

**City of Salem Planning Board
Approved Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 21, 2016**

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, July 21, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall Annex, 120 Washington Street, Room 313, Salem, Massachusetts.

Vice Chair Matt Veno opens the meeting at 7:01 pm.

I. ROLL CALL

Those present were: Noah Koretz, Bill Griset (arriving late), Vice Chair Matt Veno, Dale Yale and Helen Sides, Kirt Rieder, Carole Hamilton

Absent: Chair, Ben Anderson, Tony Mataragas

Also present: Amanda Chiancola, Staff Planner, and Stacy Kilb, Planning Board Recording Clerk.

II. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Location: 18 Thorndike Street (Map 37, Lot 38)

Applicant: DeIulis Brothers Construction Co., Inc.

Description: Review and vote on the request to release Lot 5 from the Thorndike Street Subdivision Covenant to Secure the Construction of Ways and Installation of Municipal Services.

Here for the applicant is Patrick DeIulis for Pasquanna Developers, Inc. Mr. DeIulis describes the subdivision and the progress. All municipal betterments were associated with lots 1-4 and are described. They have been completed. A cash security is still being held, and no improvements other than the homes and utilities are associated with lot 5. An as-built of installation of utilities is the only item left, but cannot be completed until the house on Lot 5 is built. Mr. DeIulis would like a release and the cash security will stay on deposit until all work is computed.

A motion to approve the request to release Lot 5 is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Dale Yale, and carries in a roll call vote with 6 (Matt Veno, Noah Koretz, Carole Hamilton, Kirt Rieder, Dale Yale, and Helen Sides) in favor and none (0) opposed.

B. Location: 14 Bertuccio Ave. (Map 24, Lot 105)

Applicant: Nathan Jacobson

Description: A continuance of a public hearing for a Definitive Subdivision Plan in accordance with the Salem Subdivision Regulations to allow the construction of a roadway to serve seven (7) residential lots, and a Stormwater Management Permit in accordance Sec. 37 of the Salem Code of Ordinances to allow for activity that results in a land disturbance greater than one acre.

Voting eligibility is discussed as several Board members have missed meetings at which this project was an agenda item.

Vice Chair Veno opens the item. At a previous meeting, it was decided that the City of Salem would hire its own geotechnical engineer for peer review; it was felt that, though the applicant could recommend one, it could represent a conflict of interest. Nonetheless, the applicant, Nathan Jacobson, introduces the engineer he has hired to review the blasting portion of the project, Mr. Kanayo Lala. Carole Hamilton asks for clarification and Mr. Jacobson states that he is not accepting the City's peer review (which would have been at his expense)

since, after today, a total four experts will have spoken on this matter. Kirt Rieder asks about the protocol and the difference between this Board recommending vs. requesting a geotechnical peer review, and what progress was made on the City's attempt to hire a geotechnical engineer for that purpose. Amanda Chiancola was not aware before this point that the applicant was not going to accept the City's peer review, but that is his choice.

Mr. Jacobson outlines current progress; a peer review letter regarding storm water management was received; there are eight outstanding issues which he says will be resolved. In this presentation he will also show some ideas for developing an open space at the top of the cul-de-sac, which will benefit the community. He is also planning to hold an open, public meeting where neighbors can attend as a group, rather than meeting with him one on one.

Bill Griset arrives at 7:25PM.

Mr. Lalo describes the site and the ledge. He outlines his background and qualifications, as well as previous projects he has consulted on that involved similar situations. He outlines the blasting plan on the site plans and describes elevations as well as the blasting procedure. The blasting on this project will create vibrations far below those allowed by Mass Highway standards; it will be one quarter of what is allowed. Vice Chair Matt Veno asks if the Mass Highway standards account for nearby structures and Mr. Lalo states that they do. Additionally, the homes in question are further away than on previous projects he has worked on.

Vice Chair Matt Veno speaks for himself but opines that the primary concern of the Board was maintaining the stability of the cliff and the impact of nearby blasting.

Mr. Lalo again outlines the distances of the cliff from the blast sites and measures taken to avoid damage. A trial blast will be done before work begins in earnest, and adjustments can be made. He, as the engineer, would work with the blaster.

