

**City of Salem Planning Board  
DRAFT Meeting January 9, 2020**

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, January 9, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall Annex, 98 Washington St., Large Public Hearing Room, First Floor, Salem, Massachusetts.

Chair Ben Anderson calls the meeting to order at 7:12pm.

**I. ROLL CALL**

*Those present were:* Chair Ben Anderson, Kirt Rieder, Matt Veno, Helen Sides, Noah Koretz, DJ Napolitano, Bill Grisct, Matt Smith, Carole Hamilton

*Absent:*

*Also in attendance:* Mason Wells, Staff Planner

*Recorder:* Stacy Kilb, Clerk

**II. REGULAR AGENDA**

**A. Location:** 45 Traders Way and 40 First Street (Map 08, Lot 159; Map 13, Lot 0011)

**Applicant:** Trader's Way Residential Holdings, LLC

**Description:** A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of TRADER'S WAY RESIDENTIAL HOLDINGS, LLC for the properties located at 45 Traders Way and 40 First Street (Map 08, Lot 159; Map 13, Lot 0011) for an amendment to a Planned Unit Development Special Permit and Site Plan Review decision in accordance with Salem Zoning Ordinance section 7.3 Planned Unit Development and section 9.5 Site Plan Review. Specifically, the applicant proposes to amend the PUD and SPR decision dated September 18, 2018. Proposed are revisions to walkways, storm drainage systems, and other site grading and retention alterations due to site conditions and building entryway alignments. The applicant also proposes revisions and clarification to the building architecture, footprints, and landscaping. The applicant does not propose further disturbance of wetland areas nor building footprint shifts more than a few feet.

Present for the Applicant are:

Attorney Scott Grover

Rob Schaffer, Architect

John O'Connor, representing the Owner

Attorney Scott Grover introduces the project and describes the process thus far. Rob Schaffer, Architect, presents changes to the project made since the previous presentation:

- Building 60 elevations and materials, front now shown as development is inward-facing.
- Building 10 elevations and materials
- Building Prototype front elevations
- Helen sides feels white vinyl windows should be toned down; not as white/stark; Chair Anderson agrees.  
This can be noted as a condition
- Railings are described. Helen Sides approves
- Horizontal banding is shown and discussed
  - Mr. John O'Connor, Director of Development for Dolben notes this hides joists on inside decks and gives a finished perimeter

- Helen Sides prefers this collection of colors to introducing red; the Board discusses and this will be revisited. The whole project can have the same color scheme, rather than various buildings differing

The Board feels this is a much improved project over what was previously presented. Helen Sides asks about the entrances, commenting that the columns look much too big. Desired column dimensions are discussed at length and it is felt that they should have a smaller base and a square taper. Bill Griset notes they should not be fluted.

Kirt Rider asks Civil Engineering about the curb cut at First St., where an ADA ramp comes down to meet the sidewalk, but stops 5' short, thus preventing walking into the development. This unfairly assumes people only move South. Civil Engineering will look at this, though it was in line with what was originally approved. Pedestrians have to step into the vehicular way to step back into a pedestrian area.

Helen Sides had commented on the roofs on building 20; hips, gables and colors are discussed. Kirt Rieder notes that 25 trees are to be redistributed or else a donation passed on to the City; he wonders about the Developer's preference. Mr. O'Connor would get conditional approval then dress the plans; it is still open. He would like an either/or option to carry into the final Decision, so they can make a donation if trees cannot be placed on site. As of now they have time to figure out where to put the trees. The preference is to keep them onsite, and the team will make that call, but in terms of this Decision, if that can't be accommodated they will pay for relocation. Kirt Rieder suggests phrasing this more strongly, rather than keeping it provisional.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment, but there are none.

*A motion to close the public hearing is made by Matt Veno, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and the motion carries.*

The Draft Amended Decision is reviewed.

