

City of Salem Massachusetts Public Meeting Minutes

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, February 26, 2020 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location:	98 Washington Street, First Floor Conference Room
DRB Members Present:	Chair Paul Durand, David Jaquith, Glenn Kennedy, Marc Perras, Catherine Miller, Helen Sides, J. Michael Sullivan
DRB Members Absent:	None
Others Present:	Kate Newhall-Smith
Recorder:	Colleen Brewster

Chair Durand calls the meeting to order at 6:00PM. Roll call was taken.

Signs

1. 30 Church Street (Hive & Forge): Discussion and vote on signage.

Miller: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting.

Seconded by: Perras. Passes 7-0.

2. Artists' row (Chagall PAC): Discussion and vote on signage.

Dennis Schaeffer, tenant, was present to discuss the project.

Newhall-Smith stated that the Grace & Digs sign will be supported by an existing sign pole and bracket.

Miller asked if the sign would be horizontal. Schaeffer replied yes. Newhall-Smith noted that the sign will be non-illuminated. Schaeffer noted that he will put white vinyl over this sign and reused it.

Sides asked if the proposed dimensions were defined by length of the text. Schaeffer replied yes, it will be applied to scale on the existing sign. Sides requested that there be sufficient white space at the perimeter of the sign. Schaeffer noted his preference for the text on one line and not two which affects the white space. Kennedy requested a minimum of 2-2 ½" of white space on all sides.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Miller: Motion to approve with condition to allow 2 ½" on each side and for Kennedy to review.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 7-0.

3. 73 Lafayette Street (North Shore Bank): Discussion and vote on signage.

Richard Batten, Batten Brother Signs. was present to discuss the project.

Batten stated that they want to change the bank signs to the new bank tenant to the same type of sign in 4 different locations. The sign would have a black background and raised gold letters, be laminated, and raised ½". The background would be finished in a satin black acrylic polyurethane paint that is not high gloss. They will use the bank logo font and eliminated two of the rails. Four signs are proposed because they will replace spaces for four existing signs. They will remove the 'Commercial Lenders Sign" and install a new sign. The "full-service bank" sign at the "Beverly Bank" side will be replaced with the new logo and this will remain the branch entrance.

Chair Durand asked if the ATM sign will remain. Batten replied yes and they will add either a vinyl door sign or a small sign indicating the main entrance. Miller asked if the upper poster signage will remain. Batten replied no. Sullivan suggested they either remove ATM sign or make it smaller. Batten replied they will make the sign smaller and make it horizontal not vertical.

Miller noted that the "Commercial Lenders" sign fits the length of the masonry opening when the other signs do not. The others could end at the end of the steel frame doors. Batten replied it was extended to conceal the cracks in the concrete panel behind it. Sullivan suggested they repair the cracks. Kennedy suggested they stop the sign at the edge of the door frame.

Miller noted that the signs in the windows are in all façade windows. Kennedy noted the newer black and gold sign, but the blue signs were existing. Newhall-Smith stated that she was unable to find a record of the blue signs receiving approval. Chair Durand noted the bank added their own signs without DRB review. Batten stated that they don't know the condition of the surface behind the adhesive decal. Kennedy suggested they test removing the vinyl decal. Batten noted that the lettering of proposed vinyl sign is scaled down. Kennedy suggested that for consistency they use the gold logo at the ATM and the "Full Service Banking" sign at the curve. Batten noted that the four black and gold signs and the changeover date is March 16th. Chair Durand stated that a partial approval can be provided.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Kennedy: Motion to approve sign up top, above the frame of the door, repair the concrete, and shorten the length of the black and gold sign.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 7-0.

Batten requested to continue the review the additional window signs.

Sides: Motion to continue the second phase of the signage package.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 7-0.

4. 193 Washington Street (East Boston Savings Bank): Discussion and vote on signage.

Michael Brewster, Barlow Signs, was present to discuss the project.

Brewster stated that he wants to add three signs at the old Bank of America space, one facing Washington Street, one facing New Derby Street, and one over the entrance door. The existing signs are all semi-recessed and internally illuminated plastic letters.

