

City of Salem ZBA of Appeals
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, August 15, 2018

A meeting of the Salem ZBA of Appeals (“Salem ZBA”) was held on Wednesday, August 15, 2018 in the third floor conference room at 98 Washington Street, Salem, Massachusetts at 6:30 p.m.

Mike Duffy, Chair, calls the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

ROLL CALL

Those present were: Mike Duffy (Chair), Peter A. Copelas, Jimmy Tsitsinos, Paul Viccica. Also in attendance - Erin Schaeffer - Staff Planner, Building Commissioner- Tom St. Pierre, and Lorelee Stewart- Recording Clerk.

REGULAR AGENDA

Project A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition requesting a special permit per Sec. 3.3.2 *Non-Conforming Uses*, 3.3.3 *Nonconforming Structures*, and 3.3.4 Variance Required of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, to authorize a change in a non-conforming use and non-conforming structure.

Applicant **RAM CONSTRUCTION, LLC**

Location **311 BRIDGE STREET (Map 26 Lot 618)(R-2 Zoning District)**

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated May 30, 2018 and supporting documentation

Applicant requests to withdraw the petition without prejudice.

Mr. Viccica motions to approve withdrawal of the petition without prejudice, Mr. Copelas seconds, and all vote in favor.

Project A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition requesting a special permit per Sec. 3.3.5 *Nonconforming Structures* of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, to allow the petitioner to construct a shed dormer.

Applicant **JEFF SIMARD**

Location **15 SCOTIA STREET (Map 15 Lot 567)(R-1 Zoning District)**

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated June 28, 2018 and supporting documentation

Ken Drako, builder for the petitioner, explained that Mr. Simard wants to build a dormer on the third floor of his house which will not change the existing footprint of the structure. The house will remain a single family and the dormer is consistent with other third floor dormer in the neighborhood. The dormer will be used for an office/den but will mostly serve as bedroom space.

Jeff Simard, the petitioner, stated that his family is expanding and they need additional space. Mr. Duffy wondered if the dormer would affect the building in any other way and Mr. Simard assured it would not. He said the dormer would not add height and that his home is under the height limit now.

Mr. Duffy opened the meeting for public comment.

Mr. Duffy read a letter from Abigail and Aaron Butt in support of the applicant into the record.

The Board confirmed that the house is a single family now and will remain a single family house. Mr. Duffy read the statement of grounds for the special permit from the application highlighting that there would be no negative impact created by the proposed work with no change of use created by the dormer. He added that there would be no changes to parking or traffic, no environmental changes and no changes to drainage. Mr. Duffy stated that the utilities in existences are adequate and there could be increased tax revenue to the city.

Mr. Viccica motions to approve a special permit per Sec. 3.3.5 *Nonconforming Structures* of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, to allow the petitioner to construct a shed dormer, subject to the following standard conditions. The motion is seconded by Mr. Copelas. The vote was unanimous with four (Mr. Copelas, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Tsitsinos, and Mr. Viccica) in favor and none opposed to the petition.

1. The Petitioner shall comply with all city and state statutes, ordinances, codes and regulations.
2. All construction shall be done as per the plans and dimensions submitted to and approved by the Building Commissioner
3. All requirements of the Salem Fire Department relative to smoke and fire safety shall be strictly adhered to.
4. Petitioner shall obtain a building permit prior to beginning any construction.
5. Exterior finishes of new construction shall be in harmony with the existing structure.
6. A Certificate of Inspection is to be obtained.
7. Petitioner is to obtain approval from any City Board or Commission having jurisdiction including, but not limited to, the Planning Board.

Project A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of requesting a special permit per Sec. 3.3.5 *Nonconforming Structures* of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, to allow the petitioner to convert and existing non-conforming single family home into a non-conforming two-family structure. No changes will be made to the footprint or exterior of the structure.

Applicant **PURA PENA JIMENEZ**

Location **7 BARTON STREET (Map 36 Lot 364)(R-2 Zoning District)**

Documents and Exhibitions

Application dated July 13, 2018 and supporting documentation

Petitioner Mr. Jimenez introduced himself and his mother, Pura Jimenez. He explained that they wish to change this single family house into 2 family house and pave a parking lot in the back. These changes would not change the existing footprint and would increase tax revenue for the city.

