

City of Salem Massachusetts Public Meeting Minutes

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board, Special Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, September 26, 2018 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location:	120 Washington Street, Third Floor Conference Room
DRB Members Present:	Chair Paul Durand, Ernest DeMaio, David Jaquith, Glenn Kennedy, Helen Sides, J. Michael Sullivan
DRB Members Absent:	Chris Dynia
Others Present:	Matt Coogan
Recorder:	Colleen Brewster

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

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

1. **20 Central Street:** Discussion and vote on Small Project Review for proposed fencing.

Colleen Brewster of Gray Architects, Inc. was present to discuss the project.

Brewster stated that the property at 20 Central Street is seeking to install a new fence around an existing planter at the North-East corner of the property and three fences with gates around the existing Courtyard. A log of 166 calls made to the police in the last 5 years from 20 Central Street has also been submitted to emphasize their need to keep their property secure. She stated that an existing easement with the SRA at the Northern walkway and Southern driveway exist; however, the Courtyard is private property. Other property owners were alerted to this proposed project, Goldberg (the property along Front Street), The Lark Hotel (Hotel Salem) and The Customs House (Trolley Stop) and all were not opposed.

Coogan stated that this project hasn't been reviewed by the SRA but based on their timeline it is appropriate for the DRB to review it prior to the SRA.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Nick Helides, 20 Central Street Condominium Board President. Stated that the neighbors at 20 Central Street appreciate the consideration and support of the Board. He noted that the reasons are self-evident when reading the police call log.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Kennedy: Motion to approve as recommended by the DRB.
Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 6-0.

2. **118 Washington Street (Blue Fez):** Discussion and vote of sign permit scheme.

Nasa Belgiti of Blue Fez was present to discuss the project.

Belgiti stated that the sign will sit below the existing gooseneck lights, the “Blue Fez” letters of the new wall mounted sign will be blue 1/4” thick PVC. The proposed blade sign will be wood with a new metal bracket to secure it to the wall.

Sullivan asked if the blade sign correlates to the height of the banding along the building. Belgiti replied yes. Kennedy noted that the sign may hang down over the edge of the brick 8” to 10” but it will be over 8’ high. He stated that the spacing of the “Fez” lettering is sufficient and suggested that the circle around the “Fez” doesn’t help with readability but making it dimensional will create a shadow. Chair Durand agreed.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Kennedy: Motion to approve as submitted with the suggestion that the circle be raised. Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 6-0.

3. 90 Washington Street (Badabing): Discussion and vote on sign permit scheme

Jordan Bartholomew, 90 Washington Street, of Badabing Babershop was present to discuss the project.

Bartholomew stated that they are proposing new lettering on the bottom of the windows indicating the services they provide, a logo next to the door, Badabing Letters on the eyelet of the building and a blade sign. Coogan stated the rendering of the proposed window lettering has been submitted and the eyebrow lettering will be standardized on the building and had already been approved by the Board.

Kennedy asked where the lettering fits in with the signage square footage in terms of linear footage and if the eyebrow lettering is part of the signage. Coogan replied that there is still room for additional tenant signage and the eyebrow signage is included in each tenant’s signage package.

DeMaio noted that the barber shop stripped logo is black and white and he’d prefer that the colored graphic be used since there is a lot of color used in the proposed lettering. Bartholomew replied that the branding of the barbershop uses the black and white striping on the pole, but they will use the colored option.

Sullivan asked if they will list the hours under the sign. Bartholomew replied yes, it will be like the “Walk-in’s Welcome” sign.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Sullivan: Motion to approve as submitted, and to change the color of barbershop pole logo graphic to white, red and blue.

Seconded by: Kennedy. Passes 6-0.

4. 27 Charter Street (T-Mobile): Discussion and vote on Small Project Review for wireless antenna relocation.

Jerry Squire of T-Mobile was present to discuss the project.

Squire stated that T-Mobile had antennas taken off of the elevator penthouse and moved to a temporary sled on the roof that they now want to move to the façade of the building. The antennas will be painted to match like several other existing antennas on the right side of the building. He submitted proposed images of the antenna. Sides asked if the antenna's project above the roof line. Squire replied no. Chair Durand asked who requested that they match the brick and paint colors. Squire replied that matching the brick facade is their standard design on a brick building.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Sides: Motion to approve as submitted

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 6-0.