Chair Durand asked if the letters can be halo lit. Batten replied that all other signs on building are internally lit, as is the logo. Perras asked if the text can fit into the wood area instead. Batten replied that they are allowed 47 square-feet, the box cuts their square footage in half with 12-inch-high lettering. They are screwed into the masonry on a raceway to give them some flexibility. They want to stay within the mortar joint and there would be one penetration through the building to provide power and a spacer that goes back to the building

Kennedy noted that all other signs are within the sign band and the proposed is above it and in the brick façade, which is problematic because it's another change to the building. Sullivan noted that the building tells tenants where to place the signs and there are seven panels to work within. Batten replied that the proposed locations are within the brick coursing but would still be on the column.

Chair Durand suggested the Washington Street sign move it left one bay, since they have three bays on their unit and not one like some of the others, and closer to the corner condition because placing it in the middle bay would look odd. Jaquith suggested using the shorter logo and keeping it on one panel. Newhall-Smith suggested placing "East Boston Savings Bank" since at the corner panel and only the logo on the side or the stacked logo on the corner panel. Miller agreed with using the stacked logo at the corner panel. Kennedy suggested the stacked logo be placed in the middle panel of the side elevations. Sullivan believed that would cover the divisions of the existing panels on the sides.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Sides: Motion to continue.

Seconded by: Kennedy. Passes 7-0.

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

1. 15 Crombie Street: Replacement of rotting columns on rear porch of 3-unit residential structure, ***request to continue to 3/25/20***

Sides: Motion to continue to continue 3/25/20 meeting.
Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 7-0.

2. 112 Washington Street (Lappin Park): Review of pilot program to install synthetic turf on a portion of the park

Ray Jodoin of City of Salem was present to discuss the project.

Jodoin stated that the front island along Washington Street side of the park will be part of a pilot program, where there is excessive foot traffic and the trampling of tree roots, however; they will protect the existing infrastructure. The same in-fill has been used at the tree pits on Carrollton Street. The irrigation system wouldn't be used during the trial program. Anything that lands on the surface would be filtered down and into the soil. This is necessary because they can't keep the grass green and protect the trees. The trees provide shade to the area and this is an opportunity for storm water remediation too.

Chair Durand requested the length of the pilot program. Jodoin replied one full season to see how it holds and up to the seasonal change.

Perras requested the lifespan of the turf. Jodoin replied 20+ years with proper maintenance. Sand will be used to stabilize which is permeable, and hardscape will go around the drip edge. It will be anchored with plastic pins. Miller requested the span of the drip edge. Jodoin replied that it will be different for each tree. Miller stated that she would prefer crushed stone paving rather than turf. Chair Durand noted that hardscape seems permanent rather than part of the trial. Jodoin replied that they have 1 year of experience proving it works well, at the tree wells on Carrollton Street. There are 50 different types of turf styles to choose from and with either one they would need to dig down 4-inches to install. Miller suggested a crushed stone paving as an option. Jodoin replied that that can be discussed and priced in the second phase.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Perras: Motion to approve pilot program limited to 1 year from installation.
Seconded by: Sides. Passes 7-0.

3. 65 Washington Street: Review of 100% Construction Drawings

Steve Tise was present to discuss the project.

Tise stated that the building has been permitted by the Building Department. There have been minimal changes since their latest review to stay on budget. The bicycle rack has been deleted, the sidewalks were revised to match landscape design, selected trees will be removed and replaced as per city arborists request, and the emergency generator was located. Miller asked if the landscaping was delayed behind the neighbors building.

Tise replied that during excavation the footings weren't building as shown on original plans and they had to underpin the Pitman building, the stairwell was relocated to within the garage to eliminate the proposed areaway, but the landscaping remains the same. Miller noted that the roof terrace above upper parking level has a revised retention system.

Perras requested the material change on the elevations. Tise replied that at the rear elevation and end return walls they initially used thin brick due to a structural problem building over Pitman's building because they aren't allowed to suspend any items over the party wall. They changed the end walls to the same material to face the window bays. They will install a thick Japanese panel system is back fastened where they were originally calling for a metal called Longboard with an embossed wood panel. The windows above Pitman's building aren't allowed by code due to common ownership so they were eliminated. The make-up at the end walls will be cement panels at every floor with a 2x2 accent strip to break up the verticality. The North and West facades are the same combination of cast stone, brick, and art panels along the end of Washington and Federal Streets. Perras asked if the same horizontal panels will be used at the bays. Tise replied yes, it will also be used at the top penthouse level. Green wall panels will also be used along North Federal Street.

