the request for relief and why?

Mr. Cohen- The petitioner is requesting a special permit *Sec. 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single and Two-Family Structures* of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to extend, alter or change the structure to allow the construction of a rear deck.

Mr. St. Pierre- Treats decks as accessory structure as long as it is open and one story and could be allowed within five (5') feet of the property, but the petitioner declined to change the design to be able to construct within five (5') feet of the property line and requested to come to the Board to keep the aesthetic of the design.

Mr. St. Pierre- Very nice design.

Mr. Copelas- The presented statement of grounds described adequately meets the standard criteria. Mr. Copelas reads a letter of support from Historic New England into the record.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to approve the request for a Special Permit from the provisions of *Sec. 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single and Two-Family Structures* of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to extend, alter or change the structure to allow the construction of a rear deck. The motion is seconded by Mr. Tsitsinos. The vote was with five (5) (Peter A. Copelas (Vice- Chair), Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, Jimmy Tsitsinos, and James Hacker (alternate) in favor and none (0) opposed.



Project	A request for a six (6) month extension to exercise the rights granted by the March 4, 2015 Decision that approved Variances from the minimum lot frontage requirements, lot area requirements, and lot coverage maximum requirements to realign lot lines for parcels held in common ownership and to allow an increase in lot coverage maximum for an existing residence.
Applicant	MARIA and WAYNE MALIONEK
Location	23 JACKSON STREET and 17 VALE STREET (Map 25 Lot 661 and Map 25 Lot 660) (R2 Zoning District)

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated February 2, 2016 and supporting documentation

The Board received a letter from Attorney Scott Grover requesting a six (6) month extension to exercise the rights granted by the March 4, 2015 Decision that approved Variances from the minimum lot frontage requirements, lot area requirements, and lot coverage maximum requirements to realign lot lines for parcels held in common ownership and to allow an increase in lot coverage maximum for an existing residence.

Mr. St. Pierre- Some of the land is registered versus recorded land and the petitioner is restricted by the timeline of the state for this consideration.

Mr. Watkins- What are the timelines for expiration for Variances and Special permits?

Mr. St. Pierre- A year (1) for variances and two (2) years for special permits. The Board can grant six (6) month extensions, but it is not clear whether there is a limit on how many times a petitioner may make this request. In this case, the six (6) months may not be enough, but the petitioner can return for another extension.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to approve the request for a six (6) month extension to exercise the rights granted by the March 4, 2015 Decision that approved Variances from the minimum lot frontage requirements, lot area requirements, and lot coverage maximum requirements to realign lot lines for parcels held in common ownership and to allow an increase in lot coverage maximum for an existing residence. The motion is seconded by Mr. Tsitsinos. The vote was with five (5) (Peter A. Copelas (Vice- Chair), Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, Jimmy Tsitsinos, and James Hacker (alternate) in favor and none (0) opposed.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

107 FEDERAL STREET - Vote to authorize execution of Agreement for Judgment in the Superior Court action, Arlander v. Sinclair, CA No. 2014-1050B as recommended by City Solicitor's Office.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to approve the request to authorize execution of Agreement for Judgment in the Superior Court action, Arlander v. Sinclair, CA No. 2014-1050B as recommended by City Solicitor's Office. The motion is seconded by Mr. Tsitsinos. The vote was with five (5) (Peter A. Copelas (Vice- Chair), Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, Jimmy Tsitsinos, and James Hacker (alternate) in favor and none (0) opposed.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

August 19, 2015 meeting minutes were approved as written.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Copelas makes a motion to approve the minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Tsitsinos. The vote was in favor (Peter A. Copelas (Vice- Chair), Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, Jimmy Tsitsinos, and James Hacker (alternate)) and none (0) opposed.

January 20, 2016 draft meeting minutes to be approved at the March 17, 2016 meeting.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

N/A

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Duffy motioned for adjournment of the February 17, 2016 regular meeting of the Salem Board of Appeals at 8:21 pm.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy made a motion to adjourn the February 17, 2016 regular meeting of the Salem Board of Appeals, seconded by Mr. Watkins, and the vote is unanimous with five (5) (Peter A. Copelas (Vice- Chair), Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, Jimmy Tsitsinos, and James Hacker (alternate) in favor and none (0) opposed.

The meeting ends at 8:21PM.

For actions where the decisions have not been fully written into these minutes, copies of the decisions have been posted separately by address or project at:
http://saalem.com/Pages/SalemMA_ZoningAppealsMin/

Respectfully submitted,
Erin Schaeffer, Staff Planner