5. 9-11 Dodge Street, 217-219 Washington Street, and 231-251 Washington Street (Hampton Inn, Mixed-Use Development Project): Review of 100% construction documents

Ken McClure, Owner's Rep, Andrew Queen and Keith Kelly of Opechee Construction Corporation were present to discuss the project.

McClure stated that the signage will be presented separately and is still under review internally, to decide which branding color scheme will be used. They have more in-depth drawings on the green roof which they've changed slightly due to wind loads.

Queen stated that they've opened the restaurant corner of the building and created a recessed entry. They've provided a detail for the Nichiha corner which are pre-made and get fastened to backer pieces that will alternate in color, to match the horizontal banding of the façade. The banding pieces are 6' long with score joints which will result in less banding than with the previous panel.

Hampton Inn Hotel

The hotel sign band was going to be a valance style but will now be mounted to and project out from the façade. The upper façade of the Hotel will be a light grey Cembrit panel, the main body the color will be Flint, and the patched area the color Pluto.

DaMaio noted that the patched area is very close to the window color that it will flatten out the façade and won't show the depth, especially during the day. Queen replied that

the darker area is recessed 7" and the recessed sides will be the color Flint to match the main body. The sill will match the window and become the drip edge and the copings at the top will match the Charcoal window color. DeMaio suggested that the metal edge be closer to the Flint color to match the main wall color and not the window. The Board agreed. Queen noted that the metal flashing edge over the masonry above the sign band over the restaurant entrance can also match the wall color.

Residential Building

Queen stated that along the Washington Street residential wing there will be panels in the color Graphite at the upper floor above the brick façade. The windows will be dark brown to match the panels. DeMaio asked if the Washington Street corner pediments at the roofline will be Nichiha panel. Queen replied yes, in the color Desert Beige, and the cornice break metal will be brown or whichever color matches at the top. Sides asked for the cornice dimension. Queen replied 11" to 12" high with a 6-7" projection, he noted that the cornice will be beveled and there will be seams. Sides suggested the cornice match the beige wall color.

Queen stated that the inset areas there will be a thinner Cembrit panel in the color Pearl. It will be custom sized, 8' to 10' high 1' wide strips, and the coping will be flush at the roofline.

DeMaio asked about the proposed railings. Queen replied they will be aluminum railing with options for pickets, grid or glass face. The Washington Street façade will be gridded and the railing color will match the brown doors and windows. DeMaio asked if the windows in the recesses are also brown. Queen replied yes, the retail and residential windows are Brown and the hotel windows are Charcoal.

DeMaio asked if the beige banding will match the panels above and for the color of the coursing line directly below the 3rd floor railing and noted that a thin line of color shouldn't be used to make a color change. Queen replied yes and noted that the metal flashing will be dark brown to match the windows and the façade color flips at grade due to the raise in grade along Washington Street. Kennedy stated that they should start with a full dark band at the top band of the base of the building. The Board agreed. Queen added that they will need to face nail the façade piece at some point. DeMaio added that a thin line of color shouldn't be used.

Kelly stated that they are open to the Board's input. Sullivan suggested a mock-up. Queen replied that they could create a corner board mock-up first to see how it lays out. The Board agreed.

Jaquith asked if the flush hollow metal door on the Mill Hill elevation, under the 3 windows could be relocated. Queen replied that it was a door to the Electric Room that was removed from the plan after a code review, but not from the elevation. It will be infilled with brick like the rest of the façade at that level.

Roof

McClure noted that the Planning Board suggested that a green roof be added. There was green roof on what was the 3rd floor open area and they've agreed to maintain the greenspace. Originally they were to use a 2½" sedum green roof with edging and irrigation with crushed stone at the outside edge. The Structural Engineer informed them that the wind capacity doesn't allow for crushed stone and it would also void the

waterproofing warranty. They wanted to use something heavier. The new proposal is to use no rushed stone and to add a colored roof membrane, of which there are 4 color options. They've also revised the layout from 4-foot wide bands to 8-foot wide which allows for more continuous greenspace with fewer edges where the plantings are more likely to die. They've cut in some islands so the roof drains are clear of vegetation. The trays will be installed in a checkboard pattern and a shadow study indicated that most of the Washington Street roof is shaded towards the outer edge, so the green portion will be in the center roof. They will use a Live Roof System with 8" high trays, instead of the previously proposed 4½" high trays, along with an irrigation system.

