



CITY OF SALEM PLANNING BOARD

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday September 15, 2022, at 6:30 p.m. via remote access. Public participation was possible via Zoom video and conference call.

Chair Bill Griset opens the meeting at 6:30 pm

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Bill Griset (Chair), Kirt Rieder (Vice Chair), Tom Furey, Sarah Tarbet, Carole Hamilton, Zach Caunter, Helen Sides (7)

Absent: (0)

Also in attendance: Elena Eimert, staff planner, Beth Forrestal, Cassie Moskos, senior planner (3)

II. REGULAR AGENDA

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

Applicant: WinnDevelopment Companies LLC

Description: A public hearing for all persons interested in the application of WinnDevelopment Companies LLC for the property located at 252 Bridge Street (Map 26, Lot 0408 and Map 35, Lot 0024) in the B5 Zoning District for Site Plan Review in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 9.5 Site Plan Review, 7.3 Planned Unit Development Special Permit, and Section 8.1 Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit and Section 37 of the Salem Code of Ordinances, Stormwater Management Permit. The project will constitute Phase 1 of a two-phase project. Phase 2 will consist of the redevelopment and preservation of the historic County Commissioner's Building and Superior Court Building, located at 32 and 34 Federal Street (Map 35, Lot 621), which will be filed as an amendment at a later date. In Phase 1, the applicant specifically proposes to construct a mixed-use building with parking on the ground level, approximately 11,705 square feet of commercial and amenity space on the first level, and 120 residential units on the floors above. The proposed work includes razing any existing improvements and construction of the new building.

Attorney Joe Correnti here for the applicant.

Attorney Correnti: This is the first time that we will be introducing the team to the Planning Board. We have been working with the Salem Redevelopment Authority (SRA) and the Design

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

Review Board (DRB) and will be going forward with all three boards simultaneously. The obvious goal to have all boards looking at same set of plans. We have this before you as a Planned Unit Development (PUD). This project will be done in two phase, basically one big campus into 2 pieces. The first piece is the historic courthouse campus. The second piece, what we will call Phase 1, is the crescent lot. This is the major housing component. Tonight we would like to give you the overview of the project and highlight the work we have done with the SRA and DRB. It's a big project and we want to give you the overview while getting into the nitty gritty. City staff has launched peer reviews, Winn has initiated the civil and traffic peer reviews. Winn representatives and VHB, civil engineers, will walk you around the lot. We also have Michael Blier of Landmark Studios with us tonight. We will end with our architects.

Adam Stein, WinnDevelopment: Very excited to be here tonight. We were selected by the SRA in November of 2020 for this project. Since then there have been a lot of community meetings, we have also met with Historic Salem, the SRA, and the DRB and have received a lot of feedback. This presentation has been shaped by those meetings and we look forward to Planning Board input. We think we have wound up with a project better than what we started with. We have a great team on this project.

Winn Companies is a multifamily affordable housing developer. We are private, family owned, and have been in 50 years. Our core business is the creation of affordable multifamily affordable mixed income housing and adaptable reuse. We make decisions based on long term ownership. Long term ownership makes us share the same concerns that you do. We started with Pequot Highlands in Salem, and we still manage that property today. We worry about sustainability and traffic, etc. Aligned interests with the City of Salem . We have done a lot of historic adaptive reuse projects and have completed over thirty-five projects. We have a large breadth of team members within the Winn organization. There is the development team, the residential team, the construction team, and we have our own "green team" that helps incorporate sustainability into our projects. We have a multifaceted approach to all projects.

This project incorporates all our disciplines. Historic adaptive reuse, affordable, sustainable. We hope we can bring this to downtown Salem. The first component is Superior Court and County Commissioners buildings.

The presentation continues on with examples shown in Attleboro and Fitchburg. Attleboro just opened an adult day center in this project. This serves residents inside and outside of the community. Fitchburg, transformed into 96 units of multifamily housing. They aren't easy projects, and the criteria is complicated – historic, fair housing (accessibility and visitability), sustainability and energy initiatives are all in place. The success of these projects is based on our considerable experience.