Sides stated that the material changes haven't been adequately being described and presented and the Board needs to see clear substitutions. Hersh replied that they will present before and after images and materials to clarify the changes. Sullivan requested they include revised rendering and to compare old and proposed plans. Perras requested they also bring samples.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting on March 25, 2020.
Seconded by: Perras. Passes 7-0.

4. 30 Federal Street: Development Project Review – Construction of a mixed-use addition with retail space, four residential units, and six parking spaces

Mike Becker, Owner, John Seger and Sanir Lutfija of Seger Architects were present to discuss the project.

Newhall-Smith stated that the SRA voted to refer to DRB and they supported the concept, but there were numerous concerns with the proposed design. Several condominiums are behind the building that Mr. Becker owns. Lutfija note that the site is on the corner of Federal and Washington Streets and the West elevation faces the courthouses. Constructed in the 1980's the façade is brick and clapboard with white trim and aluminum windows. The existing building is currently commercial use as offices and the only addition proposed is at the North façade within the parking lot and a walkway leading towards Washington Street. A large sloped well will provide light to the finished basement windows. Becker noted that there is a party wall that separates his parcel

from the neighboring parcel and there is a right of way that allows him to cantilever the addition over his four parking spaces.

Lutfija noted that they will reduce the window will create a plaza space off of the retail space just outside the first floor and the addition. The building will cantilever over 3 of the 4 parking spaces. A relief will be provided at the private residential entrance along Washington Street to enhance the streetscape. The current path to Washington Street will be relocated at the end of the addition so allow other condominium owners continued access to Washington Street. The walkway is partially on their property but it's new location will not interfere with the neighbors parking. Becker noted that one of his parking spaces is on the neighbor's property. The neighbors parking spaces are oversized, and they had no interest in restriping to reduce their size, so all of his parking will be placed on his own property and the remaining space will create a 4-foot-wide walkway to Washington Street. The two proposed parking spaces on Federal Street have been eliminated.

Lutfija stated that the Tree Warden told them there is a penalty to remove the existing trees that aren't in great shape, so the street trees will remain, and they will add two shade trees. The Crab Apple trees, and vegetation are not on their property and will also remain. Miller noted that two Crab Apple trees will be removed but aren't shown on the plan. They should discuss removing tree so close to the street with the warden, despite the cost.

Lutfija stated that the building is stepped back from sidewalk to create some public space. The existing basement will house the trash, recycling, storage and access to a central circulation space with an elevator that divides the two spaces. The first floor will have new space in both the existing and new addition, and the four parking spaces beyond. The Lobby and retail entry will be at the lot line and will have a metal clad cantilever. Becker noted that the front setback is zero on a new or existing building, particularly in a B5 district. Lutfija added that there will be 850 square-feet of retail addition and a rear walkway if the neighbors agree to it. They will add aluminum storefront to the existing brick facades. The second floor will have two 2-bedroom rental units with minor renovations to the allow for the elevator and the front stair will be removed. The third floor will become townhouse rental units. The previously proposed building was taller, and they reduced the building size to match the ridge height.

Lutfija stated that along Washington Street they will remove two windows, add 2 windows, ground floor retail with storefront windows, a new door from retail to plaza, they will paint the clapboard and brick "Iron Spot Grey." They will continue the same massing to the addition along Washington Street, but it will be broken up to resemble the townhouses that are skewed to match the property line, to add some rhythm to the streetscape. They will add a tower on the North façade to mimic the existing chimney along Washington Street. Miller asked how the top floor of the tower will be used. Lutfija replied as a window well to bring light down to the floor below or they could reconfigure the 4th floor and include it to a bedroom and provide a view to North Salem.

