

City of Salem Board of Appeals

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 20, 2017

A meeting of the Salem Board of Appeals (“Salem BOA”) was held on Wednesday, September 20, 2017 in the third floor conference room at 120 Washington Street, Salem, Massachusetts at 6:30 p.m.

Chair Curran calls the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

ROLL CALL

Those present were: Chair Rebecca Curran, Peter Copelas, Tom Watkins, Mike Duffy, Jimmy Tsitsinos, and Paul Viccica. Those not present were: James Hacker (Alternate). Also in attendance: Tom St. Pierre - Building Commissioner, Erin Schaeffer - Staff Planner, and Colleen Brewster – Recorder.

REGULAR AGENDA

Project A continuation of a public hearing for a petition requesting a Comprehensive Permit pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 40B, Section 20-23 to construction multi-family housing.
The Board will discuss the following:

- Civil and Traffic Peer Review Responses
- Discussion and respond to ZBA comments from the June 28, 2017 meeting
- Review and Discussion on Board and Commission comments

Applicant **NORTH SHORE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORP.**
Location **34 PEABODY STREET, 47 LEAVITT STREET, AND 39 PALMER STREET (Map 43 Lots 384, 136, 155)**

Atty. Scott Grover of Tinti, Quinn, Grover & Frey, 27 Congress Street, Suite 414, Salem, MA 01970, was present. Atty. Grover stated that the application deadline for funding from the DHCD has been changed so they requested a continuance to the November 15, 2017 regularly scheduled meeting.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Copelas makes a motion to continue to the November 15, 2017 regularly scheduled meeting. The motion is seconded by Mr. Watkins. The vote was unanimous with six (6) in favor and none (0) opposed.

Project A continuation of a public hearing for a petition requesting a Special Permit per Sec. 3.1 Principal Uses, to allow an indoor commercial recreational use including puzzle room and virtual reality experiences. The petitioner is also requires Variances for relief from Sec. 3.3.4 Variance Required to allow less than the required setbacks and Sec. 5.1.8 Table of

Required Parking Spaces to allow less than the required number of parking spaces.

Applicant **ALEXIS ABARE**

Location **1 JEFFERSON AVE (Map 25 Lot 649)(I Zoning District)**

Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to accept the Applicants request to continue to the October 18, 2017 regularly scheduled meeting. The motion is seconded by Mr. Watkins. The vote was unanimous with six (6) in favor and none (0) opposed.

Project A public hearing for a petition requesting a Special Permit per *Sec. 3.1.2 Table of Uses*, to allow a historic carriage house to be converted into a dwelling unit.

Applicant **AL SNAPE**

Location **108 JACKSON STREET (Map 25, Lot 390)(B-4 Zoning District)**

Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to accept the Applicants request to continue to the October 18, 2017 regularly scheduled meeting. The motion is seconded by Mr. Watkins. The vote was unanimous with six (6) in favor and none (0) opposed.

Project A public hearing for a petition requesting a Special Permit per *Sec. 3.3.2 Nonconforming Uses*, to change non-conforming use from a building with two (2) residential units and one (1) commercial unit to three (3) residential units.

Applicant **3 UNIT CONDO CONVERSION LLC**

Location **19 NORTH STREET (Map 26 Lot 493)(R-2 Zoning District)**

Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to accept the Applicants request to continue to the October 18, 2017 regularly scheduled meeting. The motion is seconded by Mr. Watkins. The vote was unanimous with six (6) in favor and none (0) opposed.

Project A continuation of a public hearing for a petition requesting a Special Permit per *Sec. 3.3.5 Nonconforming Structures*, to add a 24' x 24' garage to the rear of the existing residential structure, remove existing garage, and relocate R.O.W.

Applicant **MATTHEW KEANE**

Location **414 LAFAYETTE STREET (Map 32, Lot 169)(R-1 Zoning District)**

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated June 27, 2017 and supporting documentation

Atty. John Keilty of 40 Lowell Street, #22, Peabody, MA was present and representing the owner Matthew Keane.

Atty. Keilty stated that the existing garage will be demolished and a new 24'x24' garage addition will be attached to the rear of the existing building so that the garage is no longer within the rear yard setback. The rear property neighbor will still have access her premises. The plan dated May 23, 2017 created by North Shore Survey has notes indicating that; the exiting garage will be demolished, the right-of-way will be on the left-hand side of the property, and the new driveway will be straight. The 24'x24' attached garage requires a special permit. Since the last iteration his client has had three meetings with the neighbors and all but one abutter has indorsed the revised project and supports the variance request. Atty. Keilty stated that the property is now owner occupied, an attached garage will create a 15' year yard, and the proposed garage will be two stories but the second floor will not be used as a residence. Revised plans have been filed and a height variance is not needed since the addition will now be attached to the existing structure. Atty. Keilty noted that one neighbor submitted a letter and the applicant has submitted a rebuttal statement that will also be entered into the evidence.