Mr. Duffy asked the applicant if they were comfortable proceeding given that the ZBA had 4 members present instead of five. Mr. Jimenez replied in the affirmative and addressed the petition stating that the house is zoned as a 2 family and they need to create enough parking for the second family.

Mr. Viccica asked if this was previously a two family. Mr. Jimenez replied that he thinks it was. The board discussed the need for two exits from the property, but Mr. Jimenez clarified that the property had 2 exits with one internal exit going to the back porch.

Mr. Duffy summarized the requested relief and asked for public comment. No members of the public spoke.

Mr. St Pierre stated that it was unclear whether there was sufficient space for three standard parking spaces without seeing a scale drawing of the paved area. He suggested that this be a condition for approval.

Mr. Duffy listed the Board's findings:

The proposed change to the structure is not substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing non-conforming structure.

1. There are social, economic and community needs served by this proposal.
2. There are no changes to traffic flow and safety, including parking and loading.
3. The existing utilities are adequate to serve this addition.
4. There are no negative impacts on the natural environment, including drainage.
5. The proposal fits with the character of the neighborhood as there are many two-family structures in the neighborhood and this use is allowed by right in this zoning district.
6. The potential fiscal impact, including impact on City tax base and employment is positive.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Viccica motioned to approve a motion a special permit per Sec. 3.3.5 *Nonconforming Structures* of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, to allow the petitioner to convert and existing non-conforming single family home into a non-conforming two-family structure, subject to the following conditions. The motion is seconded by Mr. Copelas. The vote was unanimous with four (Mr. Copelas, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Tsitsinos, and Mr. Viccica) in favor and none opposed to the petition.

Standard Conditions:

1. The Petitioner shall comply with all city and state statutes, ordinances, codes and regulations.
2. All construction shall be done as per the plans and dimensions submitted to and approved by the Building Commissioner.
3. All requirements of the Salem Fire Department relative to smoke and fire safety shall be strictly adhered to.
4. Petitioner shall obtain a building permit prior to beginning any construction.
5. A Certificate of Occupancy shall be obtained.
6. A Certificate of Inspection is to be obtained.
7. Petitioner is to obtain approval from any City Board or Commission having jurisdiction including, but not limited to, the Planning Board.

Special Condition:

1. The petitioner shall submit a to scale plot plan that demonstrates zoning compliant parking spaces with the building permit application.

Project	A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition requesting a special permit per Sec. 3.3.3 <i>Nonconforming Structures</i> of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, to allow a 16' x 16' one story addition.
Applicant	KAYLA DOHERTY COURNOYER
Location	11 JAPONICA STREET (Map 26 Lot 156)(R-1 Zoning District)

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated July 23, 2018 and supporting documentation

Mark Cournoyer, the husband of homeowner, stated that they are proposing a one story addition for extra space. The addition will be hard to see from street level because of a stockade fence but will change the rear setback from 27 feet to 11 feet from property line. The outside of the addition will match the existing structure so that it is uniform. He stated that are many additions in the neighborhood and several neighbors are in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Duffy summarized that the issue is increasing nonconformity with regards to rear yard setback and opens the public hearing.

Mr. Duffy states that the following residents have submitted letter in favor of the addition:

- Matt Pudvah, 9 Japonica St.
- John Luxton, 10 Japonica St
- Sean Conner, 13 Japonica Street
- Sean and Heather Ross, 14 Japonica St
- Kris and Savannah Carlson, 15 Churchill St.

Mr. Duffy closed the public hearing and summarized how the applicant has met the criteria for a special permit:

The proposed change to the structure is not substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing non-conforming structure.

1. There are social, economic and community needs served by this proposal.
2. There are no changes to traffic flow and safety, including parking and loading.
3. The existing utilities are adequate to serve this addition.
4. There are no negative impacts on the natural environment, including drainage.
5. The addition fits with the neighborhood character and fits with the existing home as there are several homes in the neighborhood with additions and the addition fits with the existing structure.
6. The potential fiscal impact, including impact on City tax base and employment is positive.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Viccica makes a motion to approve a special permit per Sec. 3.3.3 *Nonconforming Structures* of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, to allow a 16' x 16' one story addition, subject to the following conditions. The motion is seconded by Copelas. The vote is unanimous with four (Mr. Copelas, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Tsitsinos, and Mr. Viccica) in favor and none opposed to the petition.