Discussion:

- p.3: Update reference to Plans to refer to those approved and not those submitted in October
- p.5: Include comments made by Kirt Rieder, Helen Sides, and Noah Koretz
- Landscaping comments: Decision language is acceptable
- DJ Napolitano wonders what prevents the Developer from saying it's easier to make a donation to the City rather than plant the 25 trees in question, and asks if the City has some oversight. The Tree Warden has already weighed in that this is acceptable. The Board could require a letter from the landscape architect. Kirt Rieder notes that the Applicant solicited the Tree Warden who commented there is a 30' minimum to plant a tree, however Mr. Rieder feels this depends on tree, and it is not fair to say that any tree must be 30' away from others. He does not want this to set a precedent, but the Applicant has asked for contingency, and he and the Tree Warden are at peace. However, the City should not accept dollars in lieu of trees. The Tree Warden has the decision making capacity for the amount, which fluctuates.

*A motion to approve the Draft Amended Decision is made by Carole Hamilton, seconded by DJ Napolitano, and the motion carries.*

**B. Location:** 51 Canal Street (Map 34, Lot 86)

**Applicant:** Salem Car Wash, LLC

**Description:** A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of SALEM CAR WASH, LLC for the property located at 51 Canal Street (Map 34, Lot 86) for a Site Plan Review and a Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit in accordance with the Salem Zoning Ordinance Section 9.5, Section 8.2, and Section 8.1. Specifically, the applicant proposes to demolish the existing facility and to build a 3,900 square foot car wash building, customer parking for access to vacuum

cleaners, employee parking, ADA access, and approximately 6,000 square feet of landscape area.

Attorney Scott Grover represents the Applicant. Scott Cameron of the Morin Cameron Group, and Kevin Murio, representing the owner, are also present. Most landscaping, lighting and Civil Engineering issues have been resolved, and there were just a few incoming comments from the City Engineering Dept., but at the previous meeting, the Board had design concerns.

The Architect is not present but Scott Cameron, Civil Engineer, presents the design. The Engineering memorandum was reviewed and comments for the Applicant to address were submitted; conditions for approval were included and were minor, and have been worked into today's Draft Decision.

A "bold, unique, car wash" was desired. The elevation is shown. This is a Genesis modular car wash building system. The building will have the same footprint; samples of projects built with a similar material are shown. Helen Sides asks about the ventilation panels/grilles; there are actual mirrored veneer windows that will reflect so you can't see in during the day but can see in at night. I.e. when it is light outside, the workings of the car wash will not be visible, but at night when it is dark outside and the interior is lit, equipment and cars being washed will be visible. They are not "fake windows." Chair Anderson approves of the design, and his sentiment is echoed by several other Board members, who also approve of the angled roof.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment but there is none.

A motion to close the public comment period is made by Helen Sides, seconded by DJ Napolitano, and passes with all in favor.

The Draft Decision is reviewed.

Comments:

- City Engineer's response to Attorney Grover's response is in the Decision, and he is satisfied. Mason Wells comments that the Health Dept. sent a list of conditions; boilerplate was included in the Decision and theirs is specific; the Applicant has seen and re-reviews the letter now.
- Chair Anderson asks if comments from the previous site plan are included; nothing was added from the last meeting. Kirt Rieder wonders why a Project Engineer is allowed to evaluate landscape installation boilerplate language. (p.4 states, "Letter from PE or Landscape architect.") "PE or" will be removed for this and future Decisions. It should read "Registered Landscape Architect" only.
- Clerk of Works, project changes, and notice to the Board are discussed. Has this section been modified to include clarifying language? Does the Clerk of Works report back to the Planning Dept? They do, and would note any deviation from approved conditions, but would be limited to water, utilities, and the connection to the street. What about changes made that Board did not approve? Discussion did not touch on Clerk of Works but views were pivotal in relaying the information to the Planning Dept. and potentially the Board so that the onus does not fall on the Planning Board or Dept. to police activity in the field, when the Clerk of the Works is there to do it. This will be worked on.
- p.7: Mr. Cameron notes section 14.11 (Section 14 subsection 11): "All construction shall be under the supervision of an LSP (Licensed Site Professional). Usually one is required when working on contaminated sites, not typically for overall construction. Language will be changed to reflect "construction related to contamination or under the appropriate code."
- Kirt Rieder wonders if the Board wants to add to (7), Clerk of the Works. It is clear what the Clerk is looking at, as written, and what the Board wanted is not included. The Clerk of the Works supervises public-related improvements on private property, but not the private utilities focused on by the Board in

previous discussions. Chair Anderson prefers that the Planning Dept. craft something vs. the Board inserting the language as he does not foresee issues during this particular project.

