

## City of Salem Board of Appeals

### Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, April 20, 2016

A meeting of the Salem Board of Appeals ("Salem BOA") was held on Wednesday, April 20, 2016 in the third floor conference room at 120 Washington Street, Salem, Massachusetts at 6:30 p.m.

**Ms. Curran (Chair) calls the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.**

### **ROLL CALL**

Those present were: Rebecca Curran (Chair), Peter A. Copelas, Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, Jimmy Tsitsinos, Jim Hacker (alternate), and Paul Viccica (alternate). Also in attendance Tom St. Pierre - Building Commissioner, Erin Schaeffer - Staff Planner, and Colleen Anderson – Recorder.

### **REGULAR AGENDA**

Project	A public hearing for a petition of requesting a Special Permit per Sec. 3.3.4 and Variances from the provisions of Sec. 4.1.1 <i>Table of Dimensional Requirements</i> of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, for maximum lot coverage, rear yard setbacks, and the number of stories to allow the reconstruction, extension, or structural change of an existing nonconforming structure.
Applicant	<b>THE CHARLES HOPE COMPANIES, LLP</b>
Location	<b>81 DERBY STREET (Map 41 Lot 275)(R2 Zoning District)</b>

### Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated March 29, 2016 and supporting documentation

Dan Bumagin, of The Charles Hope Companies - Presents the petition along with Annette Popp, Architect. The property has been boarded up & abandoned for over ten (10) years. If the City is unable to make the property code compliant, the City is allowed to seek a Receiver to take over the property. The property has entered into receivership by the Northeast Housing Court of Salem, and is currently being held by The Charles Hope Companies, LLP.

The property currently has Zoning and Historic Commission compliance concerns that need to be addressed. This is the last house along the odd side of Derby Street that is in the historic waterfront district. The neighboring properties consist of a residence & laundromat across the street & to the North, green space/trees to the East that faces the power plant, a garage to the South, and a residence to the West.

There are currently three zoning issues. 1) This existing two-family has no second means of egress. The site plan shows that the structure is either on or close to the property line on three sides, leaving only the property along the South for a second egress, which infringes on

the rear yard setback requirements. 2) The petitioner seeks to add a second story over a small entrance hallway on the West side of the building which will require a Special Permit. The small entrance hallway will allow for a landing at the top of the second egress stair. 3) The petitioner seeks to raise the roof three (3) feet, putting the building one (1) foot over the maximum height limit, which requires a Variance. The height increase will make the existing 2½ story building into a 3 story building, and this is a 2½ story zone. The height increase will maximize head height clearances in the two existing 3<sup>rd</sup> floor bedrooms.

Ms. Popp- added that no new work is within two (2) feet of the property line and the design changes were minimal to make it fit on such a small lot.

Ms. Curran – states that this is a very small lot. Ms. Curran confirms that the property is a two-family and is an allowed use even though the property is abandoned.

Mr. St. Pierre – Yes.

Ms. Curran – questions that the landing addition at the back façade was not the minimum egress width.

Ms. Popp – states that some deck space has been added at the rear egress stair landing for the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor unit and confirms the proposed deck space is larger than the minimum egress width.

Ms. Curran – states that the addition over the existing West entrance bump-out was within the existing footprint and added that the only footprint increase occurs at the rear, South façade, with the proposed stairway and deck, making the rear yard and lot coverage more non-conforming.

Mr. Bumagin – Correct.

Mr. Tsitsinos – asks how will the third floor be used and if they will be condominiums.

Mr. Bumagin – The third floor is a part of the second floor unit and will house two rooms and a bathroom. We do not know if they will become condominiums.

Mr. Viccica – Asks whether the building at the rear of the property was a residence and how far away it is from their structure.

Mr. Bumagin – The building immediately behind this building is a garage and the distance is shown away from their building on the Site Plan is approximate. They have had several conversations with the owner of that garage and he is in favor of this project.

Mr. Tsitsinos – asks if there was parking.

Mr. Bumagin – There is no parking on the property, on-street parking is generally available, and the ferry parking is also available, and neighbors have states that on-street parking is generally not a problem.

Mr. Tsitsinos – asks if that portion of Derby Street was resident parking only.

Mr. St. Pierre – Side streets are resident only but that area of Derby Street is not.