Superior Court and County Commissioners buildings update since 2020: We worked with owners for access. We didn't have good records available, so we did an electronic interior scan to see what we have to work with. We looked at the mechanical systems and access for loading

and accessibility. We did a full masonry and window survey. We have to make sure about preservation restrictions, the space and the components and figure out what will be saved versus replaced. There is negative economic value associated with these buildings – and while expensive, Winn brings a lot of resources to the table. We have boosted our finances – CPA funds, North shore HOME funds through the North Shore Consortium, applied for underutilized property funds, Federal historic tax credits through the National Park Service, State historic tax credits through the Massachusetts Historical Commission. We can leverage all these resource, but this takes time to gather and inventory.

We have been working with the SRA and the city as to what these spaces will be. We will couple the public use with the residential. It is why we are using the phased approach, we wanted to include both sites together.

More examples shown (Brighton and Lowell) to highlight phase 1, the multifamily piece, the Crescent Lot. They were both new construction projects of similar size to the Crescent Lot. They are both affordable/workforce/market rate housing projects. Even with the three income tiers, the units are all similar, there is no differentiation. This is the most successful method to creating inclusive housing catering to many income brackets. Winn competed to be the development partner in these projects, much like the process completed with the SRA. Find the right partner, be a stakeholder and help drive economic development in the area.

Winn as a company is invested in the North Shore (*presentation lists projects Winn has completed on the North Shore*). We are a North Shore based company and many of our team members live on the North Shore

Ramie Schneider, WinnDevelopment: Why Salem? It is the perfect partnership between Salem and the SRA, and Winn. This opportunity will bring in needed mixed income housing. This will really connect North Salem and the downtown. We know Salem is thriving and want to fill the hole that is the face of how you enter Salem.

Mixed income projects are in alignment with the state's mission of creating affordable and workforce housing. We try to replicate the communities we are part of. 1/3 of the units will be affordable units will be for 80% or less AMI; a portion will be 80-120% AMI, which is considered workforce housing, and the rest will be unrestricted market rate units. All units designed to compete with market rate buildings. No distinct finishes in any of the units and same level of service across the board. The Crescent Lot will provide 120 units. *Presentation shows examples of workforce, affordable and deeply affordable incomes.* The goal is to bring this much needed housing to Salem.

The presentation ended with an extensive list of all the public meetings that have been held on this project. Historic Salem, SRA, DRB, Historical Commission. And all the funding applications we have put forth for the courthouse buildings. And hopefully upcoming low-income tax credits for the Crescent Lot.

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

Chair Griset: We typically like to keep presentations to 20-25 minutes.
Attorney Correnti: We have about 15 minutes left of the presentation.

Rich Whitehouse, VHB civil engineer:

The Phase 1 – The Exchange Salem. Phase 2 – redevelopment of the historic courthouses. The overall PUD area for the entire site is 1.7 acres. The Crescent Lot and remnant parcel is 0.97 acres. And sits south of MBTA station; 75 ft east of the North River, portions of the site fall within the 100-foot buffer zone, 200-foot riverfront area and will prepare a NOI for the Conservation Commission next month.

Paved lot right now, with some perimeter landscaping, mainly on remnant parcel. The lot sits below Bridge Street so one of the goals is to enhance the connectivity of the parking level with the Bridge Street level.

The project itself is a mixed-use development of approximately 120,000 square feet building, 120 units of residential and approximately 7300 sq ft of commercial space. 60 parking spaces on site with 65 additional to be available by long term passes off site. This means 1 space/unit plus an additional 5 guest/commercial spaces onsite. The project also includes dedicated drop off and pick up area and a dedicated loading area along Bridge Street. In the rear of the building there is a separate resident and trash loading area, this is onsite. Outdoor amenities and pedestrian connectivity . This will be discussed in the next segment. Additionally, there is needed stormwater management and utility improvements.

The Bridge Street modifications needed to create that drop off area – to be clear the intent is to shift the travel lane, which is currently on the north side of Bridge Street more to the southside of Bridge Street and pull curb lines with it to create a drop off area and loading space protected by landscaped islands on the north side. The improvements to Bridge Street are at the surface level.

In the existing condition, the parking lot is lower than Bridge Street and pitches to the north side of the paved area where stormwater drains into the MBTA's existing drainage network into the North River. The intent is to mimic the existing drainage patterns with no increase in impervious area. Roof runoff will be collected and routed through a water quality unit for treatment prior to discharge from the site which is not featured today. Currently unmanaged and untreated. At the ground level, where feasible, the ground surface runoff will be directed to a porous paver system in the pedestrian plaza and then held there and infiltrated into the ground. And then the remainder will be directed to the existing MBTA drainage infrastructure. The main discharge area is the pipe already existing on the site. Erosion controls are set up around perimeter on lower side and we are proposing silt sacks and catch basins for additional protections.

