

**City of Salem Planning Board  
Approved Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, January 21, 2016**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, January 21, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall Annex, Room 313, 120 Washington Street, Salem, Massachusetts.

Chairman Anderson opened the meeting at 7:13 pm.

### Roll Call

Those present were: Ben Anderson, Chair, Matt Veno, Vice Chair, Helen Sides, Kirt Rieder, Dale Yale, Noah Koretz and Carole Hamilton. Absent: Bill Griset.

Also present: Amanda Chiancola, Staff Planner, and Pamela Broderick, Planning Board Recording Clerk.

### Regular Agenda

**Location:** 14 and 16 ALMEDA STREET (Map 14 Lot 116 and Map 14 Lot 117)  
**Applicant:** TOWN AND COUNTRY HOMES, INC.  
**Description:** REVISED\* The applicant has requested a continuance of the public hearing to the regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting on February 18, 2016 for a Definitive Subdivision to construct a roadway to serve two existing undeveloped lots.

Chair Anderson advised the applicant has requested a continuance to provide time to meet with the City Engineer and prepare an appropriate response to comments. The applicant has also requested an extension of the project decision deadline to February 23.

**ROLL CALL Motion and Vote:** Helen Sides made a motion to continue the public hearing to February 18, 2016, seconded by Dale Yale. The vote was unanimous with seven (7) in favor (Mr. Anderson, Mr. Veno, Ms. Sides, Mr. Rieder, Ms. Yale, Mr. Koretz and Ms. Hamilton) and none (0) opposed.

**ROLL CALL Motion and Vote:** Helen Sides made a motion to extend the project decision deadline to February 23, 2016, seconded by Carole Hamilton. The vote was unanimous with seven (7) in favor ( Mr. Anderson, Mr. Veno, Ms. Sides, Mr. Rieder, Ms. Yale, Mr. Koretz and Ms. Hamilton) and none (0) opposed.

**Location:** 401 BRIDGE STREET (Map 25, Lot 74) and 44 Boston Street (Map 15, Lot 305)  
**Applicant:** HIGH ROCK BRIDGE STREET, LLC  
**Description:** A continuance of the public hearing for amendments to the approved Site Plan Review, Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit and Special Permits associated with the North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance:

Section 9.5 Site Plan Review, Section 8.1 Flood Hazard Overlay District. The applicant requests the following Special Permit associated with the North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District (NRCC) Sections 8.4.5 and 8.4.13 North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District). Specifically, the applicant requests a Special Permit per Sec. Sec 4.0 of the NRCC to allow a multi-story arrangement of a multi-family residential use. The applicant requests amendments to the following approved Special Permits of the NRCC: A Special Permit per Sec. 8.4.12 Retail Use of the NRCC to allow ground level retail use to be amended from the original decision to exceed the 3,000 gross square feet for one retailer. A Special Permit per Sec. 6.0 to be amended from the original decision to allow an eating and drinking place on the premises to reflect the new plan. The applicant proposes to construct two separate buildings including the Community Life Center, a two-story building, and a five-story mixed-use residential/retail on the corner of Boston and Bridge Street with an associated revised parking and landscape layout.

Atty Joseph Correnti, 63 Federal Street, Salem, presented for the applicant. Other presenters included:

- Two architectural teams:
  - Chris Semmelink, LEED, AP, The Architectural Team, 50 Commandants Way, Chelsea, MA 02150
  - Harry Gundersen, owner, Gundersen Architects, 20 Central Street #2, Salem
- William Bergeron PE, Hayes Engineering Civil Engineering, 603 Salem Street, Wakefield, 01880
- Giles Ham PE, Vanasse & Associates, Inc., 35 New England Business Center Drive Ste 140, Andover 01810
- Traffic Peer Reviewer: Gary Hebert PE, Stantec Consulting Services (FST), 5 Burlington Woods Drive Suite Ste 210, Burlington 01803
- David Sweetser, principal, High Rock Bridge Street, LLC; 70 Walnut Street, Wellesley, MA 02481

Atty Correnti opened the presentation and advised the revisions to the plan being presented tonight do not include building elevations, but do show revisions to the proposed building footprints.