1. The Petitioner shall comply with all city and state statutes, ordinances, codes and regulations.
2. All construction shall be done as per the plans and dimensions submitted to and approved by the Building Commissioner.
3. All requirements of the Salem Fire Department relative to smoke and fire safety shall be strictly adhered to.
4. Petitioner shall obtain a building permit prior to beginning any construction.
5. A Certificate of Occupancy shall be obtained.
6. A Certificate of Inspection is to be obtained.
7. Petitioner is to obtain approval from any City Board or Commission having jurisdiction including, but not limited to, the Planning Board.

Project A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition requesting to amend a previously issued decision of the Board of Appeals dated November 2, 2007, which allowed the development of 130 residential units, 5,540 square feet of commercial space located in three (3) new buildings. The petitioner is seeking Variance per *Sec. 4.1.1 Table of Uses* and *Sec. 8.4.13 NRCC Mixed Use District* of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, to allow the petitioner to exceed the allowable height (feet) by one foot nine inches (Building 1) and by nine inches (Building 2).

Applicant RIVERVIEW PLACE LLC

Location 72 FLINT STREET, 67-69 MASON STREET and 71 MASON STREET (Map 26 Lots 91, 95, 97)

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated July 19, 2018 and supporting documentation

Attorney Scott Grover, Engineer Rich Williams, and Architect David O’Sullivan, represented the petitioner.

Mr. Grover gave a history of the project located between Mason St., Flint St., and Bridge St. in the North River Canal Corridor. Mr. Grover also reviewed the details of the plan and relief granted by the Board in 2007. He said that until recently the NRCC was zoned for parking 2 spaces per unit. They are back because the City Council just lowered the zoning requirements to 1.5 parking spaces per unit which allows them to create favorable changes. Parking is reduced from 282 spaces to 217spaces. They plan to reduce the height of the building on Mason St. and move the commercial space to the front. They requested minor variances for the heights in two of the buildings. Building 1 exceeds what is allowed by one foot nine inches and Building 2 is nine inches higher than what is allowed. Mr. Grover states that the site conditions and the flood plain create a hardship for these variances.

Mr. Williams said that the only way to meet requirements is by lowering the buildings or by raising the grade. He added that if they lower the buildings, it pushes utilities closer to ground, which is restricted in the NRCC. They cannot increase the grade because DEP won’t allow loss of flood storage. Mr. Williams told the Board that they analyzed each incremental foot of grading and have shown how they met flood storage in each case. Mr. O’Sullivan reviewed prior approved height on Building 1 and Building 2 and said they discovered they needed extra height. The Board discussed whether this would go back to the Planning Board and what would happen to the Flint Street parking from the original plan. Mr. O’Sullivan said it would have signage stating Flint Street parking only.

The board discussed changes in curb cuts and parking. The rooftop parking from the original plan will now be underneath the building. Ms Schaeffer stated that the petitioner now meets the zoning requirement of 65 parking spaces for 130 units.

Mr. Duffy opened the meeting to the public the public hearing.

Jane Arlander, 92 Federal St. said she didn’t think the hardship discussed by the petitioner is created by flood plain, but is created by density of the project. She stated that the petitioner had 3 variances in original plan and had to get a special permit from Planning Board as well. She thinks this new design is very different and is glad that it will go before Planning Board. She noted possible parking changes from the original design. She stated that any variance is a variance even if it is minor and feels the height of the project is too high for the neighborhood. She objected to any increases in height and preferred a reduction in density by reducing the number of floors.

Meg Twohey of 122 Federal St. seconded what Ms. Arlander stated and felt that the building on Mason Street didn’t conform with the NRCC. Ms. Arlander suggested the Board do a site visit.