Chair Curran – asked if the railing on top of the addition is a deck. Mr. Keane replied no, the railing is decorative and was added at the neighbor's request.

Chair Curran – asked if the existing façade was vinyl. Mr. Keane replied yes and the new façade will also be vinyl.

Chair Curran – questioned the size comparison of the garage to be demolished to the 24'x24' proposed garage. Atty. Keilty replied that they were always proposed a large two car garage and the plot plans submitted show the existing garage at different sizes.

Chair Curran – asked if the second floor and stairway egress were being replaced. Keane replied yes and it will be relocated to the same egress door as the first floor, on the side of the house and it will not impede on a neighbors view.

Chair Curran – asked if the structure will remain a two-family. Mr. Keane replied yes.

Mr. Viccica – stated that it is hard to evaluate with drawing that are not to scale, asked if there was enough parking for 2 units, and suggested that the third floor could be used as a roof deck which will be an issue and adding a railing may encourage the space to be used as a deck. The plot plan needs to be to scale and showing curb cut and driveway, proposed changes, the roof ridge line of exist building in relation to its neighbors, and plans of new 2nd floor to show how it marries into the existing building. Mr. Copelas added that the railing location isn't indicated or the garage doors. The plans provided aren't clear.

Chair Curran opens public comment.

Fabio Bardini, 416 Lafayette Street. Concerned that the height of the addition will obstruct their view, a reduction in their property value and the property no longer looking like it belongs in an R-1 zone. Half of property will have blacktop which will create a lot of water run off and there is already enough space to park 6-8 cars. The heights of neighboring garages are between 10-14 feet high. Didn't request railings and suggested that the area of the railings could become a usable 3rd floor. Noted that Mr. Keane can move if he wants to and it will no longer be owner occupied. The proposed changes are not in conformity with the neighboring properties. It will obstruct their view from the side of the house.

Chair Curran – noted that a peaked roof possibly with dormers to the garage would decrease its massive look. Its use is unspecified and it is a non-conforming structure that already seems large.

Chair Curran – noted that the plan changes would need to be recorded prior to the issuance of a building permit. The plan should show the existing and proposed driveway and that you are utilizing the exist curb cut. Mr. Viccica – added that the ridgeline of roof, floor plan of the 2nd floor and indicating its use, railing, and 3rd floor access should also be shown. Mr. Tsitsinos – added that a gable end would be more attractive. Mr. Keane noted that the only access to the third floor is from within the 2nd floor unit, it is designed like a townhouse, and noted that the second floor above the garage will have no walls and there will be no access from the second floor unit to the second floor of the garage.

St. Pierre – added that a deck would need a relief from the Board of Appeals. Atty Keilty replied that the applicant would have no issue with a condition that no roof deck be added.

Chair Curran – suggested that a list of items needed to be shown be added to the ZBA website.

Kristin Lewis - 416 Lafayette Street. Concerned for the neighborhood and that an addition will make this existing non-conforming structure extremely different from the neighborhood. The footprint of the house is large for the property size, and the grandfathered garage is 1/3 the size and the proposed is six times the volume. She noted that garages in the area are smaller and one story and she suggested that photos of neighboring garages be submitted for comparison. Questioned why the applicant needs such a large garage.

Betsy Mary - 413 Lafayette Street. Noted that the applicant is a great neighbor, he's been fixing up the building and resides there, some of the neighbors are his family members, and he has some large items to store. The existing garage is an eyesore, Matthew has accommodated the neighborhood concerns, and this approval will be for the overall good for the neighborhood despite that fact that this is not what Mr. Bardini wants.

Steve Dibble, Ward 7 City Councilor. Requests that the proposed right-away also be shown on the plan that gets recorded at the Registry of Deeds. Mr. Keane replied that he is reversing the driveway layout and will show the right of way however the rear neighbors want it shown.

Chair Curran opens public comment.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to continue to the next regularly scheduled October 18th meeting. The motion is seconded by Mr. Watkins. The vote was unanimous with six (6) in favor and none (0) opposed.

Project A public hearing for a petition requesting a Special Permit per *Sec. 3.0 Table of Uses*, to allow a microbrewery with a testing room and outdoor seating area.

