



CITY OF SALEM PLANNING BOARD

City of Salem Planning Board Meeting Minutes, April 16, 2020

Chair Ben Anderson calls the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, April 16, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. via Remote Access. Public participation was possible via zoom video and conference call:

- <https://zoom.us/j/460220394?pwd=MXg4OG1GM2JkV0wzY0tSekpqVm44QT09> or
- www.zoom.us/join, meeting ID # 460-220-394 followed by meeting password 680628, as directed on screen.
- Toll-free phone number 877-853-5257. Meeting ID # 460-220-394 followed by meeting password 680628. Project materials available for download at salem.com/planning-board
- Meeting was shown live on Salem Access Television Channel 22.

I. ROLL CALL

Those present were: Chair Ben Anderson, DJ Napolitano, Matt Smith, Kirt Rieder, Vice Chair Matt Venio, Helen Sides, Noah Koretz, Carole Hamilton, Bill Griset (9)

Absent:

Also in attendance: Mason Wells, Staff Planner, Georgie Driver, Staff

Recorder: Stacy Kilb

II. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Location: 79 Columbus Avenue (Map 44, Lot 57)

Applicant: Eric Cormier

Description: A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of ERIC CORMIER for the property located at 79 Columbus Avenue (Map 44, Lot 57) for a Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit in accordance with the Salem Zoning Ordinance Section 8.1. Specifically, the applicant proposes to reconstruct a home and garage on 79 Columbus Avenue. Other improvements include a new driveway. No change to the existing foundation and footprint is proposed.

Mason Wells does not see Mr. Cormier in the panelist or call-in list. He recommends moving onto the next agenda item and coming back to this later.

Eric Cormier joins the call and this item is heard at 8:13PM.

Mr. Cormier describes the history of the project; demolition was completed and engineering and architecture plans were made. Parking was proposed on the property itself, with a garage underneath and installation of a driveway. Living space would be on the first floor/floor above the garage with the third floor on top. He met with Building Inspector Tom St. Pierre, and also presented to the Historical Commission, who made suggestions and approved the Project with conditions. The Project has also been before the Mass. Dept. of Environmental Protection (DEP) and the Salem Conservation Commission, though through his oversight, the Planning Board was not consulted yet. No digging or changes of elevations are occurring other than driveway.

Chair Anderson comments/questions:

- Existing foundation remains/no portion of new building extends beyond? Yes
- Letter submitted by him discussing inspection that architect/engineer did of basement; what is he planning to do with the basement? It needs to be flood proofed OR must allow water into basement. If the former, a letter from the Engineer of record must state that it meets all conditions for state permits
 - Existing foundation will remain, but will backfill and install a slab. Chair Anderson did not see this. A drawing, stamped, from a structural engineer, is necessary, whatever is being done (filled, flood proof, or permeable basement). There will be cutouts for water to flow through; this needs to be shown.
- Make sure utility connections are above flood level
- How will sanitary sewer be addressed? Mr. Cormier is not sure, must clarify
- Requested last time a description as to how he meets FHOD (Flood Hazard Overlay District) Site requirements and special permit 8.1.4 requirements. How is safe passage for vehicles and personnel provided in a flood? The Chair notes that there will be 4' of water on the property during a flood. In 18" of water a car or pedestrian can navigate, not 4'. Chair Anderson suggests Mr. Cormier having and Engineer review Salem Zoning Ordinance FHOD Section 8, specifically 8.1.4-8.1.5

Kirt Rieder:

- Notes these answers must be documented on paper, not just verbally. Chair Anderson further comments that the Board can only approve projects it knows will be safe for occupants
- Mr Rieder notes it may help the Applicant to have a Civil Engineer participate; these are civil, mechanical and plumbing questions; a structural engineer is not adequate and the City requires these items to be thoroughly documented
- Asks why is the Planning Board at the end of the train, being asked to develop a project that is not thoroughly documented. The original building has been demolished for a year, so if the permit is withheld by this Board, the property is destroyed. It would be denying a permit to develop an already partially destroyed property, not a good position for the Board

Helen Sides agrees with Kirt Rieder; each Board the Applicant has been to has been surprised by his lack of knowledge and professionalism and each time he comes to a new Board he is surprised by

their requirements; he is “in the dark” about what the City requires for projects to be done. It was an “emergency” when he went before the Historical Commission, and he only did so because neighbors complained that the building was just gone.