Lutfija stated that the windows will be aluminum clad, glass will be used at the wall to provide light to the circulation spaces, they will continue the storefront along Washington Street, and they want to maintain the rhythm of gables above. They will continue the brick pediment along Washington Street, provide stand-alone signage along the canopy above the storefront. The metal cladding at the façade will be in a vertical bond to break

up the material changes and was selected as an homage to the metal panels of the courthouse across the street. There will be 2" painted trim around the windows, wood paneling also painted "Iron Spot Gray, in a finish with the same exposure, and asphalt shingles to match existing. Along the East elevation, the paneling between the windows is like the existing façade and in the same proportion. The few balconies will have the same cladding instead of railings, the roofline will be maintained, and the dormers will be recess dormer. Flat boards with a 7-inch exposure are proposed at the ground floor exit to continue the commercial feel. At the South Elevation along Federal Street they will wrap the canopy around to meet the door, and the remaining façade will remain and be repainted. At the North Elevation facing the train station, the canopy and metal band will continue, the tower will be wrapped in clapboard siding with metal paneling at grade, with Cedar horizontal screening to conceal the parking spaces below the addition. All the Hardi panel clapboards will have mitered corners, the siding will continue at the parking area with soffit panels above. Lighting will be installed under the canopy to minimize light pollution.

Lutfija presented the shadow study compiled for Dec 21st and June 21st that show the new addition in shadow of the courthouses. There will be no change in the shadow during the window months but slight additional shadowing in the summer.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Ann Loftin, 20 Federal Street. Concerned with the impact on neighborhood and the renderings that didn't fully show the neighborhood and condominiums next door. The building at 1 Washington Street is complimentary and not matching. Several condominium buildings will face the proposed addition. The proposed walkway location is a right-of-way for pedestrian traffic that many use. Mature trees are being removed and the trees to remain aren't as mature. Proposed materials are similar but not a match and the dark gray proposed doesn't match the lighter color of their buildings or the neighborhood.

Steve Immerman, 20 Federal Street. The condominium is in the way of the existing condominium walkway. All of his windows would look at this proposed addition and eliminate his view of Washington Street, making it an unfortunate design. Transit orientated design is important, but the façade looking at the train station is the first thing visitors will see when they walk into Salem. The design is unintelligent, uncomfortable, tucked into the area and doesn't fit with the neighborhood, they shouldn't paint the brick. They lower the massing which is good, but many people use the walkway and it's unknown if the condominium association will allow replacing it since it's not all on the developer's land. Had concerns with retail on this corner too and the number of vacant retail space around the City. Immerman asked what kind of retail would this be and what would it look like at the edge of the neighborhood. This area was designed by SRA as an experiment and the SRA should protect the character of the neighborhood.

Michelle McHugh, 1 Washington Street. The views of the parking lot side of the property doesn't show the scope of what it does to their parking lot. The Planning Board should redo the calculations of the space because the footprint seems too large and there will be difficulty turning around, parking, and maneuvering a moving truck. The proposed design doesn't fit within historic Salem.

Bill Yuhas, 28C Federal Street. This building is across from their condominium units and the proposed will impact them, and he suggested the Board make a site visit. He met with the architect, developer, and SRA that was also opposed to adding a 4th floor which he believed was removed but added in again, and he's adamantly opposed to it. He's concerned with snow removal and their building being in the shadows and the lack of sunshine on their building, particularly during the winter months. The East elevation doesn't show the fenestration on their buildings or how it the proposed addition relates to their building. They suggested a solid railing for privacy and other improvements which the architect included. The metal siding doesn't really relate to the courthouse across the street like they say, and the new North tower doesn't correlate to the chimney on Washington in size, scale or material. The architectural elements are fighting against each other on the North elevation because there are too many materials. The Washington Street façade also has too much going on, the roof ends are different sizes and angles and don't relate to anything else in the downtown area. The proposed storefronts should have some rhythm and relate to the materials of the floor above, but nothing relates to the red brick wall and no homage has been paid to the courthouses. The walkway from parking lot to Washington Street will be voted on by the New Salem Condominium Board, there is a lot of commuter traffic going through their property relocating the walkway will become an issue. They would prefer not to have the walkway but would need a super majority vote to achieve that. He asked the DRB to consider the SRA and resident concerns. The 1970's design is the first SRA development, but it encompasses the Washington, Bridge, and North Fed Street condominiums. He will provide his design comments to Ms. Newhall-Smith.