For utilities, there are currently two main utilities on site. There is a water line crossing it and site lighting circuitry. We will relocate water line into MBTA driveway to clear site for

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

improvements, and the site lighting circuitry will no longer be needed. Utilities are available in the MBTA driveway with the exception of gas, which is only available on Bridge Street so there is a connection on the east end of the building to Bridge Street. But we have done a lot to prioritize minimizing impact to Bridge Street. And these utility connections will be coordinated as part of the process and in accordance with Salem Engineering requirements.

Michael Blier, Landmark Studio

Even though the project is in 2 phases, it is designed as 1. The notion is that the courthouse and crescent lot are really reframing the corner of Washington Street and Bridge Street. And we are reintroducing a pedestrian scale throughout the site. The crescent building provides and intuitive pedestrian threshold to the downtown.

Currently there is a disconnection between the pedestrian and bike ways to the water or the train. What the building does really well is facilitate the movements up and down and across. The new building provides a heterogeneous gateway to the downtown, the building itself provides and intuitive pedestrian threshold to the downtown.

The plan sorts itself out using geometries. There is a pathway all the way down for bikes and people to the MBTA. We see it as one continuous landscape. There is movement alongside the public amenity spaces.

How do we do it? We look back at the history of the site, rail industry, the vibrant and dynamic North River – as a way to bring the river up to Bridge Street. Integrating light, plants, and even art to the urban landscape.

Steve Prestejohn, Q3

Design Goals – 1. Enhance the waterfront experience and visual connections to the water. 2. Strong defined and accessible public spaces that enhance the city experience and strengthen the public realm. 3. Reinforce pedestrian connections to the MBTA station. 4. Bold architecture that recognizes frontage in all directions, welcomes the public and creates meaningful street edges.

Diagram showing key points of the site. North River side is the notion of layering and carving of the building to create movement and a relationship to the water. The Bridge Street side is a very deliberate street edge, creating rhythm along the building – treating the intersection specifically and connecting to the courthouses across the street. *Renderings shown on screen of the Bridge Street side of building from Bridge and Washington; Views from the pedestrian level on MBTA side and from the Bridge Street driving up.*

Attorney Correnti: Happy to conclude presentation. As we go forward, we will specify areas with peer reviews. In future meetings will come in with one or two specific matters and do a deep dive.

Planning Board Questions:

Sarah Tarbet: Great presentation. Love the site plan considerations. Regarding the resiliency of site, as it is 75 feet from the river. Would love to hear more on the approach and the transformer/utility location on the ground floor.

Ramie Schneider: All utilities in the flood zone are pad mounted to be above the flood zone. This is what the utilities are doing elsewhere in flood zone areas, ie, Revere and Danvers. All other mechanical and electrical equipment and back of house equipment, where we can, will be on the Bridge Street level to keep out of flood zone.

Sarah Tarbet: What level is the mounted pad at?

Steve Prestejohn: Elevation 11, 1 foot above the 100-year flood elevation.

Rich Whitehouse: about 1.5 ft about surrounding grade

Rami Schneider: Landscapers are thinking about shrubbing around it while still maintaining accessibility for the utility providers

Sara Tarbet: What is preventing this from going somewhere else?

Steve Prestejohn: This is a Chapter 91 project with a really robust public access component that we are meeting at the Bridge Street level. So the level above parking. The transformers can't go in a vault at the residential level they would really only be able housed on street level but then we have Ch 91 access problems. Had to be at river level for Chapter 91 standpoint and accessible for maintenance.

Kirt Rieder: Is there a potential for those 3 rectangles to rotate and become orthogonal to the walkway instead of the curb. Seems consistent with the narrative to free up pedestrian space reducing the residual space that you may not need from a code standpoint.

Steve Prestejohn: Great point. We have distance requirements, but we can look into it.

Kirt Rieder: Is it code required that it be open air as opposed to under the walkway?

Steve Prestejohn: More an installation problem.

Ramie Schneider: Anything with a roof or ceiling and National Grid (NGRID) has trouble.