Ms. Curran – States that there was no parking before and is a pre-existing nonconforming condition that can remain.

Ms. Curran- opens public comment.

Ms. Jennifer Firth – President of Historic Salem – Asks whether the intention is to keep the building a two family, asks what year the house was built, and applauded the applicant's efforts to renovate the building.

Mr. Bumagin – The building will remain a two family. It was built in 1880 and renovated in 1890.

Ms. Curran – asks whether they have been to the Historic Commission.

Mr. Bumagin – states that the Historic Commission has requested that they make a few changes; width of the corner boards, work on the window configuration, and suggested they put these changes on the plans and present to the Historic Commission again. Mr. Bumagin is scheduled to present on the May 18, 2016 agenda.

Mr. Greg Stefan – 78 Derby Street – States that he lives directly across the street and the issue he and his wife have is with the view. Mr. Stefan states that raising the roof three (3) feet will hinder their already filtered view of the water, and light from the sun in the winter. Mr. Stefan presented the Board with a photo of the view of the ocean from his upstairs window. Mr. Stefan states that a cast shadow from 81 Derby Street may increase his heating bills and privacy is another issue.

Ms. Curran –Asks the petitioner to confirm that the entire roof is being raised three (3) feet.

Mr. Bumagin – The dotted line on the plan is the existing roofline.

Ms. Curran- Confirms with the petitioner that they will be keeping the same pitch of the roof.

Mr. Bumagin- Confirms.

Ms. Curran- Right now, there is no dormer on the left side of the roof.

Mr. Bumagin- Correct.

Mr. Tsitsinos- Asks the petitioner what exactly is being raised regarding the roof and why.–

Mr. Bumagin –Is proposing to raise the entire roof three (3) feet, but in order to comply with the maximum number of stories, the petitioner can by right only raise the roof two (2) feet to be a 2.5 story structure...

Mr. Viccica- To the petitioner, would you mind talking about why the proposal is to raise the roof rather than change the pitch of the existing roof line?

Ms. Popp –reviewed several scenarios keeping the roof as is. The purpose of raising the roof is to make the third floor useable. The petitioner originally designed a full shed dormer on both sides to achieve at least seven (7) foot tall ceilings on the third floor to be called a room. They wanted to make the third floor usable. A full shed dormer on both sides of the roof to achieve the seven (7) foot ceiling height is required to call it a room and changing the roof pitch would destroyed the character of the house.

Mr Viccica- Currently, are there only two (2) rooms on the third floor? One (1) in the front and one in the back?

Mr. Bumagin – Correct.

Mr. Tsitsinos – Asks the petitioner whether those two (2) rooms are usable.

Mr. Bumagin – replies that they are small rooms and are approximately 5 or 6 feet wide and a ceiling height of 7 feet in the center , which does not meet today's standards of a decent size room.

Mr. Tsitsinos – asks about the total number of rooms in both units.

Mr. Bumagin – replies two (2) bedrooms in the first floor unit, and 3 bedrooms in the second floor unit - 1 on the second floor and 2 on the third floor, depending on how the rooms are used.

Ms. Curran – states that because the petitioner is asking for a Variance, the second egress at the back of the building should be limited to the minimum egress, since, in the Chair's opinion, there is no demonstrated hardship to substantiate an increased deck. If the zoning was literally enforced, the petitioner could not use the building without the second egress. It seems reasonable to request the Variance to provide a second egress and is a code requirement; However, to do more than that is asking for a bit much.

Mr. Bumagin- States to the chair, it is only an additional six (6) feet requested beyond the required egress.

Ms. Curran- Yes, but the lot is really small. The variance hardship criteria has to be met. In terms of the request to increase the number of stories, the preference is to keep the roof pitch the same. However, did the petitioner consider looking at having two (2), two (2) bedroom units, without needing to increase the number of stories?

Mr. Bumagin – states that economics is not a criteria for a Variance request, the building historically had two (2) bedrooms on that level that do not meet today's standards for a bedroom, which includes closet space. Regardless of the design issues, the economics have to work and The Charles Hope Companies took a big risk when it received this problematic property. Mr. Bumagin states that the inability to use all of the building as it had been used in the past is a hardship.