Mr. Cormier asks if he were to eliminate the driveway and garage underneath, would that be acceptable? The Board cannot answer that question as they have nothing to go by. He must consult both Civil and Structural Engineers and get professional feedback on his proposal, then return to the Planning Board. Kirt Rieder adds that the Board is trying to help him out by requiring these things, while he struggles to answer basic questions. Mr. Cormier feels there are “a lot of pieces to the puzzle” and notes he has never been in front of a Board and is unfamiliar with the process. He was led to believe, by his engineer, that there would be no issues as long as he was building on the same footprint. Admitting his own ignorance, he apologizes for wasting people’s time during his learning curve.

Chair Anderson notes that a majority of the Applicants before the Board have an attorney to guide them through the process; he suggests that Mr. Cormier retain one to smooth the process.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment and Georgie Driver outlines the process; there are no comments.

A motion to continue to the May 21, 2020 regular Planning Board meeting is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Bill Griset, and passes 9-0.

Roll Call:

Chair Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	Yes
Matt Smith	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Matt Veno	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Noah Koretz	Yes
Bill Griset	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes

B. Location: 54 and 56 Swampscott Road (Map 07, Lots 65 and 64)

Applicant: Michael Buonfiglio

Description: A continuation of the public hearing for all persons interested in the application of MICHAEL BUONFIGLIO for the property located at 54 and 56 Swampscott Road (Map 07, Lots 65 and 64) for a special use permit per Section 3.1.3 and Section 9.4 of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to allow a change in use from an auto repair shop to a contractor’s yard and landscaping business in the Business Park Development District. Specifically, the applicant proposes to repair the shop for use as office and storage, with the addition of a second floor to the existing building.

The Applicant has requested a continuance. It is a large agenda for May 7th but several items are anticipated to be continued. A later date was discussed with the Applicant, who requested the 7th because of timing and financing. Carole Hamilton wonders if it will go before the Design Review Board (DRB).

A motion to continue to the May 7, 2020 regular Planning Board meeting is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Matt Veno, and passes 7-2.

Roll Call:

Chair Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	No
Matt Smith	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Matt Veno	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Noah Koretz	Yes
Carole Hamilton	No
Bill Grisct	Yes

DJ Napolitano asks that, before the Board gives out dates, can the Board make a decision pending its schedule? The Chair and Mason Wells do spend time in advance discussing this issue; he understands the trepidation to put it off, however this was the second continuance for this applicant, who was not ready either time. He is not opposed to discussing it on the 7th as three continuances may not be appropriate. DJ Napolitano wants to make sure continuances are the Board's choice, not the Applicant's. The Applicant understands.

- C. Location: 160 Federal Street (Map 26, Lot 0002-30)**
Applicant: North Shore Community Development Coalition
Description: *The applicant has requested a continuation to the regularly scheduled meeting on May 7, 2020 of the public hearing for all persons interested in the application of NORTH SHORE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COALITION for the property located at 160 Federal Street (Map 26, Lot 0002-30) for Site Plan Review, Municipal or Religious Reuse Special Permit, and Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit in accordance with Salem Zoning Ordinance Sections 9.5, 6.11, and 8.1. Specifically, the applicant proposes the conversion of the former St. James Parochial School into 33 units of housing, with associated community space for residents. The applicant additionally proposes approximately 42 parking spaces on site to serve the residential units.

A motion to continue to the May 7, 2020 regular Planning Board meeting is made by, seconded by, and passes 9-0.