Mr. Semmelink presented slides illustrating changes to the site plan and proposed buildings. Highlights included:

- Eliminated the corner tower and pass-through arch feature.
- Reduced height of the residential/retail building from to four to three stories to comply with current zoning, 58 feet high; eliminating two variance requests.
- Footprint is slightly bigger to accommodate the units.
- Building is situated closer to Bridge Street allowing for better use definition in the parking areas and additional landscaping.
- Entrances/exits to the site have not changed.
- Raised walkways added in the parking lot to slow down traffic within the site.
- Defined outdoor areas for the buildings.
- Adding a small number of 3-bedrooms and studios to the use mix, including 1 and 2 bedroom units as the majority of units.
- Power lines on Bridge Street will be removed.
- Widened pickup aisles to be van-accessible.

- Moved entrance off of Bridge Street due to the elevation of the site.
- Effort to introduce more green space in the parking lot using a variety of treatments.

Atty Correnti pointed out the readjustment of the parking fields takes into account different use patterns. The drive aisles have been redesigned to protect the front door of the Community Life Center (CLC).

Mr. Sweetzer addressed the Board to announce the residential units will be marketed as condominiums rather than rental units. Apartments are certainly viable but it appears there is a market here for condominiums. There will be a need to implement assigned parking to enable condo sales to go forward. They have consulted local realtors who endorse the decision to market this development as condominiums.

Harry Gunderson Associates working on the CLC design, continued the presentation to review changes to the CLC.

- Location of the building is the same orientation as previously presented with slight adjustment.
- Moved it toward Bridge Street as a result of eliminating power lines, and slightly east.
- Added considerable surrounding green space.
- Idea of turning the CLC perpendicular to original placement was explored and discarded due to parking and service access to the building, and a priority to keep the Bridge Street entrance as far East/North as possible and away from the Bridge Street elbow curve.

***Board Discussion of Revised Site Plan:***

Several Board members commented favorably on the changes and thanked the applicant for responding to feedback.

Matt Veno, reminded everyone the NRCC Master Plan looks for an urban village; he hopes for a significant feature in the design process will find a suitable replacement for the tower feature. Looking for how the NRCC vision of an urban village is realized in the revised plan. He is looking for appropriate scale and hopes there will not be a monolithic building here.

***Traffic Study Peer Review:***

Gary Hebert, Stantec, presented the traffic peer review. He visited the site on September 22, 2015. He has reviewed this data, the VAI traffic study conducted June 2015 and public comment all compared to the latest revised site plan. Highlights of his review include:

- Apartments generate more traffic than condominiums
- Am peak hour = 92 trips
- PM peak hour = 154 trips
- Daily 1636 trips
- These numbers are all down from the previous site plan. Overall projected trip generation is roughly 55-65% lower traffic than assumed in 2012 NRCC Study.

**On-Site Mitigation Recommendations:**

- How will trucks, including fire, use the site and access the three (3) loading docks; truck access will need to be timed. Applicant needs to respond with dimensions and details.

- Recommends a minor adjustment to parking layout to further reduce cut-through traffic which would make speed humps unnecessary. A landscaped curb bump-out midway on the south side of the parking lot/property line.
- Site plan should be updated to show specific locations of these amenities: exterior bike facilities, car share, car charging stations.
- Regarding Bridge Street sight lines for the driveway location, the current dimension is 445 feet of intersection sight distance. Keep driveway where it is proposed gives the safest sight line.

**Off Site Mitigation Recommendations:**

- Re-time Boston/Flint Streets signal to improve LOS rating from “F” to “D”.
- Re-time Boston/Bridge Street signal, add count-down pedestrian signal heads and reduce eastbound queues.
- Monitor traffic adjacent the site after opening .
- Work with City to pursue major enhancements to Boston/Bridge Street intersections and corridors. Ensure design does not preclude possible future Boston/Bridge Street enhancements including possible addition of a third westbound approach lane by designating potential site easement adjacent to north side of Boston Street.
  - Gateway entrance on Boston Street designed to block Pope Street drivers looking for a cut-through.
  - Pope/Boston Street crashes slightly below average at 0.47 per year.
  - Four (4) pedestrian countdown signals planned for the Boston/Bridge intersection.

Summary, current plan generates considerably less traffic than the plan that was approved in 2009 for this site.