Ward 6 Councilor Beth Gerard, of 49 Larchmont Rd., spoke in favor of the project and the new design. She added that she has heard from residents on Flint St. who are in favor of the petition, especially the parking lot that is dedicated to residents.

Emily Udy of Historic Salem, Inc., asked about HVAC and parapets. She added that 20 ft setback for the sidewalk is suburban and not appropriate for neighborhood.

Elizabeth Weinstein, co-owner of 53 Mason St, spoke in support of petition.

Maureen Scanlon of 77 Mason St spoke in opposition to the variance. She thinks it is too large and dislikes it being built in a flood plain.

A resident of from 75-77 Mason St. spoke in opposition to the variance.

Mr. Duffy closed the public hearing and asked the petitioner to discuss the density, height of parapets and setbacks. Mr. Grover said that the density has already been allowed by the board's 2007 decision and that the variance is created by the flood plain. The Board discussed the height increase per floor of the 9 feet ceilings to see if it is caused by hardship. Mr. Grover addressed the differences in the original plan and the amended plan stating the approval of the original plan can be amended to any extent. Mr. O'Sullivan added this was for the Planning Board side and added there no change to number of units. Grover felt that they were being conservative by coming back because the changes are minor but need review and that this will go before The Planning Board and Design Review Board.

Mr. St. Pierre felt the petitioners were being forthcoming by coming before the Board. The Board and Mr. Grover discussed hardship. Mr. Viccica asked if anything could be changed to eliminate the variance for Building 2 by lowering the floor to floor height. Mr. Williams stated the flood plain is causing the need for the variance because they cannot raise the grade. Mr. Grover felt the new plan is providing gains to the neighborhood, especially the Mason Street side. Mr. O'Sullivan stated they discovered design issues that cannot work in practice because of grading and that the variance for Building 2 only applies to the last 20 to 30 feet of building.

Mr. Duffy summarized the Board's findings:

1. There are special conditions and circumstances that especially affect the land, building, or structure, generally not affecting other lands, buildings and structures in the same district including significant grade changes and is located within a floodplain. Since the property is located in a flood zone, areas of the Site must be kept at existing grades. Raising grades is prohibited by the Massachusetts Environmental Protection (DEP) as additional filling negatively affects flooding in the area during extreme storm events. The site also cannot be lowered as the buildings would be deeper into the flood plain and the petitioner would not be able to comply with flood proof construction or be able to locate drainage utilities below mean high water.
2. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would involve substantial hardship in that the buildings, which are consistent with the allowed size of buildings in terms of stories cannot be constructed within the permitted limitations in terms of feet due to the special conditions relating to grading and the flood zone.
3. Desirable relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good, and without nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent of the district or the purpose of the ordinance.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Viccica makes a motion approve the amendment, as proposed, to a previously issued decision of the Board of Appeals dated November 2, 2007, subject to the following conditions. The motion is seconded by Mr. Copelas. The vote was unanimous

with four (Mr. Copelas, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Tsitsinos, and Mr. Viccica) in favor and none opposed to the petition.

All conditions of the original November 2, 2007 conditions shall remain in effect.

Project A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of requesting an amendment to previously issued decision of the Board of Appeals dated July 2, 1985, to remove the owner occupancy requirement of the special permit.

Applicant **FRANK W. CHANDLER**

Location **80 OCEAN AVENUE (Map 33 Lot 69)(R-2 Zoning District)**

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated July 23, 2018 and supporting documentation

Petitioner Frank W. Chandler presented. He asked that the language be removed from the special permit requiring owner occupancy. Mr. Duffy asks about a legal memo from 2006 and Ms. Schaeffer stated this issue came up related to another permit and this memo from the City Solicitor is legally relevant.

Mr. Duffy opens to the public and no member of the public speaks in favor or in opposition to the petition.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Viccica makes a motion approve an amendment to the previously issued decision of the Board of Appeals dated July 2, 1985, to remove the owner occupancy requirement of the special permit. The motion is seconded by Tsitsinos. The vote was unanimous with four (Mr. Copelas, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Tsitsinos, and Mr. Viccica) in favor and none opposed to the petition.

Project A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition seeking a Special Permit per Sec. 6.10.4 and 9.4 of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, to operate a licensed retail marijuana establishment.