He noted that the plantings haven't been determined yet and they'd like the Board to select the membrane color. DeMaio stated that there is a color debate in the industry, where light colors reduce heat island affect but the darker roofs are better for energy related issues in northern climates, reduce the amount of snow that stays on roof, and last longer. The color should be a design decision factoring in durability, maintenance, and preference. Sides and Chair Durand noted that their preference for Slate Grey as the safest color. Sullivan noted that three floors of people will be looking at this horizontally and the color will be a contrast to the plantings.

McClure stated that the deck is inaccessible to guests and residents, but the Live Roof is an easily replicable and is a heavier product that comes with wind-disk to lock the trays together. Queen noted that the max wind load is 127MPH and the Structural Engineer has approved of the revised product.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Sullivan: Motion to approve the 100% construction documents as part of the Development Review for the Mixed-Use Development Project for 9-11 Dodge Street, 217-219 Washington Street, and 231-251 Washington Street with the following conditions:

- The metal coping color at Hotel corner will match the main façade material – Cembrit color: Flint.
- The metal coping at pediment façade (above retail) will match the adjacent material – Nichiha, Sandstone, Color: Autumn Brown
- The metal coping at recessed façade (above retail) will match the adjacent material – Cembrit color: Pearl
- Where Nichiha material meets horizontal datum (Level 4 decks – elev 44'-0") the color adjacent to the deck trim will be Desert Beige and be full height (18") course, thus reversing the alternating color scheme shown previously.
- The application of Nichiha corner trim can act as a mock-up for the Design Review board to review placement prior to commencing full installation of the Nichiha siding material. Applicant will notify DRB when corner trim is installed for review.
- Remove the door on residential façade of building adjacent to vestibule door.
- The DRB preferred the Slate gray color for green roof.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 7-0.

North River Canal Corridor Renewal Area Projects Under Review

- 1. 72 Flint Street and 67-69 Mason Street (Riverview Place):** Discussion on revisions to the mixed-use residential and retail development.

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti, Quinn, Grover & Frey representing Riverview Place LLC, David Zion, Principal at Riverview Place LLC, David O'Sullivan - Architect James Emmanuel - Landscape Architect, and several representatives of ESF Advisors – the Joint Venture Partner at Riverview Place, LLC were present to discuss the project.

Atty Grover stated that Riverview Place is a 4.4-acre site between Mason, Flint, and Bridge Streets, the former Salem Suede factory site, that has already been demolished. The Planning Board has approved the property for 130 apartments and a small commercial component. The ZBA has approved of the Zoning relief for the property and all state and local permits are in place for the project including Chapter 91 and MEPA. DEP has modified the Chapter 91 License and its approval under the MEPA regulations to reflect the proposed changes.

The Planning Board agreed to amend their Site Plan Review decision and agreed that the proposed changes will improve the project. This site is in the NRCC so the Planning Board referred it to the DRB for their recommendation before rendering a decision.

Atty. Grover stated that the project has the same layout, unit count, 5,000 SF of commercial space, and a similar layout, but there have been 3 significant changes.

1. The removal of the parking deck due to recent change in the Zoning where 1.5 cars is allowed instead of 2. In 2014 their request to reduce parking was denied by the ZBA. They had 260 parking spaces but are now proposing 195. This change has opened up the building to provide new landscaping and creates parking areas closer to Mason Street.
2. Change in design of the Mason Street Building. It was 3 stories with 28 units and is now a row of 8 townhouses. Its height has been reduced from 37-feet down to 22-feet which is a better scale with Mason Street houses and is reflective to Mill Building housing.
3. The commercial space has been relocated to the corner of Bridge and Flint Streets, which is more visually appealing and noticeable from the main corridors and shields the open parking from across the canal.