Michael Blier: On rotating the utility boxes. The issues we have learned is the requirements for access to panels. We end up giving up planting zones if we move it away from the sidewalks. The rotation means there is paved surface between the sidewalk and unit

Sarah Tarbet: Regarding the Bridge Street Elevation Plan, ground floor retail/public space. When we look at PUDs, we have the concern about retail space that is occupied and not empty. This is a prominent site and empty space might not be problem. What is the rationale for retail on MBTA side but enclosed spaces on Bridge Street side? It might be nice to have eyes on the street on the street edge. Wondering if you studied that and wondering about the logic of the opaque blocks.

Steve Prestejohn: There are 2 main site constraints driving us in that direction. The retaining wall – need to be structurally independent of this wall. So the column grid has to be 15 feet away, creating a distance. The bottom edge is a ledge structurally independent of wall with no

access to sidewalk. You would create an undesirable way pedestrians enter the space. The slope of Bridge Street – It rises pretty steeply, A 6–7-foot grade change. Trying to locate coworking and lobby on street level where the sidewalk is most level with finished building. Sarah Tarbet: That slope is hard for me to visualize but that does make a lot of sense. The opaque blocks are just so prominent, it would be great for them to be more visible if not accessible.

Ramie Schneider: Maybe in those areas where the grade increases upwards, there is opportunity for different treatments of films or artwork that could enliven the street edge. And we are regularly thinking about that.

Sarah Tarbet: Is the elevator accessible to the public?

Ramie Schneider: It is only accessible for residential use for safety concerns. We have to have public accommodation space and we need security for residents. Parking below is only for residents too. So no real need for the public to have access to the elevator.

Sarah Tarbet: Always trying to get a little more universal accessibility. But understand concerns.

Kirt Rieder: Are these two green boxes at same elevation (*indicates landscaping on plans*)

Michael Blier: There are five trees in total. Maybe not as clear as needs to be.

Kirt Rieder: What's happening to the left of the split? And where is it vertically?

Michel Blier: They become coplanar at that moment. The slope of green area is sloping up to road and down to wall

Kirt Rieder: What is the depth of the soil is there in that zone?

Michael Blier: There is no issue with depth in soil. It slopes from 18 up to 26.

Kirt Rieder: Why aren't trees continuing

Michael Blier: We can look at that. We have the building on one side, there is less give on building side.

Kirt Rieder: This is an opportunity to activate the space. Continuing trees will make this project sing.

Kirt Rieder: The artificial turf is for residents only?

Kirt Rieder: Can you speak to the converging angle

Steve Prestejohn: to the tapering inward?

Kirt Rieder: the landscape is thought out so well and this quirk raises my eyebrow

Steve Prestejohn: The intention was to make the bottom of the stairs a monumental stair but then wanted it to open up into the public space especially as you are entering a covered zone. So it kind of counteracts the spatial compression.

Kirt Rieder: So reverse happens at the stairs looking down.

Steve Prestejohn: This is something we can study, have heard these comments before

Kirt Rieder: Compelling reason you can add tree in this location?

Ramie Schneider: loading drop off zone for the residential units.

Kirt Rieder: it looks to me that you have 25 linear feet from center point to center point

Rami Schneider: because of the MBTA and access and their right of way, where we draw the box, the drop off and loading zone.

Michael Blier: Because that is limited, want to make it feel like a pedestrian space .

Ramie Schneider: So it reads as one.

Kirt Rieder: High five to the team for actually expressing what the slop is and that isn't a ramp, it is great access to those of us who cycle down the ramp.

Kirt Rieder: All renderings show positive looking planting, you don't control this, but would it be possible to plant in that zone? This is vegetated today (*looking on Google Earth*), it is another remnant parcel that begs for attention

Bill Griset: Across the street? Behind the courthouse buildings?

Kirt Rieder: Yes, same elevation as Bridge Street but sloping towards the courthouse.

Bill Griset: Are you looking for a response?

Kirt Rieder: I am rewarded with silence which makes me think this is not the design team's problem.

Tom Furey : This is a bold and visionary project. Can remember when courthouses were built, took a lot of vision, creativity, and will power. This project is a nice balance to the courthouses. The Crescent Lot is very bold and dynamic project. A win-win project for Salem. Excited about this project.

Helen Sides: Pleased to see that this project has made it to the Planning Board. A lot of work done so far with the DRB.