***Board Discussion Traffic Peer Review:***

- Board clarified there is an existing cross walk at Proctor Street that will remain for a total of six (6) pedestrian countdowns. Mr. Hebert agreed.
- Board clarified that updated details on site grades will be addressed at a future meeting. Atty Correnti agreed.
- Board asked Mr. Hebert if the rear parking lot design will drive traffic to the Boston Street entrance rather than using the Bridge Street entrance. And if so, does this affect traffic counts for Boston Street. Mr. Hebert replied he does not believe the design will cause drivers to favor the Boston Street driveway over the Bridge Street driveway.
- Board asked for Mr. Hebert’s professional opinion of the adequacy/best practices regarding handicapped spaces for a senior center—are six spaces adequate for this CLC? Mr. Hebert Replied he needs to research details including the planned use/capacity of this CLC before venturing an opinion. Ms. Duncan advised the planning department will also research current information on comparable senior centers.

***Chair Anderson opened the matter to public comment:***

- David Eppley 69 Boston Street, Ward 4 Councillor; for those living West of the intersection, why isn’t there an additional crosswalk and signal on the west side of the Boston/Bridge intersection? There are a large number of commuters in this neighborhood walking to the train.

- Mr. Hebert agrees this is an issue and should be addressed as part of a larger plan for this corridor and intersection. He agreed to review the specific question.
- Nina Cohen 22 Chestnut Street; pedestrians in Bridge Street crosswalk are not visible to Boston Street traffic turning right onto Bridge Street. Suggested a no turn RED at this intersection. Have visibility studies been done?
  - Mr. Hebert advised the traffic delays created by limiting this right turn would be substantial. Traffic engineer for the developer should address this question.
  - Mr. Semmelink observed the corner visibility will be opened up with removal of the fence and proper landscaping.
- Peter Eschauzier 15 ½ River Street; Proctor Street is supposed to be “no through traffic” as far as Pope Street. Enforcement of this posting would mitigate traffic.
  - Heather Famico 195 Essex Street, Ward 2 Councillor; stated her understanding that “no through traffic” cannot be enforced. Signage is there as a deterrent only.
- Jennifer Firth 3 Carpenter Street; asked to know the personality of the building envisioned by the developer; targeting investor/rental or owner occupied? What is the projected size of the units?
  - Mr. Sweetzer responded they have not focused on this detail yet.
  - Atty Correnti advised the breakdown of units/square footage will be presented at a future meeting.
- Jerry Ryan 4 Nichols Street, Councillor at Large; agreed a crosswalk is needed on the west side of the Bridge/Boston intersection. Asked for clarification of turning lanes at for north/west bound Boston Street.
  - Mr. Hebert advised no left turning lane needed for Proctor, volume does not warrant it. One lane for through traffic and right turn onto Bridge Street is current proposal.
  - Mr. Ryan regularly sees traffic violations occurring at Proctor, Pope and Boston Streets.
- Lou Sirianni 6 Botts Court; spoke in favor of turning the position of the CLC building on the site.. He pointed out Jefferson Station as an example; one controlled entrance. He contends the exit onto Bridge Street is dangerous and warrants a signaled intersection/entrance. His suggestion is to turn the CLC building perpendicular, and move the entrance to the elbow at Bridge Street and make it a signalized entrance.
  - Chair Anderson advised this forum is not an appropriate place to present an alternative plan and encouraged Mr. Sirianni to send his drawings and suggestions to the Planning Department.
- Jan Eschauzier 15 ½ River Street; concerned about seniors coming out of the Bridge Street entrance turning left onto Bridge Street. Asked to know if there have been studies specific to senior citizens and slowed reaction times.
  - Mr. Hebert advised the sight line studies are very conservative but do not provide specific data on seniors. He did not recommend a right-only exit here because there is enough sight line distance, and the traffic on this street goes in spurts.
- Mary Wood 29 Courtney Street, Beverly; asked for clarification of the drop off in front of the CLC. She is concerned about the safety of groups of people waiting for pickup or being dropped off.
  - Mr. Bergeron (Hayes Engineering) advised the space at the front doors can accommodate two vans side by side. In addition there are adjacent spaces sized to accommodate more vans, with full-width aisles and wider parking spaces.

Chair Anderson ended the public comment on this topic and advised this applicant will be continued to a future meeting.

- Ms. Famico, Ward 2 Councillor, asked to know the best way for the public to communicate to the developer questions they were unable to ask. She also requested an electronic copy of the slides.
- Chair Anderson informed the audience that all unasked questions would be best sent to the Planning Department in writing, for distribution to Planning Board members and the developer.
- Ms. Duncan confirmed planning staff will make the slides available.