Roll Call:

Chair Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	Yes
Matt Smith	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Matt Veno	Yes

Helen Sides	Yes
Noah Koretz	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Bill Grisct	Yes

- D. Location:** 13 Hawthorne Boulevard (Map 35, Lot 0287-0)
Applicant: North Shore Community Development Coalition
Description: *The applicant has requested a continuation to the regularly scheduled meeting on May 7, 2020 of the public hearing for all persons interested in the application of NORTH SHORE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COALITION for the property located at 13 Hawthorne Boulevard (Map 35, Lot 0287-0) for Site Plan Review and Municipal or Religious Reuse Special Permit in accordance with Salem Zoning Ordinance Sections 9.5 and 6.11. Specifically, the applicant proposes the conversion of the former Immaculate Conception parochial school into 29 units of housing and approximately 4,500 square feet of studio, workrooms, galleries, and meeting space. There are 7 parking spaces on the premises for visitors. The applicant proposes that the required 29 parking spaces for the residential units will be reserved in nearby municipal parking facilities.

A motion to continue to the May 7, 2020 regular Planning Board meeting is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Helen Sides, and passes 9-0.

Chair Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	Yes
Matt Smith	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Matt Veno	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Noah Koretz	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Bill Grisct	Yes

- E. Location:** 16, 18, and 20R Franklin Street (Map 26, Lots 400, 401, and 402)
Applicant: Juniper Point Investment Co LLC
Description: A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of JUNIPER POINT INVESTMENT CO LLC for the properties located at 16, 18, and 20R Franklin Street (Map 26, Lots 400, 401, and 402) for an amendment to a Site Plan Review, Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit, and Special Permits associated with the North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 9.5 Site Plan Review; Section 8.1 Flood Hazard Overlay District; Section 8.4 North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District; and a Stormwater Management Permit in accordance with Salem Code of Ordinances Chapter 37.

Specifically, the applicant proposes to amend an existing Planning Board decision dated September 20, 2018. The original decision allows replacing the junkyard with a residential development consisting of forty-two (42) units in five (5) buildings and includes a strip of land running from Franklin Street to the river that is approximately 25,000 square feet and is part of an ownership dispute. The new application includes only a portion of the disputed land, referred to as Parcel B, and downsizes the project accordingly. The amendment proposes to replace the existing junkyard with a residential development consisting of thirty-seven (37) units in four (4) buildings with parking under each building, in addition to some surface parking. The project also includes landscaping throughout, and public access along the riverfront with walking paths. Also included are slightly repositioned building locations. In order to accommodate the new building layout, the applicant proposes the relocation of the site entrance approximately 55-feet to the south; revised parking and walkway layouts; changes to grading, drainage, sewer, water, gas, electric, lighting, and landscaping; and a new proposed three-foot tall retaining wall along the disputed strip of land. NOTE: Alternatively, should Parcel B not be integrated into the project, then the Applicant requests the Decision be amended to reflect a further reduced plan, to 31 units, with no change to the building footprints, or site plan, as submitted herewith.

Attorney Joseph Correnti, Serafini, Darling & Correnti, LLP
Attorney Kristin Kolick, Serafini, Darling & Correnti, LLP
Marc Tranos, Principal
Bob Griffin, Site Engineer, New England Civil Engineering
Ryan McSherer, Architect
Bill Ross (Peer Review Engineer)

Attorney Correnti reviews the project, including a reduction from five to four buildings and from 42 to 37 units if [some of] the land in question remains in dispute. If Parcel B, the back half, consisting of 15,000 square feet of land in dispute, is included in the Project, the Plan will be amended as described. In reality, Parcels A and B do not exist, but the line between them is drawn along the point where the City of Salem feels (Parcel A) that there is a stronger basis to conclude that it belongs to the City. Ferris [the current owner of the property] is not conceding A or B but the Applicant needs to advance the project, and cannot obtain financing for land under dispute. Thus, they are seeking alternatives that do not include it. If neither Parcel A or Parcel B is not included, what is left is undisputed Ferris title, which would only accommodate a 31-unit Development; Parcels A and B will remain undeveloped. They are asking the Planning Board to acknowledge that the only difference is that Parcel B will be landscaped if it is included.