Vice Chair Veno comments that part of the Board's selection process of a peer reviewer is to understand his or her training and credentials, and would like to know if Mr. Lalo's training was specific to blasting. Mr. Lalo describes his education, which he describes as very thorough, in India. He claims to have built very large homes up to 30,000 square feet. Kirt Rieder comments that the Board is not in a position to evaluate Mr. Lalo's credentials and experience. Mr. Lalo states that there are only three geotechnical engineers in the state that are licensed as such, and that every structural engineer is a geotechnical engineer by definition. He has received training regarding blasting within his engineering training, and has supervised blasting but never performed it himself.

Vice Chair Matt Veno asks if Mr. Lalo conducted a specific inspection of the cliff face, or if he viewed it from afar. He feels that this expert is not credible as this analysis has not been done, and he has not heard specific credentials regarding blasting, nor learned anything new. The purpose of the Board specifically hiring a geotechnical engineer for peer review is to understand the stability of the ledge and how it will be impacted by blasting.

Mr. Jacobson wonders why this issue of peer review is only coming up at this point, despite discussion in previous meetings. Discussion about timing ensues.

Helen Sides asks for clarification about the locations of blasting; there are only two places, and blasting is only required if the ledge is more than 2' deep. Half the cul-de-sac requires blasting.

Mr. Jacobson speaks to Ben Anderson's comment on how to benefit the community. He shows renderings that illustrate a seating area overlooking the City. Mr. Jacobson disagrees with the concept of a park since

neighbors do not want additional traffic. Thus, he is proposing places to sit on private land but the public will have access. Benches and potentially a lookout area with plantings could be installed at the closest place of the cul-de-sac to cliff; there are some options as there will be an easement for neighbors to access the cliff. He reassures the Board that anyone at this lookout will not be able to see into the yards below. There will be a fence and the homeowner's association can be responsible for maintenance, and he can require that nothing be planted to obstruct the view. It will be handicapped accessible.

Kirt Rieder comments about a discrepancy between the number of trees on the plans vs. the ones shown in the renderings; Mr. Jacobson did not expect each tree to literally be counted, but Kirt Rieder replies that that is the job of this Board. Vice Chair Matt Veno comments that Chair Ben Anderson had originally raised the suggestion of benches but is not here to give feedback; he himself does not feel strongly either way.

Helen Sides says that Chris Burke of the Parks and Recreation Commission originally brought up the possibility of a lookout, and she appreciates attempt to implement that idea.

Vice Chair Matt Veno is concerned about the proximity of the lookout to the ledge, though he understands there will be a fence. He is also still concerned about the visibility of the yards below from the lookout. The applicant replies that the location shown is the best one, though another could be chosen. Arborvitae would provide visual barriers to the homes below without obstructing the view. Mr. Jacobson wonders if people will come at night to throw things off the ledge, and how they can balance the risks with the needs of the community. Vice Chair Veno is interested to hear about the outcome of the conversation with neighbors once it occurs.

Vice Chair Veno opens to the public for comments.

Bob Dube of 18 Francis Rd. states that the engineer did not go to the base of the cliff, and he is still concerned by how loose and cracked the rocks are.

Robyn Giannopolo of 15 Bertuccio Ave. is concerned about the lack of objective peer review on this project, and that it is being done for profit with no concern for residents.

Linda Wilson of 18 Bertuccio Ave., whose parents own 14 Bertuccio Ave. and are the ones who sold the land, feels that not everyone is making money, and she is unsure what the Board desires regarding a geotechnical engineer. She feels that they would just like to be "done." She reiterates that this is private property.

Scott Maglaughlin of 14 Francis Rd. agrees with Bob Dube regarding the rocks. He is also concerned about the impact of water movement from a vernal pond at the top of the area.

Steven Szpak of 27 Bertuccio Ave. agrees that the developer has the right to develop in accordance with the City's current rules. However, they are requesting a waiver. He wonders why rules are in place if they will be waived without a compelling reason.