Becker stated that the parking won't be moved, no increase or decrease to the turning radius is proposed, and they've only shifted the addition wall three-feet South. The paint color isn't as dark as presented and there is some precedent to painting brick facades. The only material change proposed is the metal panels. Lutfija noted that the drive aisle is 24-feet-wide.

Seger stated that the proposed metal panel façade came from a rooftop of the courthouse. Nichiha panels is what is proposed and there will be storefront at the first floor for a more pedestrian field. Lutfija added that the removal of some trees will help create the large patio space and the Tree Warden didn't want them to add more trees to the wells along Washington Street. Becker noted that the other condominium pushes snow towards Washington Street, the new building will have snow on the roof so that snow shouldn't be included in their snow removal equation. They will continue to manage the snow removal and there is an agreement in the works.

Joan Hopper, 28 Federal Street. Noted his concerned with snow removal and the removal of the green space that runs to the end which is where they put their snow. Chair Durand stated that snow removal will be a concern of the Planning Board.

Dikran Artinian, Unit 301, 1 Washington Street. There is a liability issue with mixing pedestrian traffic and vehicular traffic if they move the walkway, because someone could get hit or fall as they walk through the parking lot/driveway. Snow will make the walkway more challenging. The rear crab apple trees to be removed to construct the proposed addition and the landscaping of evergreen bushes that they maintain will be eliminated. The proposed building will block their view of North Salem and Washington Street, and their property values could go down.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Jaquith stated that there is too much visual architecture and they are trying too hard to be different. The existing South elevation is the best view, the proposed metal panels don't work with the existing condos, he questioned painting the brick, suggested removing the North tower which has too many materials. He's not in favor of building over the retail and there is no visual elements to help them, and the roof pitches are varied. It will be difficult to include retail into the existing facades and they are missing the continuity to the ground as well as lintels.

Sides is okay with the massing and breaking up of facades but not a fan of metal paneling, there are too shocking in a contrasting color. Less contrast would be better because they seem to be trying too hard. The North tower is odd and doesn't work, and neither is the material they proposed to carry around it. Along the Federal Street façade, the window and panels are also too much of a contrast and should be lighter. The entire building could be lighter and simplified.

Kennedy noted that with work it could be nicer presentation but not in this current space because it doesn't fit this location, on this corner, in this landscape, or next to the new 65 Washington Street building. The style can be enhanced but this doesn't fit.

Sullivan asked if the proposed fourth floor was removed and reincorporated. Lutfija replied that it received negative reviews from neighbors as well as the massing. They minimized it due to shadow concerns of 65 Washington Street. Becker added that they matched the existing ridgeline, but the fourth floor hasn't returned. Sullivan stated that they should simplify the design and massing and the tower is arbitrary when it's 10'x10' not responding to a chimney. The design could improve with a material change. The canopy at the front also appears to float over the storefront. Seger agreed with stripping down the design, removing the metal panel and using Nichiha panels instead. Sullivan suggested they pay homage to other materials on neighboring buildings and added that the retail needs to be more architecturally appealing.

Chair Durand stated that they want it to be an extension of many buildings under development, but it being rotated off the street is counter-intuitive and doesn't relate as a continuation of Washington Street. The gap at the parking lot is a weakness that needs to be strengthened and the retail doesn't meet grade well either. Seger agreed and added that they want to fill the urban edge coming from the train station. The proposed North façade is eclectic and needs work as one of the first things you seen when entering Salem.

Miller stated that the applicant will need approval from Tree Commission for the removal of three trees. The condominiums are in the middle and this addition could become more of an ell and needs to be defined.

Perras appreciated them lowering the roofline but the design needs simplification and they should consider an addition with a flat roof. They could use the gable extrusion and windows to add a simple gable, different materials, and to change up the windows to have a straight extruded expression, but that would create an issue with fourth floor headroom. The addition is minimal and a similar size to the existing building. They could find other ways to make it more modern by replicating the gables and wrapping them around the addition. The West elevation is currently the best elevation.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to continue to next regular meeting.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 7-0.