Bob Griffin, Site Engineer, reviews changes made to address comments made at the last meeting:

- Landscape Plan 2020 With Parcel B
 - Retaining wall separates Development from Parcel A; driveway being raised to above 100 year flood elevation; 42" railing has been included in new Plans sent

- Absence of street trees in front of Building D; this was examined along with revising the 5', 5-7% grade requiring railings on both sides
- Proposed Landscape Revisions 4/8/2020 are shown. Depending on what happens on Parcel A, there may not be as much of a grade difference, but if so, the railing note is there
- Two additional trees (little leaf linden) are now proposed in front of Building D. Tree grates were originally proposed and the 30" tree grate and model number are noted
- Not much distance to increase length of ramp from sidewalk to driveway to eliminate railing, so they are still included
- Revisions include those made after comments from peer review by New England Civil Engineering were received; Bill Ross is available
 - Demolition Plan revisions: sewer from existing building (toilet) is called out. Will be located at time of construction and abandoned as per City requirements
 - Request to find if gas service is available to building; he believes there is not but if so, it will be properly abandoned as well
 - Sewer Sketch/Retaining wall weight on sewer line; retaining wall has been moved slightly to accommodate
 - Bump out created by three parking spaces; red maple was in it but a sewer manhole limits space so that tree has been eliminated, area will be replaced instead with perennials
 - SMH & DMH Sketch 4/16/20 shown
 - Bill Ross asked them to check stormwater treatment device; it will accept the two incoming pipes as proposed
- Bill Ross, Peer Reviewer, notes City Engineer asked about tree grates; City standard is no grates but structural fill instead. Two little leaf lindens; note revised to reflect structural soil with surface covering 30" tree opening. This will provide a smooth surface over the opening
 - Kirt Rieder appreciates this being flagged; he suggests a flexi-pave or porous pavers instead to allow water and air exchange without having unipavers pop up with frost heaves. The Applicant is open to this
- Bill Ross notes that comments made previously still apply to this project; they have been itemized in a letter and will need to be addressed at the proper time as noted
 - Sewer drain easement through Parcels A and B would not be an issue in this redesign

Kirt Rieder comments:

- If Parcel A is acquired, fill would be placed to lessen abrupt dropoff, but this is not shown. Is it a 1:10 slope? Bob Griffin notes the railing might become unnecessary depending on what happens with Parcel A. Kirt Rieder asks if the railing would be vehicular rated. The retaining wall would act like a curb, but there should also be a vehicular rated guard rail atop that, to 28" or whatever the height requirement for that is, then a railing above that to get to 42". It should be somewhat permeable for drainage. All pavement will drain into catch basins in the roadway. There is no off site discharge
- He appreciates the addition of two street trees; as City trees, the final species will be determined by the Tree Warden. Kirt Rieder will discuss with him

- Regarding the loss of the street tree at the corner; can it be moved Northeast to where the three shrubs are on the other side of the sidewalk, replacing them, or to the other side of the street? Yes, this can be done

Chair Anderson comments:

- Seeks clarification that building footprints are exactly what was previously approved. There have been minor revisions. The Building Overlay Plan is shown. One building was eliminated and the others have only shifted slightly
- Requests elevation drawings for this submission so that a final amended Decision package can include exactly what the Board is approving

Chair Anderson opens to public comment. Georgie Driver, Planning Assistant, will run the public comment section. She outlines the procedure.

Darlene Malus, 150 Federal St. Chair, Salem Tree Commission, has not reviewed this project but notes that the comments re choice of tree, and tree grates are matters that the Tree Commission has discussed in the production of its tree manual, to be voted upon next Thurs meeting. This manual will set forth best practices, and this comment is to let them know that it is available. Little leaf linden is among the recommended trees. Also regarding grates, water permeable surfaces that allow for passage of traffic are recommended instead. The manual recommends the volume of trees, planting practice, etc. It will be posted on the Tree Commission website as soon as they can get it there.