*A motion to issue the Draft Decision is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Bill Griset, and the motion carries with all in favor.*

- C. Location:** 129 Lafayette Street, 20 Harbor Street, 135 Lafayette Street (Map 34, Lot 307)  
**Applicant:** Harbor Point Properties LLC  
**Description:** A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of HARBOR POINT PROPERTIES LLC for the property located at 129 Lafayette Street, 20 Harbor Street, 135 Lafayette Street (Map 34, Lot 307) for an amendment to a Planned Unit Development Special Permit and Site Plan Review decision in accordance with the Salem Zoning Ordinance section 7.3 Planned Unit Development and section 9.5 Site Plan Review. Specifically, the applicant proposes to amend an existing Special Permit decision dated September 17, 2010 and later amended by amended decision dated July 31, 2019. The Decision, as amended, allows a mixed-use development consisting of 85 dwelling units and commercial space at the former St. Joseph's church site. The applicant proposes three (3) additional dwelling units in the former school building, increasing the number of units in that building from 21 to 24, for a new total of 88 dwelling units on site. The applicant also proposes exterior changes to the building, including additional windows matching the existing style. There are no changes to the parking plan and all units will have at least one parking space as required by zoning.

Presenting for the Applicant is Attorney Joseph Correnti of 63 Federal St. and Kristin Kolick. The history of the project is described. He considers this a minor amendment to the summer 2019 amendment, including a request to add 3 units to the former school building. 37 units are now proposed between the rectory and school building; 40 parking spaces are deeded between them. There will be a 1:1 parking ratio with 3 visitor spaces available. Exterior changes have been made to accommodate the additional three units.

David Pabich and Larry Frye, Principals at Harbor Point, present.

David Pabich outlines changes to elevation:

- Increasing units b/c while applying for federal tax credits, they wanted to reduce the number of units in the school building, but this would leave top floor open, not public, and unusable; as a result, they are not pursuing fed or state tax credits on the school, but will revise exterior to Park Service standards as if using Federal funds
- Are applying for HDIP credits, getting historic tax credits on rectory but not school. Applied but will not pursue to end of process
- East Elevation shown; some windows being added into what would otherwise be a "dead area" in the building
- North (Harbor St.) and South Elevations shown and described
- Helen Sides wonders why some of the new windows are smaller and questions the aesthetics; this is discussed. This is not a critical issue, but she wonders if it was considered. It can be re-examined. Matt Smith appreciates the smaller windows and variety they add
- Header on the new windows matches cast concrete on the existing
- Chair notes that these projects are not easy to rehab, as there can be unforeseen expenses, and he appreciates the Applicant taking them on. He thinks City benefits from the addition of housing and keeping of an historic building

- DJ Napolitano asks about affordable housing; Tom Daniel provided agreement w/City; originally 85 units, going to make 51 units in the existing 100% new affordable at 40 60 80 AMI. Two buildings were supposed to be 100% market rate but they are doing 3 at the same level of affordability. HDIP vs. AMI is discussed. More HDIP = can provide units at greater affordability. It is close enough to affect project financial viability. Might not be able to do the same project after inclusionary zoning. The City's incentives will have to grow, notes Attorney Correnti. Mr. Pabich comments that rehab is different from ground up construction. Once you open an existing building, you are into it and there will be unhappy surprises, developers roll through contingency and wish they had more. There is a lot of risk in this type of project, so the math is different than for new construction.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment but there is none.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and the motion carries.

The Draft Amended Decision is reviewed.

A motion to approve the Draft Amended Decision is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and the motion carries.

**D. Location:** 57 Marlborough Road/Osborne Hills  
**Applicant:** Osborne Hills Realty Trust  
**Description:** Planning Board review and vote on the Osborne Hills Realty Trust's Triparty Agreement and the request to release the lots for Phase 5.

This item is heard second. Paul DiBiase represents the Realty Trust, developing entity building the project at Strongwater Crossing. The project has been continually inspected by the Clerk of the Works. One bond amount for curbing was adjusted to be greater. He is requesting release of the lots in Phase 5.