Public Comment:

Written comments available in the SharePoint file

Lou Siriani
6 Botts Court
[Courthouses_Louis Sirianni_06112022.pdf](#)

Bicycle Advisory Committee
[letter_to_planning_board_re_exchange_salem_8-25-22.pdf](#)

No further public comment

Attorney Correnti: We would like to be on the agenda for the October 20 meeting. In the intervening time will be working with staff and going to DRB and interacting with peer reviews, both traffic and civil that are hired on behalf of the Planning Board.

Motion to continue to the October 20, 2022, meeting is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Zach Caunter, and passes 7-0 in a roll call vote.

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

III. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

A. Discussion and Vote on adoption of the Housing Production Plan

Cassie Moskos, senior planner, is here to discuss. The consultant presentation, draft and executive summary are available. This is your time to have a discussion on it and send back comments to the consultants.

Helen Sides: I need a summary.

Cassie Moskos: *The presentation from the July 14 Joint Public hearing meeting is put on screen. Please view here: [Salem Housing Roadmap Draft 062822.pdf](#).*

Brief Summary: The average Salem resident can afford \$1000/ month but the average rent in Salem is \$2000/month. Between 2010 and 2019, family income increased 8% but average home price increased 49%. We have to use Boston numbers. 48% of Salem households have low-moderate income. 42% of that 48% is housing burdened, meaning more than half of their monthly income goes to housing each month. Highest concentration of BIPOC are in the Point neighborhood and highest concentration of lowest incomes as well. Extensive outreach was done throughout the city and community which provided much of the information that was used to put together the vision statement.

Draft vision statement:

The Salem Community sees housing as a human right and a fundamental aspect of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We envision that our city will be an equitable place where: People of all backgrounds, means, genders, and ages are welcome; People who work here, longtime residents, and newcomers can live here and thrive throughout the stages of their lives; We celebrate our diverse stories and histories; We protect the availability of affordable, secure, and stable homes.

Overarching goals (*detailed language on overarching goals can be found in the above referenced July 14 presentation*): 1. Preservation and Stability- preserve affordable housing and naturally occurring affordable housing; 2. Households in Need – protect and create affordable homes to support the needs of Salem’s most vulnerable populations; 3. Supply – Strive to create opportunity to sensitively expand the supply of market rate, mixed income, and affordable housing; 4. Complete Neighborhoods – focus housing development/redevelopment in areas with access to public transportation, jobs, and commercial hubs; 5. Transformative Areas – Consider redevelopment of transformative areas, i.e.. SSU south campus; 6. Middle Housing – encourage strategic infill in existing residential neighborhoods that maintain historic character design standards; 7. Sustainability and Resilience – work toward more sustainable and resilient housing stock through innovative design and materials; 8. Rehabilitation of Housing Stock – encourage rehabilitation of existing buildings, including historic, to improve energy efficiency and maintain character

Draft Strategy Ideas (*detailed language on draft strategy ideas can be found in the above reference July 14 presentation*): Stability, Supply, Municipal Subsidy, Implementation capacity and outreach.

Kirt Rieder: Very broad brush but points to super detailed things that can’t be flushed out. More aspirational.

Cassie M: It’s a five-year plan. In the actual document is calls out who are the key players and teams suited for each point. I.e., City Council, Affordable Housing Trust Fund, or Salem Housing Authority. Also lays out a matrix for the best order of operations.

Sarah Tarbet: Is this first kind of document like this that you are acting on?

Cassie Moskos: Yes, this is a new plan, we don’t have an established production plan. Will update very 5 years.

Sarah Tarbet: Enjoyed reading the full document. Suggestions: Its funny that the point was rebuilt at the same time and fun fact: copper piping has a life of 100 years. Are there any subsidies for maintenance or deferred maintenance for landlords specifically. Because that could encourage landlords to sell decreasing affordable housing.

Cassie Moskos: Don’t know what existing rehab programs we have. But we have a strategy to support existing rehab programs. But can send to the consultant team to expand that to include housing and landlords.

Sarah Tarbet: This covered historic properties, but a 100-year-old house isn’t historic in Salem.

Helen Sides: 1. What other small cities are doing this? And were they successful and 2. This is important to be adopted regionally. These are issues beyond Salem

Cassie Moskos: lots of communities are doing housing production plans. Ours is different in that a lot of communities do housing production plans for protections around 40b applications. And we are over 10% of 40b , Salem has set housing as a priority. More about actually trying to solve and make a dent in our housing situation. Nothing regional, city by city. The consultants – this is huge part of their portfolio. I don't know how many have been done or filed with state. But no effort at a regional level.