Kara Meindel of 14 Hodges Court will be moving to 32 Bertuccio Ave. and is concerned about getting insurance on interior belongings, etc. that could be damaged due to the blasting.

Chris Shane of 28 Calabrese St. also feels that, while it is within the owner's rights to sell the land, he is concerned about the project itself. He feels that the developer is under agreement and wants their money's worth. He wonders about the market value of the property and if there is another way that can be realized. Vice Chair Veno says that that discussion would be more appropriately had with developer, and is not under the purview of this Board.

Peter Lupo of 24 Bertuccio Ave. questions the distances of the blasting, which can be reviewed by Mr. Jacobson at the upcoming public meeting. Mr. Lupo would rather see Salem Woods acquire the property.

Mr. Jacobson describes the blasting and the inspections that will occur before, during and after it. Proper compensation can be made for any items damaged.

Vice Chair Matt Venio notes that the board has received public comment from Kelly Porter, Robyn Giannopolo and Clifford Goodman.

As this project's current deadline is July 30th, a motion to extend the deadline for final action to Sept. 8, 2016 is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Noah Koretz, and passes 5-0 with Kirt Rieder abstaining.

A motion to continue to the Sept. 1, 2016 meeting is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Bill Grisct, and passes 5-0 with Kirt Rieder abstaining.

C. 81 Highland Ave; 108 Jefferson Ave; Old Rd; 1 Dove Ave; 79 Highland Ave; 55 Highland Ave; and 57 Highland Ave (Map 24, Lots 1, 2, 88, 19, 216, 218 220; and Map 14, Lot 129)

Applicant: North Shore Medical Center, Inc.

Description: A continuance of the public hearing for a Site Plan Review, in accordance with the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 9.5 Site Plan Review; and a Stormwater Management Permit in accordance with Salem Code of Ordinances Chapter 37. Specifically, the applicant proposes to construct a new Emergency Department/Inpatient Beds building, a new front Lobby expansion, renovation resulting in an addition of 119,735 square feet and repurposing of 119,734 square feet of interior space, internal driveway and parking modifications, landscape and hardscape improvements and utility infrastructure modifications to their existing campus.

Here for the applicant are:

Kristen Kolick, attorney, of 73 Federal Street, who will respond to the civil engineer's comments and will present regarding the façade, etc.

Justin Mosca of 101 Walnut St., Watertown, will address civil design addressing comments. Bill Ross for peer review is also present. Steve Diderian and a landscape architect are also present.

Justin Mosca presents the following PowerPoint slides:

- Overall site plan
- Site Layout Changes – ED Entrance
- Site Layout Changes – Dove Ave (one fewer parking space due to increased turn radius)
- Site Layout Changes – Walkway to Highland Hall
- Civil Peer Review (New England Civil Engineering Corp). Comments have been addressed to the satisfaction of the peer reviewer and City Engineer. There are several requested conditional approval items outlined, including:
 - Drainage alteration permit
 - Soil test pits at proposed infiltration
 - Sanitary sewer mitigation at existing syphon. Flow is not increasing.

Bill Ross, Peer Reviewer, states that the 25 comments were spread across many different aspects of the plans, and he concurs with them being addressed. Two additional questions were resolved as well. While there were

also questions about a detention pond, no agreement on what or who will pay for it was reached, but discussions continue, so he will report back at the next meeting.

Vice Chair Veno asks about the location of the syphon and Mr. Ross points it out on the map from the June 22 letter. Mr. Mosca states that mostly refinement is required on the civil engineering end.

Steve Diderian, landscape architect with VHB, outlines:

- Overall Site Plan
- Highland Avenue – Existing Conditions
- Highland Avenue – Proposed Improvements
- Highland Avenue – Axelrod Entrance
- Highland Avenue – Lot A Frontage
- Highland Avenue – Lower (ED) Entrance
- Jefferson Avenue – Existing Conditions
- Jefferson Avenue – Dove Avenue Intersection
- Jefferson Avenue – Employee Parking
- Representative Campus Planting – Dove Ave.
- Representative Planting – Macomber/Phippen

Angela Watson from Shepley Bullfinch at 2 Seaport Lane Boston shows renderings of the following viewpoints:

- Ambulance Bay – Day View
- Ambulance Bay – Night View
- Main Lobby – From Highland Avenue
- Main Lobby – Day View
- Main Lobby – Night View

Noah Koretz is concerned about pedestrians cutting across the driveway to get to the entrance, but Ms. Watson cites the placement of the door and Mr. Mosca cites topography that will guide pedestrians toward the door. There can be uplighting installed on the walkway; there are lights proposed but it is unclear what type.