Ms. Duncan asked to know what topics the developers hope to address at the February 4th meeting. Atty Correnti advised they will respond to traffic issues raised; and will present more information on landscaping and site issues. Hoping to have site grading and engineering plans updated for this meeting.

Board asked to know applicant's next appearance at Design Review Board (DRB). Atty Correnti replied they expect to present at the regularly schedule DRB meeting the end of February; they are in ongoing discussions with them. Elevations will not be ready by Planning Board February 4 meeting.

**Motion and Vote:** Matt Veno made a motion to continue the public hearing to February 4, 2016, seconded by Dale Yale. The vote was unanimous with seven (7) in favor ( Mr. Anderson, Mr. Veno, Ms. Sides, Mr. Rieder, Ms. Yale, Mr. Koretz and Ms. Hamilton) and none (0) opposed.

<b>Location:</b>	<b>CLARK AVENUE (Map 6, Lots 7, 8 and 9)</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>NSD REALTY TRUST</b>
<b>Description:</b>	A continuance of a public hearing for a Definitive Subdivision Plan in accordance with the Salem Subdivision Regulations and a Cluster Residential Development Special Permit per Sec. 7.2 Cluster Residential Development of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to allow the construction of a roadway to serve twenty-six (26) residential lots, and a Stormwater Permit in accordance with the Salem Code of Ordinances Sec. 37.

**Documents and Exhibitions:**

- Revised Plans previously submitted at December 17, 2015 Planning Board
  - Drainage Improvement Plans dated 12/16/2015
  - Index Plan "The Woodlands" Subdivision dated 12/07/2015
  - Definitive Plan "The Woodlands" Sheets 1-2, dated 12/07/2015
  - Definite Plan & Profile Sheets 1-2, dated 12/07/2015
  - Topographic Plan Sheets 1-2, dated 12/07/2015
  - Detail Sheets 1-4, dated 12/07/2015
  - Drainage Improvement Plan dated 12/16/2015
  - Watershed map revised 11/10/2015
- NECE Comment Letter (engineering peer review) dated November 24, 2015
- Applicant Response to NECE from Williams & Sparages dated December 7, 2015
- 2<sup>nd</sup> NECE Comment Letter (engineering peer review) dated December 30, 2015

Atty Joseph Correnti, 63 Federal Street, Salem, presented for the applicant. Other presenters included:

- Rich Williams; Civil Engineer; Williams & Sparages, 189 North Main Street, Suite 101, Middleton MA 01949.
- Nick Meninno, president Meninno Construction, 76 Oakville Street, Lynn 01905.
- Tom Pascuccio, project manager Meninno Construction, 76 Oakville Street, Lynn 01905.
- Engineering Peer Reviewer: William Ross, P.E. Principal Engineer, New England Civil Engineering Corporation, 120 Washington Street Suite 202E, Salem.

Atty Correnti advised the applicant has been working with the civil peer review engineer and City Engineer to move the project forward.

### ***Civil Engineering Peer Review***

Mr. Ross advised a thorough review of utilities and storm water management has been conducted. Massachusetts storm water policy has four main standards:

- No additional untreated outfalls as a result of a project
- Post-runoff cannot exceed pre-runoff
- Site runoff must have good quality—suspended solids removed
- Groundwater recharge

The revised plan does meet the intent of the state stormwater management policies. Conditions from City Engineering department are recommended for inclusion in any decision.

Chair Anderson requested the applicant address open items from the December 30 comment letter. Mr. Williams provided the following updates:

- Items 9-11 open space trail: to be cleared in place and mulch path created from cleared material.
  - Mr. Williams suggested a final set of drawings could be provided to the Planning Board; they will submit shortly after tonight's meeting and they will be the same version of plans being presented to the Conservation Commission.
- Item 13-14 sewer infiltration: working with City Engineer to resolve this.
- Item lighting detail: National Grid will do the design with developer once there is an approved sub-division.
  - Ms. Chiancola advised the planning staff recommends a lighting plan be included, subject to notes from the utility. Mr. Williams agreed a plan will be provided.
  - Mr. Pascuccio advised the prior decision had a condition for lighting.
- Snow storage: Board asked if any change to what has been indicated. Mr. Williams advised it is not practical to do a subdivision snow plan. Board clarified the City will accept the street and so be responsible for plowing it.
  - Mr. Ross observed some drainage catch basins at the end of a cul de sac will be blocked by snow storage; this is common.
  - Mr. Williams observed that during melt, the runoff will move to the catch basin under the snowbanks.
  - Mr. Mennino suggested the standard arrow on the pavement 10 feet off curb be added to indicate location of a catch basin; agreed by the Board.
- List of trees suitable for planting to be provided, 3.5" caliper at breast height: the landscape architect will produce it. The issue is quantity and species.
  - Mr. Pascuccio advised 43 trees are planned for the street.