Applicant **EACH REGIMENT BEER CO.**

Location **30 CHURCH STREET (Map 35, Lot 445)(B-5 Zoning District)**

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated July 25, 2017 and supporting documentation

Atty. Scott Grover of Tinti, Quinn, Grover & Frey, 27 Congress Street, Suite 414, Salem, MA 01970, was present. Owner Scott Perry, part owner of East Regiment Beer Company (Massachusetts Bay Colony Brewers Company) and owner of the building since May 2016 was also present.

Atty. Grover stated that his client is proposing to install a microbrewery in the basement and it is an allowed use with a Special Permit if there is a tasting room. The proposed tasting room will be an outdoor seating area on an outside deck. The seating location is proposed in an area that is owned by the SRA, whom he met with last week. The area will be in the planting strip that is next to the public walkway. The applicant will welcome ZBA approval that is conditional upon approval by the SRA, but without a use approval there is no project. The proposed seating area will be reviewed by the DRB before going back to the SRA for approval.

Atty. Grover stated that allowing this establishment in this area with its proximity to the parking lot, the train, and the rest of the downtown create benefits that outweigh any adverse effects. This would have a positive impact on the area and be good for downtown.

Chair Curran – Asked if there will be a new unit in Basement. Atty. Grover replied that the basement space will be built-out.

Mr. Perry noted that there will be no handicapped use in Basement and they will ramp up into the building for access to the newly renovated accessible toilet rooms at Nick's Firehouse Restaurant. A 4 season awning is proposed and the SRA continued the discussion to review more detailed plans and samples. Atty Grover added that the awning will have sides and heaters which are not shown in the sketch submitted.

Mr. Viccica – asked what would happen to the production space if the SRA were to say they could no longer use the space. Atty Grover replied that the production could survive but the special permit requires a tasting room. The owners would need to have a plan B. The SRA's main concern with granting the easement was if the business didn't success. If that were to happen the applicant

would remove the awning cover, wood deck, and re-install the planting bed. The two trees being removed would be replaced.

Chair Curran – asked how many seats were proposed and their hours of operation. Mr. Perry replied 40 seats and 3PM-11PM, but 12PM to 12AM at the latest. Atty. Grover noted that he has spoken with the City Solicitor and because a more permanent arrangement is needed this is more than a sidewalk cafe license. Approval by the is in process Mr. Perry noted that he has registered with the FDA and received a federal brewers license and a farmer breweries which is granted by the Alcohol Beverage Control Commission (ABCC) have had their inspector inspect the building has reviewed the building; however, their decision is pending until local approval is received.

Ms. Schaeffer – asked what their business hours would be. Mr. Perry replied 6AM – 12AM although their operations would occur in the basement and not in a public area. Mr. Perry noted that the building is operation 24 hours a day since Salem Taxi is one of their tenants.

Mr. Copelas – asked where delivery would be made. Mr. Perry replied through the stairs but their right of way is on far side of building closer to the district court building. Atty. Grover added that the SRA created a right-of-way so loading/unloading won't have an adverse impact with trucks stopped on Church Street.

Chair Curran – asked how many square feet were in the basement. Mr. Kerry replied approximately 1,600 SF and only kegging will take place on site.

Mr. Watkins – noted that noise level might be an issue for the neighboring housing complex and the awning would help curb the noise. Mr. Perry replied that the building is over 500 feet away and 40 people wouldn't generate a large noise level and music they play wouldn't be loud.

Chair Curran – asked what the outdoor square footage would be. Mr. Perry replied approximately 900 SF. Atty. Grover added that the area would be 10-15 feet in depth and deck at the neighboring residences have their decked on the back of building and the awning would help mitigate any sound.

Chair Curran opens public comment.

Louis Harvey, 11 Church Street. Noted that the area is lively at night, the Church Street parking lot is noisy at night and the police are there often. Trash gets placed in the dumpster regularly in the middle of the night which is also noisy. A tent won't eliminate the noise that will be generated. The tent looks too narrow and as the building owner it makes more sense to take over the building and make it a pub. Noted that there are already two other breweries in the City. Mr. Perry replied that if they were to expand they would keep the proposed tasting room and brew additional beer off-site.

Loretta Clarity, 11 Church Street. Noted that she is routinely 3AM she is awaked by the sound of trash being dumped. Mr. Perry replied that his tenants are not the ones dumping trash at that hour and their grains will be repurposed not thrown into a dumpster.

Chair Curran – asked for a description of how a tasting room works. Mr. Perry replied that a tasting room can only sell product they make, from 12oz. to 64 oz. to go jugs, and all servers will be ServSafe certified for responsible alcohol-service practices to know when to stop serving alcohol.