Helen Sides urges Shelley Bisegna to consider upgrading the parking lot on the opposite side of the road, but it is leased and there is not much room for planning.

Kirt Rieder appreciates the renderings and comments on the relationship between wayfinding and viewing the front door of the hospital. He would like to see more shade trees as they are what will last on the campus. They would in fact be preferable over the detention pond as that cannot be blocked.

Kirt Rieder also comments that the white "fence" may be a guardrail and is concerned about the applicant investing in a black metal fence, which would be good for scale/detail but may get damaged during snow removal. Regarding street trees, he is still hoping for more transformative plantings along Route 107, and wonders if the applicant can reduce parking and insert street trees to provide vertical relief, shade, and a change in scale. He approves of shade trees along walkways but they have no overhead utilities except at Dove Ave, so can do columnar and shade trees there. He would like to see more upper level vs. ground level vegetation.

Vice Chair Matt Veno opens to public comment.

Alma Pelletier of 3 Horton St. asks if there has been a traffic study and if traffic will be discussed at another meeting and wonders about its impact. Amanda Chiancola does have an applicant-provided traffic study that has been peer reviewed. Amanda explains that there has been some back and forth between the applicant's traffic engineer and the civil engineer, and the traffic related discussion is still on going. Amanda will share traffic info with Ms. Pelletier. Judy Weir 24 Willson St. is also interested in traffic.

A motion to continue to the Sept. 1st meeting is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Helen Sides, and carries 7-0.

D. 14 and 16 Almeda St. (Map 14, Lot 116 and Map 14, Lot 117)

Applicant: Town and Country Homes, Inc.

Description: A continuance of the public hearing for a Definitive Subdivision Plan to construct a roadway to serve two existing undeveloped lots.

Bob Griffin of Griffin Engineering and George Belleau, the applicant is also here. Progress on the project and the permitting process is described; all comments from the City Engineer have been addressed. There was also a response to a letter from an abutter, Mr. Harlow-Powell.

Vice Chair Matt Veno opens to the public and Mr. Donald Harlow- Powell of 12 Almeda St. outlines his concerns:

- Discrepancies in footage
- Discrepancies in the width of the street
- Turnaround for trucks and vans
- Types of houses
- No lighting currently proposed
- Sight lines

There was also an issue raised regarding a motor home parked in front of their house; Maria Hamilton of the same address feels the comments are unfounded.

Mr. George Belleau, the petitioner, comments that Mr. Harlow's Powell's swimming pool is half on his property and his lawn takes up $\frac{3}{4}$ of the lot, so this is why Mr. Harlow-Powell cannot envision where the houses will go. There will be no slabs used. Homes will be traditional colonial; there is no plan yet but they will be high quality.

George Fallon of 36 March St. has discussed some of these issues with Mr. Hamilton. He states that he saw a motor home in front of Mr. Harlow-Powell, which remained there for about a month, hooked up to an electrical cord. He questions why Mr. Harlow-Powell is so concerned about truck turnarounds if he feels comfortable taking up that width of the street for that length of time. He cites another area where trucks must back up and opines that the age of the City is just something that has to be accommodated, as prior decisions were made many years ago.

Bob Griffin describes the width of the road; it will not be reconstructed but will only be widened in the portion in front of the 2 lots. Easement is provided so turnaround on the properties is provided, but that will go away when Almeda St. is developed. He also comments on the footage; there will be some repaving which makes up the difference.

The Vice Chair reminds Mr. Harlow-Powell to restrict his comments to the plans for this project. Mr. Harlow-Powell is still concerned about the street and the lack of turnaround.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Bill Grisct and passes in a roll call vote with all (7) in favor (Matt Veno, Noah Koretz, Carole Hamilton, Kirt Rieder, Bill Grisct, Helen Sides and Dale Yale) and none (0) opposed.