Applicant **CTDW LLC**

Location **3 DODGE STREET (Map 34 Lot 401)(B-5 Zoning District)**

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated July 24, 2018 and supporting documentation

Attorney Tom Alexander represents the petition. Mr. Alexander said CTDW plans to open a retail marijuana facility at 3 Dodge Street, which is currently Deschamps printing. Deschamps will relocate

to a separate part of the building and move their production. He states they filed the application in accordance with all City zoning bylaws and MGL. He added all abutters were notified and a neighborhood meeting was held. He states the City Councilor Josh Turiel and Rinus Oosthoek from the Chamber of commerce were in attendance. They received no community opposition.

Mr. Alexander stated that their security plan with a delivery bay was reviewed by Chief Butler who wrote a letter to the Board approving their plan. They notified all required entities and there are no churches and no institutions of higher education within the buffer zone. Parking with current business will stay the same but they will lower number of employees from 22 to 10 employees. Employees of CTDW will get passes to the parking garage. Mr. Alexander reviewed criteria for approval and stated that this will enhance the Dodge St. corridor and provide a diversity of locations of marijuana retails shops. There are no residential abutters. Mr. Alexander described the proposed finance details of the host agreement and added that the applicant has a history of donating to Salem Charities and intends to continue.

Chip Tuttle of CTDW said the working name of the company is Sea Grass because it is committed to marine ecology. They plan to have three stores with the first in Salem. They are committed to the local community and will help with improvements occurring downtown.

Mr. Duffy asked about the mural design on the building and Mr. Tuttle states the mural on the building is public art from North Shore Community Development Coalition which will remain. They will occupy just over 6000 square feet.

Mr. Duffy asked how Sea Grass space will be separated from adjacent spaces. Mr. Tuttle replied that there are doors for common areas and they are walling off access to the basement from their area and another part located behind Winer Brothers with secure door. The Board discusses current use of the building and what they expect for volume of customers. Matt Hawes of CTDW replied that they expect 30 customers per hour during peak times and most of it by foot. Mr. Tuttle adds that their waiting area is large—about 1000ft—and they do not expect outside queuing. They want this to be a high-end customer experience and they are investing \$1 million in the interior. Mr. Tuttle states the building has no parking but their business will subsidize garage spots for employees. He adds that customers who drive to this location will use on street parking and garage spots. Mr. Tuttle said they will train employees to be sensitive to parking and that they are willing to lease spots if needed.

Mr. Duffy opens meeting for public comment.

Josh Turiel, City Councilor for Ward 5, stated he is in support of Sea Grass, which the first applicant for a facility that won't be located on Highland Ave. He addressed parking impact for the neighborhood and reminded Board that B5 Zone has no parking requirement for commercial uses.

Mr. Duffy closes the public comment. The board summarizes their findings:

The Board finds that the applicant has demonstrated that the following specific criteria for retail marijuana establishments will be met and is in accordance with Section 6.10.8 of the Salem Zoning Ordinance:

1. The applicant demonstrates that the marijuana establishment will meet all of the permitting requirements of all applicable agencies within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and will be in compliance with all applicable state laws and regulations including, but not limited to M.G.L c.94G, Section 12 General Marijuana Establishment Operations.
2. The applicant has satisfied all of the conditions and requirements of this section and other applicable sections of the Zoning Ordinance and any applicable city ordinances.
3. The facility provides adequate security measures to ensure that there are not direct threats to the health or safety of employees, staff, or members of the public.

General Special Permit findings:

1. There are social, economic, and community needs served by the proposal. The retail establishment will be extensively regulated by the Cannabis Control Commission, which was created to regulate the industry as approved by a popular vote in 2016. Pursuant to the popular vote, the proposed establishment will meet community needs expressed by such vote and Massachusetts General Laws c.94G.
2. Traffic flow and safety, including parking and loading are adequate as the property is located in the B5 Zoning District and there are no on-site parking requirements. The petitioner will also provide transit and parking passes to employees to limit the impacts to on-street parking in the area.
3. Utilities and other public services are adequate.
4. There will be no negative impacts to the natural environment, including drainage as the proposed use will be contained entirely within the existing footprint of the building.
5. There are no negative impacts to the neighborhood character and do not currently abut residential properties. The petitioner will also be significantly investing in this property.
6. The potential fiscal impact, including impact on City tax base and employment is positive.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Viccica makes a motion to approve a Special Permit per Sec. 6.10.4 and 9.4 of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, to operate a licensed retail marijuana establishment, with the following conditions. The motion is seconded by Mr Copelas. The vote was unanimous with four (Mr. Copelas, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Tsitsinos, and Mr.Viccica) in favor and none opposed.