- Mr. Williams advised the plan is for the Clark Avenue sidewalk constructed at 4' with a slightly wider grass plot for tree planting.
- Mr. Mennino confirmed the plan is for 3.5" caliper trees to be planted before sidewalk installation to accommodate the root balls per recommendation of the landscape architect who has also suggested a 4-foot wide sidewalk with slightly larger tree lawn. He asked for Board feedback on this.
- The Board reminded the applicant there is a standard of one tree per thirty feet of strength length.
- After extended detailed discussion of the trade-offs related to sidewalk width, sidewalk materials, preferred tree lawn capacity and other details the Board and applicant agreed to the following:
  - Applicant to install two (2) street trees per lot in a tree lawn four (4) feet wide, after installing concrete sidewalks on both sides of the street at a width of 3.5 feet each.
  - Board will consider granting a waiver of the requirement for one tree per thirty feet.
  - Applicant will update the site plan to indicate accurate street tree placement.

***Board Discussion:***

Ms. Hamilton asked to see a feature made of the open space, such as a children's set rather than just incorporate the space into backyards. This was raised at the applicant's first meeting. She asked for applicant response to this request.

Mr. Rieder noted that based on the topography and the adjacent conservation land, a passive trail would be more appropriate for this site.

- Atty Correnti stated the space feature is the trail, passive recreation. He observed that additional features can be a maintenance burden on the home owner association in future years. The applicant believes the trail is sufficient.

***Chair Anderson opened the matter to public comment:***

No questions from the audience.

Chair Anderson read into the record written correspondence received:

- Denis Colbert 37 Clark Street; wrote to Planning Board to suggest the developer be required to install LED street lights. Mr. Mennino agreed to this suggestion.

Atty Correnti advised their next meeting will include a revised plan with all notes and details for the Board. The applicant hopes the Board will entertain a draft decision at the next meeting.

***Motion and Vote:*** Noah Koretz made a motion to continue the public hearing to February 4, 2016, seconded by Kirt Rieder. The vote was unanimous with seven (7) in favor ( Mr. Anderson, Mr. Veno, Ms. Sides, Mr. Rieder, Ms. Yale, Mr. Koretz and Ms. Hamilton) and none (0) opposed.

**Location:** 7 HOWARD STREET (Map 35, Lot 180)  
**Applicant:** Howard Street Nominee Trust



**Description:** A public hearing for a Site Plan Review in accordance with Salem Zoning Ordinance Section 9.5 to allow the conversion of a convent into six (6) residential dwelling units with six (6) parking spaces on the adjacent property by an easement.

Atty Scott Grover of Tinti, Quinn, Grover & Frey, P.C., 27 Congress Street Ste 414, Salem; presented for the applicant. Other presenters included:

- Dan Ricciarelli, Seger Architects 10 Derby Square, Salem

Atty Grover provided a brief overview of the project. St. John the Baptist Church convent is a 1960's style building that has not been used for many years. The Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) granted relief to convert the building to residential use. The site is located in R3 district which allows multi-family use but the lot is undersized to current code. The ZBA also issued a variance to allow six (6) residential condominium units, all dwelling space above grade.

Parking is a unique problem for this site. Arch diocese granted a permanent usage easement for six (6) spaces. A variance of 1.5 spaces per unit was granted by ZBA with a requirement the association purchase annual parking passes in the garage.

Mr. Ricciarelli continued the presentation supported by drawings to illustrate building features and changes. Highlights include:

- Yard surrounding the building will be used as a common area with patio.
- Asphalt parking lot will be replaced and landscaping added at perimeter.
- Steel picket gates to control lot access, will be locking.
- Solid wood fence will be installed on the property line, existing chain link being removed.
- Concrete block wall at back of property will be taken down.
- Trash area enclosed with gate, sized to accommodate recycling and trash bins.
- Patios will not be dedicated, common space.
- Elevations will remain the same, cleaning the masonry. Windows are odd sized and locations, will lower sills and regularize these.
- New windows, single pane casement, vinyl.
- Painting exterior brick a charcoal gray.
- Lighting at entrance, existing street lights provide lighting to the parking area.
- Mechanicals will be rooftop, one per unit.