O'Sullivan stated that there have been minor design changes to the 3 main buildings; they've reduced the footprints, decreased the impervious areas by 6,000 SF, and moved them away from the canal which helped with the Ch. 91 requirements. Other than the relocation of some catch basins the drainage layouts remain the same.

Landscape

Sides asked for the Planning Boards comments regarding moving the townhouses away from the street edge. O'Sullivan replied that there was some discussion, the guidelines say to place it closer to the street but since the street is narrow the Planning Board requested that shade trees be added to improve the streetscape. DeMaio asked if

moving the Mason Street townhouses closer to the street would complicate the use of the driveways on the opposite side of the street. O'Sullivan replied that they could be accommodated but the existing utilities would be impacted.

Emmanuel stated that adding deciduous shade trees would be to improve the view on Mason Street and at a mature height of 40 or more feet would shade the parking area and provide greenspace in front of townhouses. The previous plan called for a 5-foot strip of landscaping and the proposed plan will maintain the tree line, and every other tree will be a street tree. The evergreen and planting buffers along the property lines will be maintained and several canopy trees will be added to them.

Roof Garden

Emmanuel stated that a roof deck was added to Building No.2, on top where the roof is lower and it will be visible from the Canal. There will be an outdoor living space with seating outdoor grills, a synthetic lawn, green shrub perimeter, and a fence to separate it from the HVAC units on the larger roof. It would be used by all residents. O'Sullivan noted that there will be a low parapet wall but the roof deck will be flush with the top floor of the residential building to allow handicapped accessible.

Sullivan asked if the commercial tenant will be under it. O'Sullivan replied yes, and the commercial space will be for a single tenant with a two-story tall space. Sides asked if the changes proposed were in relation to their approval and if they will return with details. Atty. Grover replied that the ZBA approved the plan in August so the Planning Board is the last approval they need.

DeMaio asked if the ambient light on the roof deck will be screened from the houses along Flint Street. O'Sullivan replied that the deck is in the front corner, it's a tall building and screening will be provided at the rear of the deck with a 6-foot high fence and plantings. It's focused towards the canal and away from the neighbors. DeMaio noted that the lights along the rear of the deck are taller than the fence and it and the screening at the upper level HVAC units shouldn't disturb the neighboring residents. O'Sullivan replied that the poles lights are 6-feet high like the fence so the lights can be lowered or changed to downlights at the trellis. The lights will also be gas lantern which aren't bright.

Sullivan asked if the commercial unit will have parking. Atty. Grover replied that any user must fit within the parking requirements because there is a limited number of spaces available.

Building Design

O'Sullivan stated that they still have the two main buildings, entrances, parking at grade, and the same massing. At Building No. 1, they created a parking lot at the level of the road behind it with a 5 to 6 foot grade change between the two parking areas. The upper floors are unchanged, and they've retained the red brick below and associated pattern, siding colors, window and grille pattern, and detail at window and cornice. The people on First Floor will look at shade trees and not cars since the parking deck was eliminated.

At Building No. 2, the first floor level for commercial space has to be at an elevation of 12.8-feet and the sidewalk is elevation 10 and there are steps and a handicapped ramp. DeMaio asked if the parking will be screened. O'Sullivan replied that the screening was

approved and no changes are proposed. The new commercial building was previously a parking lot so they've also shifted the vehicular entrance.

At the townhouses, the building is two-stories on Mason Street and three-stories at the rear. They've reduced the scale and are proposing clapboard siding and double-hung windows. Each unit has a door and walkway and the colors that vary so they read as townhouses. They will also have a mixture of shade trees along the front façade.

Board Commentary

Sides stated that she is pleased with the new commercial location. The townhouses have no entry roofs and they could flip every other unit to create a shared roof over two entrances, and more detail is needed. The townhouses could be a typology that fits in better with the Mill Building.

Jaquith agreed and noted that the townhouses appear as one building except for the color and the streetscape doesn't match the buildings next to it. The townhouses could become two buildings instead of one. A better design could increase their value and there needs to be a shelter/roof over the entrances. The landscaping has improved but he wanted to see more landscaping in the larger parking lot. He approved of the Mill buildings.