Mr. DiBiase provides an update on project progress. Phases 1, 2 and 3 contain 52 houses, already built. Phase 4 has 15 of 18 houses built. Phase 5 has an additional 17 lots to be built on. The binder and infrastructure are in place and homes are ready to be built.

Kirt Rider asks about the crossings to be eliminated; this will be presented later. DJ Napolitanos asks about the previous neighbor's concerns when Phase 3 was released. All neighbor concerns have been addressed and they are working on an as-built to get phases 1-3 turned over to the City. Information has been compiled but Engineering has not done a final evaluation of it. This project was extended for five years.

A release document for Board signatures is available and the Applicant has provided a notary. Bill Griset wonders about the reason for the signatures being notarized; this will be looked into and provided. It is a recorded document with the registry of deeds, though it is not registered land.

**E. Location:** 57 Marlborough Road/Osborne Hills  
**Applicant:** Osborne Hills Realty Trust  
**Description:** Form B/Preliminary Subdivision Application for proposed access modifications to Phases 6-10 of the Osborne Hills/Strongwater Crossing subdivision.

Mr. Paul DiBiase represents his project.

Proposed changes are described. Better access will be provided to the remaining project phases 6-10, which are in an RC zone. As approved, the subdivision required culverts and two bridges to access those areas. Chris Mello of Eastern Land Surveyors examined the route and came up with a different approach to the phases in question, that has several advantages to both the City and developer. It will allow for more open space.

Chris Mello of Eastern Land Survey present the changes:

- Current phases 1-4 in R1 zoning outlined, reduced lot size from zoning
- RC zoning dimensions and setbacks are described
- Diandra Drive is described
- Phases 6-10 modification will also go before the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for relief. and will also appear before the Conservation Commission for changes in the road
- Two wetland crossings and bridges will be eliminated, 12 lots at Diandra Dr. to be eliminated and the lots on Strongwater Dr. will be smaller, though the same in number. A large portion of road will be eliminated. RC zone meant lots had to be much deeper; now with 8,000' lots, they can gain more open space per unit
- Wish to modify definitive plan to eliminate Diandra Dr. and allow Strongwater Dr. lots get smaller but this will be under ZBA purview for dimensional relief from RC zoning, to be the same as Phases 1-5. Asking PB for lots with 70-80' frontage and less square footage
- Infrastructure does not change, stormwater management will need tweaking, sewer and water are the same but now do not need to cross the wetland
- Some questions may come to a finer point

The Applicant will appear before the ZBA and concurrently again before the Planning Board; this is a preliminary approval for a Form B Preliminary subdivision. If obtained, the project will go to the ZBA for dimensional relief. If successful, they will prepare a definitive subdivision Plan and file it here and for a Notice of Intent with the Conservation Commission because the roadway was not anticipated. Preliminary approval will allow them to move forward. The Applicant is awaiting comments from Engineering, though this is preliminary so comments would have no legal impact on the process in the future. Mr. Mello notes that there is not much engineering for the Department to comment on, as the road network was approved to requirements, and this connection also conforms but would be reviewed in a definitive process.

DJ Napolitano asks about the number of homes; 12 are being eliminated, but are then being combined with the 32 previously approved in another area, so now there will be 44 in that one area. DJ Napolitano feels the houses look tight, but the Applicant replies that it would be similar to Witchcraft Heights, where Mr. Napolitano lives. Mr. Mello describes the setbacks, which did not change. Houses will be 25-30' apart, 20' in some cases, with a 20' set back from the street. It will be no different than driving through Osborne Hills & Amanda Way. These will be the same product type and lot size as what is completed. This needs to be made prominent in the narrative comments, says Kirt Rieder. He also notes that, since the entire property is privately owned, it would help their narrative to clearly quantify the net increase in conserved property. This is outlined:

- Open space increased by 30 acres, 36% (96 acres were previously approved)
- Roadway decreased by 15% or 861 linear feet (Kirt Rieder feels that the Applicant should quantify this in acreage for clarity)
- Total lots remain at 131 with no change

Kirt Rieder asks about open space vs. conservation land and if it will be deeded to the City. Legally, the plans say open space. Open Space will be maintained by the Homeowners Association (HOA,) currently Mr. DiBiase's entity, with the ability for all Salem residents to use it for passive recreation on the trail system. Phase 4 created a parking lot for visitors to access the open space trails. Ownership stays with the Association at this time but he believes the City can take it at some point. Privately owned public space would roll to the HOA, who would hold the deed to it.