***Board Discussion:***

The Board asked if the trash area is large enough to accommodate the twelve (12) recycling/trash containers required by the City. Mr. Ricciarelli confirmed the space is large enough to accommodate them all.

***Chair Anderson opened the matter to public comment:***

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Grover advised the applicant expects to discuss comments from building inspector and engineering, at the next meeting, and hopes the Board will consider a draft decision at that time.

**Motion and Vote:** Noah Koretz made a motion to continue the public hearing to February 4, 2016, seconded by Carole Hamilton. The vote was unanimous with seven (7) in favor (Mr. Anderson, Mr. Veno, Ms. Sides, Mr. Rieder, Ms. Yale, Mr. Koretz and Ms. Hamilton) and none (0) opposed.

## Approval of Minutes

### January 7, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes

No comments or corrections were made by the Planning Board members.

**Motion and Vote:** Helen Sides made a motion to approve the January 7, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes, seconded by Matt Veno. The vote was unanimous with seven (7) in favor and none (0) opposed.

## Old/New Business

**Location:** 43 BRIDGE STREET (Map 36, Lot 238)  
**Applicant:** Skomurski Development, LLC  
**Description:** Planning Board review of architectural plans for the duplex located on Lot 5, in accordance with condition no. 15 of the Decision dated June 24, 2015.

Dan Ricciarelli, Seger Architects 10 Derby Square, presented for the applicant. Drawings were used to illustrate elevations planned for new house on this visible lot. The exterior design echoes existing simple Federal styles on Bridge Street and the surrounding neighborhood. Highlights include:

- Duplex with Nantucket double stair entrance
- Hardy plank siding
- 6 over 6 windows to match what else was done on Planter Street; planning black frames/sash.
- Trim will be 5.5 Azek material

### **Board Discussion:**

The Board was collectively in favor of the design and complimented the developer and architect on their work for this highly visible lot on an entrance corridor.

**Motion and Vote:** Dale Yale made a motion to approve the architectural plans for the duplex located on lot 5, seconded by Carole Hamilton. The vote was unanimous with seven (7) in favor (Mr. Anderson, Mr. Veno, Ms. Sides, Mr. Rieder, Ms. Yale, Mr. Koretz and Ms. Hamilton) and none (0) opposed.

## Planning Board Processes

Discussion on Planning Board processes including: 1) Submittal of meeting materials; 2) Continuances; and 3) Sequencing of permitting through various boards.

### **Documents:**

- Legal Opinion Re Agenda Topics from City Solicitor Elizabeth Rennard, dated January 21, 2016
- Legal Opinion Re Permitting Sequence from City Solicitor Elizabeth Rennard, dated July 28, 2015

- Memorandum from Staff planner Amanda Chiancola dated January 21, 2016 “Planning Board Processes”

Ms. Chiancola summarized the City Solicitor opinions in these key points:

- If published agenda describes the project too narrowly the Board risks violation of local sunshine ordinance if discussion moves beyond description.
- The applicant has the legal discretion to determine the order of the permitting process.

**Staff Recommendations for Process:**

- Planning Board members and/or staff will question the applicant regarding specifics of their next meeting appearance and those details will appear in the minutes rather than the agenda which will assist both Board members and the public.
- Submittal of Materials stays flexible but Board members are reminded they may withhold comment until ready. Staff will work with applicant to try to get materials in advance. Applicants must understand that any given meeting Board can ask questions about previously discussed topics.
  - Board noted that applicants must understand late submissions can result in delays while staff and Board take the needed time to review submittals.

The Board accepted the staff recommendations and collectively thanked the planning staff for their efforts to streamline and improve the process.

## Adjournment

**Motion and Vote:** Helen Sides made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Kirt Rieder. The vote was unanimous with seven (7) in favor ( Mr. Anderson, Mr. Veno, Ms. Sides, Mr. Rieder, Ms. Yale, Mr. Koretz and Ms. Hamilton) and none (0) opposed.

Chairman Anderson adjourned the meeting at 10:30pm.

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/Pages/SalemMA\\_PlanMin/](http://www.salem.com/Pages/SalemMA_PlanMin/)

Respectfully submitted,  
Pamela Broderick, Recording Clerk

Approved by the Planning Board on 02/04/2016

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