The Fire Department has no issues with the turnaround, its concerns having been addressed by the turnaround built to roadway standards and the acquisition of a temporary easement from the property owner.

Kirt Rieder asks about the language in one of the waivers for sidewalks and granite curbing; this is not required under this application but the decision leaves the option open for the road extension to accommodate a crosswalk and sidewalk.

Carole Hamilton asks about homeowner maintenance of a retaining wall; the deeds will require that the owners maintain their portions of the wall until such time as the road is transferred to the City. The condition is revised.

A motion to approve the Form C-Definitive Subdivision, as conditioned is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Bill Grisct, and carries in a roll call vote with Matt Veno, Noah Koretz, Carole Hamilton, Kirt Rieder, Bill Grisct, Helen Sides and Dale Yale (7) in favor and none (0) opposed.

A. Location: 70-92 ½ Boston St. (Map 15, Lot 299 & Map 16, Lot 139)

Applicant: 139 Grove Street Realty Trust

Description: A continuance of a public hearing for a Site Plan Review, Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit, 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 the redevelopment of the former Flynnntan site consisting of removal of three structures on the property, the construction of 50 residential dwelling units within two separate buildings and a commercial retail space with parking provided on the site.

Here for the applicant is Mr. Joseph Correnti of 63 Federal St.

Also present:

Kristin Kolick

Anthony Roberto

Ken Staff, VHB

Chris Sparages, project Engineer

Peer Reviewer for the City of Salem

Mr. Chris Sparages of Williams and Sparages review the revised plan. Differences between the plans are shown.

Changes incorporated:

- Entrance off of Boston St. moved 25' further away from Dunkin' Donuts to achieve site distance as per peer review
- Goodhue St. – moved entrance on Beaver St; previously using existing City curb cut, now moved and widened entrance
- Garage parking spaces are wider with improved traffic flow (9' x 19')
- Cars will enter garage straight on rather than having to make a 90 degree turn
- Improved access to proposed dumpsters for private hauler
- Addition of access for pedestrians from Boston St. Accessible route added from existing sidewalk
- Additional green spaces created, some parking spaces are eliminated from 108 (for 2 spaces per unit plus retail). Now proposed is additional green space between parking and Dunkin' Donuts and 5 fewer spaces there; the Beaver St. side will have 2 fewer parking spaces with additional green space on both sides of the

lot/driveway. Inside the garage, there are 5 fewer spaces. This means there is a total of 12 fewer spaces for a grand total of 96 spaces. Zoning requires 106 spaces but the applicant believes that the flow and additional green spaces are improvements.

- Retail space reduction and moved to Goodhue St. side
- Parallel parking spaces on Goodhue St. lot (9'x22')
- Another entrance to the building has been added on the Goodhue St. side; it is ADA compliant and next to the retail
- The sidewalk will be extended up to Witch City Cycle but this is not yet rendered on the Plan; it will be added

Attorney Correnti comments on the reduction in parking spaces. The developer is putting himself in a variance-required situation because this is a better plan. This Board as well as the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) have consistently commented that the requirement that there be two parking spaces per unit is "overparked," and the developer trusts that they can make the case for a variance from the ZBA. They must prove a hardship and Vice Chair Matt Venio suggests that the topography of the site makes development difficult. The developer would very much like to see this project done right.

Noah Koretz asks about the pedestrian entrance next to the retail on Goodhue St. Mr. Sparages outlines the reconfiguration of the initial plan.

Chris Sparages responds to the peer review comments from VHB. Additional review has been done with back and forth between himself and the peer reviewer. Work continues on remaining items and another revised plan will be developed next week. Timing of the letters is discussed. Many items were addressed in the storm water report.

Ken Staffer, Peer Reviewer from VHB, outlines the outstanding issues. Mr. Sparages indicates that several items were contentious and that Mr. Staffer had said he should defer to Dave Knowlton, the City Engineer. For those items the applicant agreed to accommodate the suggestions as there would be little difference.