5. 49 Federal Street: Review of proposed façade restoration project and construction of rear 10'x22', two-story addition.

Mike Becker, Owner, John Seger and Sanir Lutfija of Seger Architects were present to discuss the project

Newhall-Smith stated that the plans have been slightly revised based on comments received from Patti Kelleher. Seger stated that the proposed is a conversion was a funeral home, offices, and is not vacant but five residential units are proposed. The original building was constructed in 1873, with second empire architecture and decorative brackets at the mansard roof. The aluminum siding will be removed to reveal the wood clapboard, quoins and other details that have some deterioration. Some front entrance modifications were made, including enclosing the front porch, cutting away the eave to allow for a fire escape, and an added dormer. The aluminum shutters, siding, and fire escape will be removed, however; the granite base, mansard roof, and 2 over 1 windows will remain. The rear not easily seen from Lynde Street and the rear entrance to be replaced, as well as the bulkhead at the rear and side (East elevation.)

Seger stated that the second-floor balcony is shared and two condenser units will be placed there. The rear addition will house kitchen and bathroom on first floor, and they will restore the window trim, frieze board, brackets, replace the asphalt shingles, add a balcony over the porch, replace one entry door, and reduced the size of the entry stair. Along the West driveway they will restore the eave, remove the door and provide a couple windows at the dormer. At the rear balcony the glass enclosure will have double-hung window. The rear two story addition foundation will be poured concrete and they will replace the gable with 2 doors at the shared balcony. The chimneys will remain, any deteriorated materials will be replaced, and the clapboard exposure will also remain. They won't use PVC trim, but the decking will be composite in a painted wood finish. The window will be restored, and any new ones will be vinyl clad wood with external muntins. They will also add a skylight on the side of the building that is not easily visible from the street.

Newhall-Smith added that the houses at Lynde Street are approximately forty-feet from the rear property line and there were some concern people looking down from the 3rd floor roof deck down into the neighbor's windows.

Chair Durand stated that is a successful restoration plan, but the Board will want to see detail of the posts, balusters, rails, windows of all new materials. Seger replied that they will provide it once they determine the remaining details.

Jaquith suggested they change the dormer size above the fire escape which looks too small to fit. He also suggested the post at rear balcony be pushed back towards the building and that they attempt to match the water table.

Becker stated that the four windows changed will be changed to three, so they aren't so squished. They will also recess the entry door off the porch because the glass door is currently all on the step.

Miller asked about the remaining proposed condensers. Becker replied that three will be on the ground and the two above will be on the deck.

Miller asked about proposed trash barrel storage. Becker replied they will be on different sides at the rear.

Perras asked why a dormer was proposed and not a skylight. Becker replied that it's tight at the side wall and it would be partially in the stair or the roof.

Perras requested floor plans. Becker replied that they could submitted a rough floor plan that hasn't been finalized. Perras suggested that a dormer would be easier to build.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to continue to next regular meeting.
Seconded by: Sides: Passes 7-0.

Old/New Business

Hampton Inn Sign: Newhall-Smith stated that the SRA liked the recommendation for the alternative design and requested they return if the Owner said no. She spoke with the applicant and they are closer to getting the other sign.

Crombie Street: No site visit is necessary. She informed the applicant of what the Board wants.

Superior Court: The RFP is due April 30th and the SRA interviews will begin in early June.

1 Derby Square: The half round window proposed by Board Member and architect for the applicant David Jacquith was approved and some windows are already being replaced.

City wide update: On-line permitting has been good for a City perspective and people who need to review application will be sent a notification to review it.

SRA Goals: One goal is to look into notifying abutters. They currently don't have to tell abutters about upcoming projects, but some abutters need to know at the beginning of the process. She will explore doing a post-card mailing with a link to find the proposed plans as well as the cost. SRA has no review fee, but they want to recoup the cost of mailing letters. Sullivan noted that the Conservation Commission requests that receipts from abutters be included in the submission, so they know abutters are aware of the project.

Minutes

No minutes to review.

Adjournment

Sides: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 7-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 9:00PM.

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A §18-25 and City
Ordinance Sections 2-028 through 2-2033.