Mr. Viccica – states that he lives in a similar home and uses the space under the eaves along the 6' 8" side walls as closet space. Mr. Viccica, does not see the hardship in relation to the request to raise the roof three (3) feet. However, it is within the right for the petitioner to request the dormer to be able to have the headroom to install a bathroom. Half story concerns are not new to Salem, the roofs could be smaller and storage could be added efficiently. The areas under the eaves can become closets. There is something about the plan that is in excess and there does not seem to be a hardship to warrant the additional three (3) feet of height requested. The roof should be able to stay within the allowable height limit of 35' feet and 2.5 stories.

Mr. Bumagin – states his concern with the roof line at the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor rear egress addition. The roof has to intersect the building somewhere?

Mr. Viccica – states that flat roof could also be used and are also common.

Mr. Bumagin- speaks with the architect regarding the suggested design change. Mr. Bumagin states to the Board, suppose the plan was to raise the roof only two (2) feet?

Mr. Viccica- states that it is within the petitioner's right to do so.

Mr. St. Pierre- Building Commissioner- states that the proposed dormer on its own triggers the Variance. Mr. St. Pierre states that any wall over (two) 2 feet high that is perpendicular to the ridge will trigger a Variance. By adding the third floor dormer, triggers the need for a Variance for a third floor, by putting the gabled end on the dormer wall. The request for a Variance is still in play, whether the petitioner raises the entire roof or not.

Mr. Viccica – states that raising the roof and maximizing the porch to be within five (5) feet of the rear lot lines is asking for too much. Mr. Viccica is not in favor of granting the proposed plan, when a less detrimental option is a possibility.

Mr. Bumagin – asks whether the neighbor would oppose to a compromise of raising the roof two (2) feet.

Mr. Greg Stefan – 78 Derby Street – States that his concern is with the roof being raised at all.

Mr. Bumagin – states that the economics don't work if they can't raise the roof. They already have a marketing hurdle by having a lot that does not provide parking. No parking and no deck will not bring in perspective buyers/renters. The petitioner feels that the proposed design is minimally obtrusive.

Ms. Curran – states that the proposed is a better design, but the Board has specific criteria to follow.

Ms. Popp – states that deck would change the side yard setback and the side yard access would remain. There isn't much access as it currently existing and access would still be from the Power Plant side of the property.

Ms. Curran – states that the special conditions and circumstances the Applicant is requesting for a Variance in this instance. 1) It is an existing two (2) family on a small lot that presently doesn't meet building code requirements specifically in regard to egress requirements and is in a dilapidated state. 2) Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would involve substantial hardship to the Applicant – which can't be economic. Ms. Curran questions the hardship with providing the minimum egress width. A house without a deck is not a hardship. Ms. Curran states that this is a derelict building and as such, Mr. Bumagin needs to invest in the property and this is a public good to be able to invest in the property. However, the Board has to show that there is a hardship. Needing to provide a second egress is a hardship even if the property is more nonconforming. However, to go beyond the minimum request is requesting too much. This is hard because the Board does not deal as much with design, but it is clearly a better design to keep the pitch of the roof.

Ms. Popp- On the size of the deck, the petitioner states that the setbacks are usually for fire access and safety. There is sufficient access on the power plant side.

Mr. Bumagin – replies that he will have a house with no parking and no usable outdoor space. Mr. Bumagin states that he is proposing six (6) feet of usable outdoor space where the yard will have none.

Ms. Curran – states that the first floor tenant will have access to the rear yard.

Mr. Bumagin – replies that it is land surrounded by buildings on three sides, and is not usable.

Mr. Duffy – states that the structure is non-conforming, has been unlivable since 2003, it has recently been put into receivership and the Applicant is the receiver. That should not change the dynamic of the Variance. Mr. Duffy finds that the receiver must deal with a property that has been unoccupied, has code violations, impairs health safety and wellbeing of abutters & the community, and constitutes a public nuisance, which are all significant issues. The receiver has no responsibility to remedy the code violations, etc. except where the revenues would support it in their action as a receiver. The economics do play a significant role in whether the present condition can be remedied at all. Does a significant health safety risk persist in lieu of having a nice proposal? Given the condition of the property, this proposal is not about changing the dimensional requirements to provide someone with comfortable space, this is remedying a problem that has been here for over thirteen (13) years.