Mr. DiBiase holds the deed now; it will get transferred to the HOA, which normally happens toward the end of the project. Kirt Rieder asks how the HOA will be enforced. Recorded documents are part of the development, attached to Purchase & Sale Agreements. These recorded documents include covenants and restrictions, and also cover open space and its usability, and that it will be kept in its natural state and not built on. Kirt Rieder notes that in his subdivision no one cared because the original owners disappeared over 30 years. He feels covenants should prevent the HOA from parceling in perpetuity, so that if Conservation laws are loosened they cannot invite a developer in, or if the open space is given to the City, something should prevent the City from selling and developing. Mr. DiBiase suggests that if he is successful the Board should revisit and look at what was approved already. The issue he has legally is that now there are 60+ residents who have purchased homes, in accordance with the restrictive covenants that exist, and he is not sure he can add to that as he would have to get their consent, but he can double check. Brian McGrail, legal representative, could not be present, but can answer next time. Kirt Rieder comments that it may be pivotal to Board approval. Mr. DiBiase replies that the intent is for the land to remain undisturbed forever.

The Board comments that the density of homes per property is not increasing but the concentration of homes is. Mr. DiBiase notes that the Conservation Commission was delighted to see them and with the proposal, noted they would be in support of it. They are seeking support and direction before going to the ZBA.

Chair Anderson asks about the anticipated waterway crossings; 2 bridges and 1 large culvert will be eliminated. There will be a culvert on grade and filled; also a levee/causeway. No new lots are any smaller than the smallest existing ones that have been built.

Carole Hamilton asks how the ZBA changes the zoning. Mr. Mello notes that the Planning Board issued a special permit under the bylaw, and now the Applicant is asking the ZBA to reduce the minimum setbacks, so this is not a zoning change. The Applicant is asking, in RC zoning, to allow setbacks to be 15/10/30 and not 15/40/30, comments Bill Luster. Carole Hamilton replies that the zoning district has setbacks associated with it, so if asking to change setback requirements, they are in effect changing the zoning. The Applicant replies that they are seeking relief on this piece of land only, but Carole Hamilton opines that it is not allowed before ZBA. Mr. Luster counters that they have had direction re proper steps from people at City Hall; the City Solicitor did not provide legal opinion but referred them to Planning and the ZBA. Carole Hamilton would still like an opinion as to how the ZBA can give dimensional relief.

Kirt Rieder asks how comfortable they and the Engineering Dept. will be with distance of cul de sac. This initiates a discussion regarding the lack of connection to Barcelona Ave. A waiver was granted by the Planning Board sitting when the project was originally approved, with one entrance. The Developer comments that Engineering approves because they will have to maintain less. The distance to the subdivision entrance will remain the same (it is far). Procedurally the Planning Board can vote for preliminary approval, but can they then get Board of Health comments and revisit? The Chair approves, and Board members appear to, and if there is a positive vote, the Developer would then design a definitive plan. Matt Veno was on the City Council when this went through; he notes that, at that time it was a long process, with strongly held views by the ward councilor and others. Have they engaged the current Ward 4 councilor? Also, there was a City Council meeting tonight so Councilors could not attend this Planning Board meeting. Mr. DiBiase met with the Ward 4 Councilor at the development, he filmed it, posted to the FB page, and had no issues with it. Mr. DiBiase also had a neighborhood meeting where 25 residents showed up and he presented changes; there was no real comment. Residents were also invited to the public hearing and to contact his office if they had any issues.

Chair Anderson understands Carole Hamilton's concerns and that the Planning Board needs BOH comments and City Council concerns, and recommends reviewing the Draft Decision at the next meeting, and getting an interpretation from the City Solicitor before then as well.

There is additional discussion about the lack of connection/outlet to Barcelona Ave. and whether the current Board can require one. Councilor Flynn's feelings on a connection to Barcelona Ave. are unclear.