DeMaio stated that the townhouses being set back make the front resemble backyards and people could locate the grills in the rear which is actually their front door, like at Bell at Salem Station.

Sullivan stated that this is a great opportunity on the Mason Street site and he agreed with other Board comments. He suggested that the townhouses be made to look like individual units. This façade will face North so they should make it more of an entrance like the other homes along Mason Street that are very close to the sidewalk.

Chair Durand suggested they push the townhouse building forward.

Kennedy stated that wayfinding and signage is his concern and there is an opportunity for it to be done subtly. Atty. Grover replied that they would welcome a condition to require signage and wayfinding.

Kennedy exited the meeting.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Emily Udy, Historic Salem Inc. She suggested they move townhouses closer to the sidewalk by half the distance it is now, since it's only 2 stories, to allow back-yard activities on opposite side. This will also allow a guest to park in the driveway behind the resident. She suggested they plant trees at the other side of Mason Street to see the canopy

Victoria Ricciardiello, 5 Foster Street. The two-story townhouses are respectful of Mason Street but could be moved forward. She asked for the clarification of the other building heights. O'Sullivan replied that the 4-story build is 50-feet-high with parking underneath and the three-level residences are 40-feet-high.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Chair Durand was in favor of the commercial area and landscape revision but agreed with the Board's townhouse comments. He likes the lower height of the townhouses but has the same concerns as the Board. Atty. Grover replied that building can be moved forward. O'Sullivan agreed with the comment of the front yard so big it becomes a back yard which the Planning Board didn't mention. Atty. Grover replied that they will return with revised townhouse building plans.

Jaquith: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting.
Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0

Old/New Business

- **Discussion on DRB criteria review for SRA and NRCC projects**

Chair Durand stated that in regard to the Ferris project (16-18 Franklin Street), the DRB and SRA aren't parallel but the DRB conducts the SRA's design reviews, so their job is more parallel with the Planning Board (PB). This created possible disfunction on this project because the PB approved of what the DRB didn't. The NRCC advising is different than advising the SRA and the PB because the PB has a different purview, their Site Plan Review, while the DRB's inclusion in this district is to provide more design review. He wants to have a better working relationship between the two Boards.

Sullivan suggested the DRB communicate with the PB before their review. Coogan stated that he provided a memo to the PB to explain the DRB's split vote for the Ferris project but future memos can be more descriptive to what they are reviewing and the DRB's findings, including with what the DRB liked along with an overall review.

Sides stated that the DRB could suggest that projects be reviewed after the PB has finished their review to see how the project got to the point its at when it begins its review by the DRB. This would be a different process for the DRB.

Chair Durand stated that the overall project had changed based upon what the DRB has approved. He wanted to fix the communication, goals, respect between the Boards so that applicants don't won't bully their way through the review process.

Jaquith stated that it was a bad scheme from the beginning that he didn't approve of from the start. Sides replied that there is a process to the review and an overlap of expertise between the DRB and PB as far as their membership. The PB has progressive members with a view of planning for the modern world and the developer for the Ferris project was following the PB's path and their expectations. There should have been more communication between the two Boards along the way. Coogan noted that staff can offer that communication that was missing between the two Boards with their review and he can provide a memo to the PB based on tonight's meeting.

DeMaio stated that he went to the last PB meeting when the Ferris Project was discussed. The DRB had never not recommended approval of a project which was a big step and the DRB's decision was barely mentioned. There needs to be proper communication between the Boards. All other PB members besides Sides made an

opening statement and the DRB's split vote was in the negative. The PB didn't seem to care about the DRB opinion. Sides replied that they read and reviewed the memo from Coogan but agreed that there was no discussion or debate. It could have been read out loud to make it part of the meeting. She noted that the DRB is advisory to the PB only with NRCC Corridor projects and buildings over a certain square-footage. The optics of the PB meeting was his biggest concern because the lack of discussion about the DRB's concerns undercuts the DRB's effectiveness and developers will see that the PB makes the final decision.

Chair Durand stated that the applicant asked for a vote and he would have done things the same and not continued it. Sullivan asked if the PB could send it back to the DRB to review the finishes. Jaquith suggested the PB wasn't thinking about the overall scheme which is bad for Salem.