Mr. Duffy wishes the neighbors' concerns could be remedied but understands the concerns of the Applicant. Perhaps they could find some middle ground on raising the roof?

Ms. Curran- Concurs with this finding.

Mr. Watkins – adds possibly going up just (two) 2 feet rather than the proposed three (3) feet?

Mr. Duffy- something can preserve the view as much as possible while getting a property back in use.

Mr. Viccica – states that there could be a possibility to satisfy both that doesn't require a Variance. Mr. Viccica questions whether they could build the room they want for the second floor on top of the existing structure and increase the third floor, without needing to raise the roof. Just looking for a middle ground, not to redesign the project.

Mr. Bumagin – states that they have considered that option, but they also have the Historical Commissions requests and he believes they would not be pleased to see an addition that large.

Ms. Curran – What does increasing two (2) feet rather than three (3) do?

Mr. Duffy- Mr. St. Pierre stated that the proposed dormer is what triggers the need for the Variance request. Regardless of if the petitioner proposes an increase by two (2) or three (3) feet, the Variance will be needed for the dormer. However, two (2) feet may have less of an impact on the neighbor than three (3) feet. Raising the roof two (2) feet rather than three (3) feet does not meet all of the desires of the neighbor nor the applicant.

Ms. Popp – states that it would affect the head room in the third floor bedrooms, but can manage.

**Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to approve the petition seeking a Special Permit per Sec. 3.3.4 and Variances from provisions of Sec. 4.1.1 Table of Dimensional Requirements Salem Zoning Ordinance for maximum lot coverage, rear yard setbacks, and the number of stories to allow the reconstruction, extension, or change of an existing nonconforming structure. Mr. Duffy also makes a motion to grant a Special Permit pursuant to Sec. 3.3.4 in order to construct a second story above an existing one story portion of the building with eight (8) standard conditions and one special condition that the petitioner may increase the height of the roof by two (2) feet rather than the proposed three (3) feet. The motion is seconded by Mr. Watkins. The vote was unanimous with five (5) (Rebecca Curran (Chair), Peter A. Copelas, Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, and Jimmy Tsitsinos) in favor and none (0) opposed.**

Project            A public hearing for a petition seeking a Variance from the provisions of *Sec. 4.1.1 Table of Dimensional Requirements* of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, for minimum lot area per dwelling unit

Applicant        **RICARDO GARCIA and ROSE HELEN GARCIA**  
Location        **24 LEMON STREET (Map 36 Lot 44)(R2 Zoning District)**

## Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated March 14, 2016 and supporting documentation

Mr. Garcia – states that the proposal is to convert the single family house into a two(2) family structure with parking for two (2) units. There are no proposed structural changes on the exterior of the house. Mr. Garcia states that the only exterior construction is a second egress from the second floor unit, as is required by the building code. The proposed rear egress is proposed to be constructed on top of the existing back patio.,

Ms. Curran – States that the conversion of a single dwelling to a two (2) dwelling units is an allowable use in the R2 Zoning District. However, Ms. Curran stated concern and asked the petitioner to confirm whether there is an existing curb cut.

Mr. Garcia – No. We found out from the City that there is not an existing curb cut, but from the real estate listing said there was. Mr. Garcia, would be happy to apply for a curbcut.

Ms. Curran – There is obviously a driveway, but doesn't seem that there is a curbcut. There are three (3) parking spaces proposed, which meets the parking requirements.

Mr. Garcia- there is a mistake in the plan, which shows the proposed driveway to be nine (9') feet wide instead of the twelve (12') feet required. There is plenty of space to widen the proposed driveway to twelve (12') feet.

Ms. Schaeffer – Asks the petitioner whether the new driveway will be constructed closer to the home or whether the petitioner will be using the existing driveway.

Mr. Garcia – Proposes to use the existing driveway entrance, but reconfigure the parking spaces.

Ms. Curran – Is the third parking space shown angled on the Site Plan, just after the end of the house? If so, why can it not be in-line with the other two spaces?

Mr. Garcia – Yes it is. If the third parking space were placed next to the existing two, it would hit the corner of the property and not be within the side yard setback requirements

Ms. Curran – opens Board comments.

Mr. Copelas –Does the rear deck exist? Mr. Copelas could not see the deck from the street.