Standard Conditions:

8. The Petitioner shall comply with all city and state statutes, ordinances, codes and regulations.
9. All construction shall be done as per the plans and dimensions submitted to and approved by the Building Commissioner
10. All requirements of the Salem Fire Department relative to smoke and fire safety shall be strictly adhered to.

11. Petitioner shall obtain a building permit prior to beginning any construction.
12. Exterior finishes of new construction shall be in harmony with the existing structure.
13. A Certificate of Inspection shall be obtained.
14. A Certificate of Occupancy shall be obtained.
15. Petitioner shall obtain street numbering from the City of Salem Assessor's Office and shall display said number so as to be visible from the street.
16. Petitioner is to obtain approval from any City Board or Commission having jurisdiction including, but not limited to, the Planning Board.

Special Conditions:

1. The applicant shall not operate until the issuance and submission of a copy of the issued state license by the Commonwealth and all other state and local requirements are met.
2. A community host agreement shall be executed with the City within six (6) months of issuance of this special permit. A six (6) month extension can be granted by the Board of Appeals if good cause is shown.
3. The applicant shall be issued a state license within six (6) months of the issuance of this special permit. A six (6) month extension can be granted by the Board of Appeals if good cause is shown.
4. The petitioner shall continue to allow the use of the exterior walls for public art.

Project	A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition requesting a variance per Sec. 5.1.8 Table of Parking Requirements of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, to allow the petitioner to have less than the required number of parking spaces.
Applicant	THE COLUMBUS SOCIETY OF SALEM
Location	18 COMMERCIAL STREET (Map 26 Lot 51)(NRCC)

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated July 24, 2018 and supporting documentation

Attorney George Atkins, representing the petition, requested to continue to the next meeting.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Viccica makes a motion to continue the public hearing until the September 19, 2018 meeting. The motion is seconded by Mr Copelas. The vote was

unanimous with four (Mr. Copelas, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Tsitsinos, and Mr. Viccica) in favor and none opposed.

OLD
and NEW BUSINESS

The board discussed changes to the Board's application form. Ms. Schaeffer stated that changes will require paper sizes to be 11 by 17 inches, indicating exterior elevations, dimensions and all sides which are affected by the proposal. Exposed foundation should be depicted on elevations. A certified plot plan for construction is required for all new construction if it will affect the footprint. A mortgage plan can be submitted instead of a certified plot plan. Additionally, petitioners seeking dimensional variances must include a chart showing how proposal falls short of the ordinance. She added that any easements, water, sewer, gas lines, underground electrical, paper streets, conservation land, wetlands, and historical sites must be shown as they may be relevant. Mr. St Pierre reminded the Board that only land surveyor can produce plot plan that are to scale.

Discussion about fee structure is tabled until more research can be done. Board discussed how to handle late submissions and storage of applications

The Board discussed the Salem News ad fee costs. Ms Schaeffer told the Board that the Registry of Deeds wants book and page number on decisions and would like to shift this work and research to the applicant by putting this in the application.

**Mr. Viccica motions to make the discussed changes to the Board of Appeals application.
Mr. Copelas seconded the motion and all vote in favor.**

MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Copelas makes a motion to approve the March 28, 2018 meeting minutes. The motion is seconded by Mr. Tsitinos and all vote in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Vicicca makes a motion to adjourn at 9:15pm. The motion is seconded by Tsistinos and all vote in favor.

For actions where the decisions have not been fully written into these minutes, copies of the Decisions have been posted separately by address or project at:

<http://www.salem.com/zoning-board-appeals>

Respectfully submitted,

Lorelee Stewart, Recording Clerk