Helen Sides: shame, it should be done

Cassie Moskos: I agree

Tom Furey: In my 36 year in elected office, this is the most alarming and great report. Visionary road map, housing affects all of us, this is a human face on the problem. Alarmed that only 13% of land available for multifamily housing. Definitely on a regional basis, and in Salem. This is on the front burner. This is long overdue. Shows a great deal of compassion.

Zach Caunter: Outstanding plan. Love the visionary aspect of it. It is limited and expensive to live here. Great to have everyone come to enjoy Salem. Is appropriate to look at this on a regional basis. This is definitely a regional issue.

Cassie Moskos: I think you guys are making a recommendation to support the plan. Do you want to include any of Sarah's concerns on expanding subsidies for improvements?

Kirt Rieder: I guess it is so broad and encompassing that I hate to add riders this early in the process.

Sarah Tarbet: I would agree.

Kirt Rieder: I think keep it as is.

Elena Eimert: We had put the draft resolution together using the language of adoption. Let me know if that should change.

Bill Grisct: We have authority to adopt this?

Cassie Moskos: The City Council will adopt; Planning Board merely recommends of support.

Kirt Rieder: Let's change that to say recommendation for adoption. Does it have to have tomorrow's date

Elena Eimert: That is specific to the date I submit it to the city clerk.

Motion to accept and enthusiastically support the draft resolution as written by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Helen Sides, and passes 7-0 in a roll call vote.

Bill Grisct	Y
Kirt Rieder	Y
Tom Furey	Y

Carole Hamilton	Y
Zach Caunter	Y
Sarah Tarbet	Y
Helen Sides	Y

B. FY23 Community Preservation Plan – Request for Comment/Input

The Community Preservation Committee is seeking Planning Board comment on the FY23 Community Preservation Plan

- Elena Eimert: I have the draft letter ready. I have been told that in the past the Planning Board has declined to give comment.
- Kirt Rieder: Its more that more often than not we cede what has been decided.
- Bill Grisett: We feel that it appropriate to comment as individuals but not as a board.

C. Updates from Staff

- Final plug for the Net-Zero Training doodle poll. This will likely be offered hybrid, so consider your availability based on that.
 - Kirt Rieder: I will decline out of a wealth of other things.
 - Elena Eimert: The training will be recorded so you can revisit it in the future.
 - Kirt Rieder: Thank you and the department for inviting us, we appreciate it, but we cannot always do the time.
 - Helen Sides: It would be great if they were offered and made possible if you can earn license points by attending.
 - Kirt Rieder: CEUS would be a great way for Sarah Tarbet and Helen Sides to attend.
 - Helen Sides: The state should acknowledge our service on boards as a way to earn points.
 - Kirt Rieder: The landscape board is in disarray.
- Witchhill Subdivision
 - The City engineer is working with the developer on final water relocations.
- Woodlands Subdivision
 - Fourth extension request filed. They will be on the October 20 agenda. City is working with the developer on final paving and the installation of street signs.

- 4 Franklin Street update
 - Their Ch 91 appeal period ended yesterday, and no appeals were filed. If this is the case, the license will be signed by the DEP and the governor. Working to get building permit filed so they can move forward ASAP with demolition and site clearance.
 - Kirt Rieder: So this is imminent as opposed to unknown?
 - Elena Eimert: Yes.

A> APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

This item has been moved to the October 20, 2022 meeting.

Prior to adjournment, Chair Griset revisits item III, Old and New Business

- Kirt Rieder: Based on 4 Franklin Street at the last meeting, spurred by Mr. Furey, about how this board may help write a paragraph that would somehow provide the building inspector with more teeth or initiative to pre-condition an inspection on the languishing properties. So we give approval and years go on and no improvements or stabilization has occurred, the inspector is empowered to do whatever he wants to do at any point in time. Maybe it is as easy as us drawing attention to the property. But ultimately, I don't think we have any enforcement over the property between approval and construction. So I think Mr. Furey, we will stay the course for the moment.

B> ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made by Carole Hamilton, and seconded by Helen Sides and passes in an 7-0 roll call vote

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

Adjourned at 8:24 pm
Approved by the Planning Board on October 1, 2022