Mr. Garcia – Yes. It is wood that is rotting and it will be changed to patio pavers.

Mr. Copelas – The proposed second floor egress, do you have a design or plans for this?

Mr. Garcia – No.

Mr. Copelas- Petitioners need to do the design and plans for exterior work related to the requested Variance.

Mr. Garcia- It will be a copy of what was done at 138 Bridge Street.

Mr. Duffy – Confirms with the petitioner, that the proposal for an egress is to have a landing off of the second floor with an external stairway down to the new pavers on the rear patio.

Mr. Garcia – Yes.

Mr. Copelas – Will the egress have a cover?

Mr. Garcia – A cover will only be at the landing outside the second floor Kitchen door.

Mr. Copelas – asks whether that allows it to be considered a legal egress.

Mr. St. Pierre – Yes. There needs to be a plan to maintain it during snow and icy conditions – shoveling.

Ms. Curran – introduces a letter from Lloyd Kropilak – 6 Smith Street – Is in favor of the application.

Ms. Curran – opens public comment.

Ms. Jennifer Meger – 27 Lemon Street – stated that she lives across the street and her biggest concern with adding another unit is parking. Most of the housing on Smith Street does not have driveway and cars will park on Lemon Street. There are a number of multi-family houses, the neighborhood is densely packed with cars, and parking is only allowed on one side of the street. Police call records will show there is a lot of illegal parking on the street already. Two (2) cars fit in the existing driveway, but there is a fire hydrant in front of the property which could the ability to affect additional parking.

Mr. St. Pierre – shares a copy of the parking plan with the public to view.

Ms. Flora Tonthat – 30 Northey Street – states that parking is dense. Parking from a large apartment building at the end of Northey Street spills over onto the street. Cars also park in the park parking lot down the street and then people who want to go to the park are unable to park their cars. R2 zones mean single and multi-family, but they shouldn't all be two/multi-family buildings.

Ms. Curran – R2 means they are allowed uses.

Mr. Michael Falcheck – 3 Lemon Street – speaks in opposition to the proposal due to concerns about landlord disinvestment in the neighborhood, density, speeding cars and illegal parking.

Mr. Matt Kaminski – 23 Lemon Street – Speaks in opposition to the proposal with concern about future disinvestment in the property, parking availability and college student rentals. Mr. Kaminski asks how many bedrooms will be in the building.

Mr. Garcia – Two (2) bedrooms on the second floor and one bedroom on the first floor. A three (3) bedroom house will remain a three (3) bedroom house divided into two (2) dwelling units. No new bedrooms are being added.

Ms. Garcia – states that she lives alone and will occupy the second unit on the second and third floors.

Ms. Catherine Dawnworth – 3 Smith Street – asks whether the two spots at the end of the street by the Lemon Rock be affected by the proposed parking plan or driveway?

Ms. Curran- the petitioner proposes a single driveway.

Mr. Garcia – There is no parking on the 24 Lemon Street side of the road because of the fire hydrant, but there are two (2) parking spaces at the end of the road for access to the walking path. Mr. Garcia, does not believe that the parking spaces will be affected by the driveway. Mr. Garcia checked in with the police to ask about where the two (2) parking spaces are located and it turns out that the place where everyone parks by the circle is not a parking place. But, that is up to the City.

Ms. Jennifer Meger – 27 Lemon Street – She checked in with the Salem traffic division to also clarify the location of the parking spaces and it was confirmed that the two(2) spots further away from the property are legitimate parking spaces. Ms. Meger, requests to see the parking plan and proposed driveway.

The plans are shared with the public.

Ms. Curran – requests the Applicant provide a revised parking plan to show a 12' driveway width, the applicant needs to apply to the Engineering Department for a curb cut and confirm that one is needed. As for parking, the petitioner is providing the required parking on the property.. A revised plot plan and architectural plans are needed to show the location of the proposed egress and rear deck proposed.

Mr. Garcia – states that he will go to the Building Department to apply for a permit to start repairing/remodeling the house, repair the windows, roof, siding. He is also the General Contractor so he will produce ground floor plans.

Mr. Copelas – states that there is a lack of detail of for the proposed building for the egress and also that there is no formal statement of hardship. The petition doesn't meet the requirements to make a decision.