Bryan Edwin Dawson, 30 Dearborn St., asks about the definition of Plots A and B. Attorney Correnti notes that A and B are the developer's designation; the line running from Franklin St to the middle of the site then to the river is a defined line. A and B combined from Franklin St. to the river, with the tree line on the West side, and the line along Furlong Park is also well defined. All of that 25,000 square feet is in dispute. The Developer is not conceding ownership of the land – it is called “the land in dispute” for a reason, because there is no clear title to it. The position of Ferris Trust, the current owners, is that it belongs to them. This was demonstrated in a 6 year litigation, which ran from 1982-88 but was inconclusive. If Ferris doesn't own it, then they believe they have an adverse possession claim, as it has been used exclusively by them since 1952. No further comments or legal arguments are being made during this meeting. Attorney Correnti will not speak for the City of Salem, but in 1980 the City disputed this in litigation, stating that they owned the land even though there is no clear title in the City either. It can be broken down further into a stronger claim by the Developer for Parcel B than Parcel A, but there are too many legal details to go into for this context. The Plans assume that IF the City believes it has a claim for A, B or both, then the only way the City can dispose of that land is through a City Council action(s) or vote(s). If the Council feels it benefits the City to do a Plan like this one for 37 units, then Parcel B could be deeded or transferred to Applicant, for a certain amount of money; there is a process for that. If disposed of thus AND added to this project (purchased by Applicant) then the Plan will be followed as shown. Parcel B would be remediated and landscaped, and 37 units put in to stay consistent with the density variance granted by the ZBA previously. If the City did not want to dispose of Parcel B, then the Applicant would only be able to build 31 units to stay within the variance granted (no land in dispute included). This would not mean the City owns it (Parcels A and B); it would remain Land in Dispute.

#168 Anne Sterling, 29 Orchard St., works with a group of neighbors who have opposed the project but feel now that the Parcel B solution is desirable. She wonders if a deed restriction could be put in place that prohibits development by the current and any subsequent developer, that would also prohibit the area from being fenced off

#618 Tyler Terry, 22 School St., notes conditions he would like to see:

- Enforceable condition that Applicant will provide cleanup of junkyard
- No fencing constructed w/in 80' from post, unlike what is happening at Collins Cove Condos, where the beach is blocked off with a locked gate
- No fencing should separate Parcel B from Furlong Park.

#369 Patricia Murphy, 27 Foster St. wonders if the land in dispute is considered parkland, which would have to undergo a process with the State as well as the City. She also asks about drainage, noting that the drains do not currently function during rain storms. Bob Griffin notes that drainage pipes go towards the North River, and they are staying independent of drains on Franklin St. Only a small part of the entrance area drains into an existing catch basin, so less water will be flowing there than today.

Attorney Correnti notes that if any land is determined to be parkland, then what Ms. Murphy stated about the process w/City Council, Home Rule Petition and state involvement are correct – IF there will be a dissolution process. If it is parkland and the designation is sought to be changed or the land disposed of, that is the process.

Tim Jenkins, 18 Broad St., notes that the solution being proposed for dividing the disputed land into two parcels makes a lot of sense. He wonders if it has to be an outright sale or if this can be done on a long term lease if allowed on park land, with a deed restriction to prevent development on that site that allows for passive use. He also does see a fence along Furlong Park, and reiterates the comments above imploring the Applicant to not block access to the waterfront, as has been done at Collins Cove. He also asks if the Developer will remediate the Land in Dispute.

Attorney Correnti explains, patiently, as he did at the last meeting when the exact same question was asked, that while it is the Developer's responsibility to remediate land included in their project, Land In Dispute is another matter. The proposal for the Board to approve is as shown, including remediation and planting on Parcel B, assuming they are able to obtain it. There will be public access. The walkway along the river is intended to connect to Furlong Park but does not pick up the walkway there because the Park walkway does not go that way, but their walkway will connect to the Park itself. It will have public access as required by Chapter 91. A public walkway will go through the site to the path along the water. This is acceptable but not "great," as they would rather come up through Parcels A and B with a broader, straighter walkway from Franklin St. to the walkway along the water, but this depends on the disposition of the Land in Dispute. Either way, there will be public access to the water. Re: leasing Parkland; Attorney Correnti has not researched this but does not believe the City would have the ability to lease park land to a private property; the City Solicitor would have to weigh in. Regarding Parcel B it is uncertain that a lease of Parcel B would even be finance-able. Mr. Jenkins asks if the developer would be OK with a deed restriction prohibiting building on Parcel B. This would need to be discussed with the City Solicitor and Council.