Sullivan suggested that when the majority of the DRB disapproves of a project that's the time to meet with the PB before they make a vote if a project is this important. It's sad that the DRB's opinion didn't take more weight.

Sides stated that all PB members were aware of the DRB's circumstances, judged it on the same criteria as always, but those points need to be discussed by both Boards because there was a lot of overlap between them. The PB wants to clarify that review of NRCC project because it trips up Boards. Chair Durand replied that the intent was good but the mechanics weren't well thought-out and the PB should be asked for their clarification. Coogan suggested a joint public meeting for these types of projects.

- **SRA project review – Old Salem Jail, Phase II**

Chair Durand stated that he received a letter from Tom Daniel and Matt Coogan about post review of projects. There is now a maze of gas meters that were prominent that the DRB would have asked that it be dealt with in a different way. He suggested a checklist to improve the process and to allow Applicants think ahead to additional items, especially when they aren't screened. He noted that dryer vents in the façade also weren't presented to the DRB. The Applicant needs to let the Board know where these items will be located and return for review and approval of such items.

Sides stated that the project came out well despite unknowns. Jaquith added that the applicant could have come before the board earlier. DeMaio noted that it is difficult to know the future placement of utilities and vents when the consultants work comes after the DRB's review. Chair Durand suggested that such questions be asked during the original review and making visible items a condition that requires additional review and added landscaping or screening. Sides suggested itemized guidelines for the applicant; venting, piping, conduits, etc. DeMaio noted that items such as the color of dryer vents may change when the contractor buys the items or they can be forgotten about.

Coogan stated that there are many projects coming up in the next couple of years and the DRB taking this recently completed project and reviewing how the process went and if the end results matched. And whether the project could have eliminated obvious items such as the meters because there were so many of them. The Board should consider deadlines for submission reviews and materials that are asked for to clarify the process

so the items can be mitigated. The Design Guidelines in the Downtown Renewal Plan do mention maintaining the street wall, so how does the Board catch such items. DeMaio replied that this is a building trades issue and they need to be more proactive and say not to locate utilities along specific walls or primary facades within the project, which implies more review on the DRB side.

Coogan suggested the DRB make the response to the SRA specific to this project, and to decide how it gets incorporated into their review. He suggested that the utilities could be the motivating factor in why this project was selected for review because they overshadow the project. Sides stated that the DRB must have the same awareness regarding rooftop units.

Chair Durand stated that the PEM window is also different than what was intended. Sides noted that they should have returned to the DRB when they wanted to make the change.

Coogan stated that Chair Durand drafted a response for the Board that needs to be reviewed and edited prior to the October 10, 2018 SRA meeting. It should include a desire by the DRB for a dialog with the SRA if they feel it is necessary. Chair Durand suggested a representative speak to the SRA on DRB's behalf.

Jaquith: Motion to send Chair Durand's letter to the SRA.
Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0.

Minutes

August 22, 2018

Sides: Motion with Kennedy and Sides edits
Seconded by: Jacquith. Passes 6-0

Other Items

Northern Downtown Visioning

Coogan stated that the SRA is conducting a Northern Downtown Visioning that includes the 2 former Superior Court and County Commissioner buildings. The disposal of these properties for redevelopment will be a 2-step process with an RFQ followed by an RFP. The Tabernacle Church, Bridge at 211, the crescent lot, the Church Street parking lot, and Mall parking garage could also be included. The SRA wants public input to determine what people want, such as high-level items like housing. The SRA hired Utile to facilitate a public process to determine the goals. The public meeting will be October 16th at the new CLC building and the DRB is welcome to attend.

HDIP Zone Expansion

Coogan stated that they have put in an application to expand the HDIP zone from the current 6 parcels to include the entire B5 and NRCC zoning districts, plus 3 additional parcels: St. James Church, Immaculate Conception Church, and 5 Broad Street because of their potential redevelopment challenges for adaptive reuse projects.

Coogan stated that the former school buildings at Immaculate Conception and St. James Church are under agreement for a master lease to reuse these buildings and mostly likely convert them to housing with some affordability.

Adjournment

Sides: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 6-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 9:15PM.

Approved by the Design Review Board on November 28, 2018.

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