Ms. Curran – requests the following of the Applicant for a Variance request.

- 1- A revised parking plan
- 2- A proposed egress plan
- 3- Curbscut permit or similar from the Engineering Department

4- A revised statement of hardship

Mr. Copelas – added that to be sure the egress is compliant with the dimensional requirements the Board needs more detail and to determine if the stair will require a Variance for a setback.

Mr. Duffy – adds that a checklist is on the application to use as a guide.

Ms. Edna Kobierski – 16 Lemon Street – states that there is too much vehicular traffic that speeds down Lemon Street, and the house should remain a one family.

**Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to continue the public hearing on the application the petition seeking a Variance from the provisions of Sec. 4.1 at the next regularly scheduled meeting on May 18, 2016. The motion is seconded by Mr. Watkins. The vote was unanimous with five (5) (Rebecca Curran (Chair), Peter A. Copelas, Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, and Jimmy Tsitsinos) in favor and none (0) opposed.**

Project	Request for a size (6) month extension to exercise rights granted by the June 2, 2010 Board Decision, as previously extended by request of the applicant as well as the Permit Extension Acts of 2010 and 2012, the approved Variances from building height (feet), buffer zone width, and number of parking spaces to allow the construction of a 2-4 story professional office building with retail and municipal space.
Applicant	<b>HIGH ROCK BRIDGE STREET</b>
Location	<b>44 BOSTON STREET and 401 BRIDGE STREET (Map 15 Lot 305, 165)(NRCC Zoning District)</b>

Attorney Joseph Correnti – 63 Federal Street – represents High Rock Bridge Street LLC. Attorney Correnti states that he is asking for a six (6) month extension. The project, on the corner of Boston and Bridge Streets, was fully permitted on 2010 by all necessary Salem Boards. This location is the future home of the Community Life Center. The petitioner does not want the permits to lapse. This project should not be confused with the revised project that is presently working its way through the Boards. When the revised project is approved by the Planning Board, it will return to the Zoning Board of Appeals. The petitioner expects that the Planning Board will make its decision in the next month or so. Technically, the revised project is not before the Zoning Board of Appeals. The only request before the Board is to extend the fully permitted project.

Ms. Curran – introduces a letter from the Federal Street Neighborhood Association, which speaks in opposition to the request for an extension and requests that a new application for this project be submitted because there is a change in use and a change in density. Ms. Curran confirms that the petitioner is requesting a continuation of the rights granted by this previously issued decision.

Attorney Correnti – Yes.

Ms. Curran – confirms with the petitioner that when the revised project returns to the Zoning Board it will be either a new application or a modification.

Attorney Correnti – Yes.

Ms. Curran – Will the revised project come back before the Board this year?

Attorney Correnti- Yes. It has to be. Yes, there has been substantial progress on the revised plans.

Ms. Curran- opens public comment.

Ms. Jennifer Firth – President of Historic Salem – When the revised project comes back, which is a proposed residential use rather than commercial, will there will there be an opportunity for the public to discuss it.

Ms. Curran – Yes.

**Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to grant the six (6) month extension on the project. The motion is seconded by Mr. Tsitsinos. The vote was unanimous with five (5) (Rebecca Curran (Chair), Peter A. Copelas, Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, and Jimmy Tsitsinos,) in favor and none (0) opposed.**

## **OLD/NEW BUSINESS**

NONE

## **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

March 16, 2016 meeting minutes were approved as written.

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

## **OLD/NEW BUSINESS**

N/A

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Copelas-motions for adjournment of the April 20, 2016 regular meeting of the Salem Board of Appeals at 9:50 PM.

**Motion and Vote:** Mr. Copelas made a motion to adjourn the April 20, 2016 regular meeting of the Salem Board of Appeals, seconded by Mr. Watkins, and the vote is unanimous with five (5) (Rebecca Curran (Chair), Peter A. Copelas, Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, and Jimmy Tsitsinos,) in favor and none (0) opposed.

The meeting ends at 9:50 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:*  
[http://saalem.com/Pages/SalemMA\\_ZoningAppealsMin/](http://saalem.com/Pages/SalemMA_ZoningAppealsMin/)

Respectfully submitted,  
Erin Schaeffer, Staff Planner