Ken Staffer agrees that the changes, especially to the garage access, are significant, and also comments that the parking requirement is high for this type of use. He hopes the Board will support the applicant's request for a Variance when they appear before the ZBA.

His comments/concerns:

- Would like clarification on the retail space. The relocation makes sense but accessibility is unclear
- Stairway on Boston St. is most likely acceptable to the ADA but the Mass. AEB is very stringent about "equal access" so they may balk
- Consider a guard rail or fall protection on retaining walls for parking

Larger storm water issues have been resolved. Ken Staffer feels that runoff will be handled adequately, but some calculations should be checked.

Helen Sides and Vice Chair Matt Venio express their approval of the project in its current iteration. The Vice Chair wonders if there is precedent for this Board to express that approval and suggest that the ZBA grant the variance. Amanda Chiancola states that the Planning Board may write a memo to the ZBA in support of the variance. She notes that the Design Review Board has also issued a favorable recommendation to the Planning Board on June 20. Noah Koretz adds that language in the decision should reflect that these plans were a response to Planning Board concerns, and that this Board endorses them. Mr. Correnti outlines the outstanding issues and comments on the timing of the meetings of the two Boards.

A motion to continue to the Sept. 1, 2016 meeting is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes with all in favor, 7-0.

There are no public comments.

III. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

- **40 Circle Hill Drive (Map 9, Lot 255; Land Court Plan 856-J, Lots 56, 57, 59 and 60)**

This item is heard after the minutes as Bill Griset is still not present. Amanda Chiancola outlines the progress and items needed; an extension was provided.

Still needed:

- Installation of 100' of sidewalk
- Guardrail
- Asphalt

Discussion was previously tabled as the Board was awaiting the outcome of a Conservation Commission decision, and that Commission was also adding a condition requiring the contractor to secure a bond before work could begin. A new Order of Conditions was issued on July 14th by the Conservation Commission.

This project does not require an extension request due to the amended Permit Extension Act as cited. Permits extend automatically until Dec. 1, 2017.

- **Other discussion:**

The Board discusses the inadequacies of the current zoning requirements regarding parking. As the issue arises with every development, they would like to address this and list it as a desired zoning change. Vice Chair Matt Veno comments that this Board should formulate a list of zoning issues and figure out the logistics of raising them to the City Council. Amanda Chiancola will add this as new business for the Sept. 1st meeting. However, she does have a list of items she would like the Board to review, and asks them to hold off until after her return in October, as she will not be available in September. Subdivision regulations and zoning updates can be explored at the same time.

Attorney Joseph Correnti announces that the Zoning Board of Appeals has granted the requested variances and special permit for the High Rock Gateway Center. This is the first time a special permit for shared parking has been entertained; the concept is referenced in the zoning ordinance, but no guidelines are provided for how to apply it. The applicant reviewed the guidelines of other cities, drafted a memo, and worked with this Planning Department. Last night's meeting was the end of the municipal permitting process, and the applicant will continue to work toward obtaining state level permits.

Attorney Correnti comments that the developer took a risk in appearing before the Planning Board before the ZBA, as it is not required to work in that order. He notes that the developer of the Flynntan site has also done this. The Chair of the ZBA noted his appreciation for the developer of the CLC working with Planning first, as many of the ZBA's questions were already answered through site and plan review. As a result, the applicant required two fewer variances than they were originally intending to request. Attorney Correnti outlines the logistics of the shared parking concept; Noah Koretz and Carole Hamilton note that this usage is ideas as the residents will park at night and those going to the CLC will park during the day.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. July 7, 2016

This item is taken next, out of order, as Bill Griset has not yet arrived.

A motion to approve the minutes with minor modifications is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Noah Koretz, and passes 5-0 with Carole and Kirt abstaining

V. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn is made by Bill Griset, seconded by Noah Koretz, and the motion carries with all present in favor, 7-0.

The meeting ends at 10:18PM.

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://www.salem.com/planning-board/webforms/planning-board-2016-decisions>

Respectfully submitted,
Stacy Kilb, Recording Clerk

Approved by the Planning Board on 09/01/2016

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