*A motion to continue to the Jan. 23, 2020 meeting, is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and passes with all in favor.*

### 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. A condition of this amended decision states that prior to installation of rooftop HVAC and ventilation units, the Planning Board will determine at a regularly scheduled meeting whether screening will be required.

Mason Wells shows the unit proposed, which should be dark, gray and supposedly discreet; however it is not particularly dark and Mr. Wells did note it may not be amenable to the Board. The Applicant did not provide an alternate but the Historical Commission and others sent him some samples. The Applicant did a mock up, and one unit was visible, so the Board had asked for it to either blend in or be screened. The Applicant should provide a screen as suggested. Kirt Rieder comments that the one at Salem State is good. This will be communicated to the Applicant, who will hopefully have a solution for the next meeting. Noah Koretz comments that the second screening option is preferable to the third.

- B. Receive and File Chapter 91 License Application Notification of the project located at Willow Beach at the end of Willow Street, Salem, MA 01970.**

Board members can submit comments to Mason Wells offline and he will pass them along. This is the Engineering pipe relocation project, located behind Saltonstall School, up from Forest River Park.

- C. Review and vote on the 2020 Planning Board Meeting Schedule.**

*A motion to approve the 2020 Planning Board meeting schedule is made by DJ Napolitano, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and the motion carries*

### Discussion on Enforcement re violation sat 73-75 Wharf St., Pickering Wharf

This is the project on the left across from Sea Level, between that restaurant and Longboards; it is "heinous, and not as approved." Tom St. Pierre, Building Inspector, is aware, and is in contact with the owner. He will have an inspector onsite, but Mason Wells has no sense as to what action he will take. The Planning Board could cite the Applicant for being out of conformance, but it is unclear what, if any, penalties could be imposed or actions enforced. The project is entirely, materially different from what the Board approved, however it was FHOD special permit project so did not undergo Site Plan Review. However, there was an original Site Plan that included that building so to raise it another story would be out of conformance. The now maximized usable area was not what was before this Board. Its decision also mandated that the Applicant replace the trees, now it is questioned whether the Board has the purview to enforce that. Matt Smith wonders about the pause in construction which left an entire floor open. It could have been the contractor, but also could have been because they were changing something. The



Board did not have a problem with what was presented; they still added a floor but maintained a pitched roof. Now, the corners are markedly different. Why does the Board bother reviewing and approving projects if applicants just go in a different direction? What is the point? If City enforcement does not enforce, why do it? Chair Anderson comments that the Zoning Enforcement Officer can get things on record and correct the situation; Kirt Rieder asks if this can be done administratively or physically.

Someone can correct the problem physically, and the Board can definitely do so administratively. There is a question about imposing financial penalties. Kirt Rieder notes changes to the hotel project and asks if the Board needs to redline drawings to note differences. Bill Griset asks if the Board can get legal opinion on enforceability from the City Solicitor. If the Planning Board has no teeth, there is no point in reviewing projects. Matt Veno comments that the Board does not have dialogue with Mr. St. Pierre or the City Solicitor, an issue is fundamental to the Board's work.

City personnel Tom St. Pierre (Building Inspector), Tom Daniel (Planning Director) and Beth Rennard (City Solicitor) will be invited to the next meeting to discuss.

#### **IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- A.** Regular Planning Board meeting minutes for November 7, 2019.
- B.** Special Joint Planning Board and City Council meeting minutes for November 14, 2019.
- C.** Regular Planning Board meeting minutes for November 21, 2019.

*Postponed to the next meeting.*

Mason Wells note that the Mass Municipal Association's annual meeting & trade show is the 3rd weekend in January, Friday and Saturday the 22nd and 23rd. Registration closes on Wed. Jan. 15th. Matt Veno notes that the agenda has several relevant items. Fri/Sat Some Board members are interested in going. the City is willing to cover the cost via reimbursement. It is uncertain if CEU's toward licensing are available.

#### **V. ADJOURNMENT**

*A motion to adjourn is made by DJ Napolitano, seconded by Noah Koretz, and the motion carries.*

The meeting ends at 9:46 PM.

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 XX/XX/2020

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