Kirt Rieder notes that a previous conversation about another property re public access and Chapter 91; Developers are required by law to provide unfettered access, however he will look to make sure there is no fencing on the portion of the property (the water half of Parcel B) perpendicular to the water at Furlong Park, as people need access all the way to the South. A condition should espouse this.

Marc Tranos, 86 Hale St., founder of Juniper Point Investment Co., notes that he built a house 2 doors over from Collins Cove, and had drastic issues with them. As a developer, he has no intention of closing off access, and will build a path going down Parcels A and B to the water, if they are obtained. He wants the City to enjoy the project as well. Kirt Rieder is happy to hear this, noting that Attorney Correnti and Mason Wells should work out language for the Board to review, to demonstrate to neighbors and the Board that the Applicant is serious about this.

Mr. Tranos notes all species of trees onsite; at his South Mason St. project, they are having a hard time sourcing those trees so different ones have been placed there, depending on what the landscapers can acquire. Kirt Rieder notes that these are two different projects, but that Mr. Tranos should be put in touch with the tree warden to discuss; he can discuss with Mr. Rieder offline. Mr. Tranos notes he speaks to Michael Blier as well. Kirt Rieder approves.

City Department comments are discussed. Attorney Correnti notes they are not asking the Board to choose between 37 and 31 units; they are asking for a decisions that will say “The Board approves the Plan as shown with 37 units,” and while it could stop there, it could note that this is “if and only if Parcel B is included; if not, the Board approves 31 units as shown on Plan” That will allow them to move forward.

A motion to continue to the May 7, 2020 regular Planning Board meeting is made by Bill Grisct, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes 9-0.

Chair Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	Yes
Matt Smith	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Matt Venio	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Noah Koretz	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Bill Grisct	Yes

- F. Location:** 23 Summer Street (Map 26, Lot 463)
Applicant: 23 Summer Street LLC
Description: *CORRECTION* - During the April 2, 2020 Planning Board meeting, the 23 Summer Street project was formally continued by a Planning Board vote to their May 7, 2020 regularly scheduled meeting. This item was mistakenly included on the April 16, 2020 agenda and will not be heard at the meeting on April 16, 2020.

III. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

- A. Location:** 94 Washington Square East (Map 35, Lot 536)
Applicant: The Breakaway at Salem Common, LLC
Description: Review proposed paint or screening of a proposed HVAC unit partially visible from Andrew Street. On May 30, 2019 the Planning Board issued an amended Site Plan Review decision for 94 Washington Square East. The Planning Board is reviewing the proposed design solution.

Mason Wells provides an update; documents can be sent later. The Applicant is exploring the option of moving the HVAC units in question closer to the center of the building mass to avoid visibility issues. Once an answer is available, he will come back to show if it can be moved, or if not, he will come back with proposed screening or paint colors for Board approval.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A.** Regular Planning Board meeting minutes for January 23, 2020.
B. Regular Planning Board meeting minutes for February 20, 2020.

Board members have not yet reviewed the minutes, and Mason Wells will send PDF copies to the Board members. Minutes will be voted upon at the next meeting.

Kirt Rieder asks about the efforts to schedule meeting w/Mayor/Bldg Inspector/City Solicitor re enforcement and compliance, as it is a recurring topic with various Applicants. He understands there are pressing issues going on, but Mason notes a 3 week break until next PB meeting, now settled into remote meetings, he will push forward with it.

V. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Helen Sides, and passes 9-0 in a roll call vote.

Chair Ben Anderson	Yes
DJ Napolitano	Yes
Matt Smith	Yes
Kirt Rieder	Yes
Matt Veno	Yes
Helen Sides	Yes
Noah Koretz	Yes
Carole Hamilton	Yes
Bill Grisct	Yes

The meeting ends at 8:37PM

For actions where the decisions have not been fully written into these minutes, copies of the decisions have been posted separately by address or project at: <https://www.salem.com/planning-board/webforms/planning-board-2020-decisions>

Respectfully submitted,
Stacy Kilb, Recording Clerk

Approved by the Planning Board on 5/21/2020