Chair Curran – asked if they will serve food. Mr. Perry replied no, but they will allow patrons to order food and have it delivered similar to other local establishments.

Steven Lovely, 14 Story Street, Ward 3 Councilor. He has met Mr. Perry, noticed that the proposed area is in need of care and upkeep and the proposal will do that. Noted that the City Council has expanded their regulations for breweries. He believes that Mr. Perry is excited about starting this business and admires his ambition and desire to invest in Salem.

Chair Curran – asked if the awning would be secured overnight. Mr. Perry replied that the taps will be caged overnight, the tables and chairs will be locked together, and the awning will be locked up will have a solid door.

Mr. Duffy – asked for clarification regarding trash disposal. Mr. Perry replied that trash will be stored inside in small bins and a company will be hired to remove it. Could get an agreement to utilize the back alleyway between the two buildings where there neighbors store theirs.

Ms. Harvey asked if the used grain has an odor and asked if the water usage needed to complete the beer making process was a concern to the city. Mr. Perry replied that a vent hood will be installed in the basement which will vent to the outside and the grains will be contained inside until they are removed, but the odor generated is not a foul one.

Mr. Viccica – asked if the existing vent stack would be utilized. Mr. Perry replied that an existing water heater in the basement utilized a portion of the stack but they could tap into the 3 story stack space because they will be venting steam and natural gas fumes. Water is the biggest expense and it is important to them to conserve it and the water chiller system they are designing will do that.

William LeGault, 2 Orne Street. Noted that Notch Brewery is a larger brewery and the grain scent is only noticeable from within the brewery and there have been no complaints from the neighbors and there is no noise involved with the brewing operation.

Chair Curran closes public comment.

Mr. Duffy – noted that it's a disabled veteran owned building and the neighbors' concerns can be mitigated.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Viccica makes a motion to approve the petition for a Special Permit per Sec. 3.0 Table of Uses, to allow a microbrewery with a testing room and outdoor seating area subject to the following special conditions; SRA approval, no live entertainment be allowed on the premises, deliveries on the right of way not Church Street, their public hours of operation shall be from 12PM-12AM 7 days a week and their operational hour shall follow the city ordinance, grain removal to occur daily and to not be stored outside, and the petitioner must return to the SRA if they choose to expand. The motion is seconded by Mr. Copelas. The vote was unanimous with six (6) in favor and none (0) opposed.

Project A public hearing for a petition requesting a Special Permit requesting relief from *Sec. 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single and Two Family Structures Uses* of the Salem Zoning Ordinance, to allow a 22'x22' one story addition construction within the side yard setback.

Applicant **SILVIA SOUZA**
Location **44 Irving Street (Map 17, Lot 2)(R-2 Zoning District)**

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated August 28, 2017 and supporting documentation

Gregory Z. was present to discuss the project. Ms. Souza, co-owner, was also present.

Mr. Z state that he and his sister-in-law want to put an addition on the house to add on a second bedroom to the first floor. The house is a two-family but the first floor unit only has one bedroom.

Chair asked if they will demolish the rear addition and replace it with a 22'x22' addition with a flat roof. Gregory replied yes, it will line up with the foundation, and the new roof will be approximately 9 feet high and under an existing window, and there will be no deck above.

Chair Curran – noted that it will be less non-conforming. Gregory replied yes, it will have a 20-21 foot depth.

Chair Curran – asked if the addition will eliminate any parking. Gregory replied no, the parking will remain the same.

Mr. Copelas – asked if there will be an egress to the outside. Gregory replied that the architect will determine what will work best.

Chair Curran – asked what the existing siding material is and if the addition would match it. Gregory replied vinyl, to match the vinyl that was done before they bought the house.

Mr. Viccica – asked where the cars get parked. Gregory replied 3, the existing tandem parking layout will not change and the wide entrance stair will be reduced slightly so two cars can also park side by side.

Chair Curran opens public comment.

Barbara Oseca, 3 Harrod Street (rear abutter). Asked how far the addition would extend into the backyard. Greg replied 18" past the edge of stone wall, 22 feet out from the end of the house.

Mr. Viccica – asked if there were parking spaces behind the existing addition. Gregory replied he believes the 8-9 foot wide concrete pad was previously used for parking.

Patricia Caspers, 45 Irving Street. Questioned the recent additional vehicles parked on the street with limited parking. Gregory replied that his workman's truck was only parked on the street because a dumpster was in the driveway but their vehicles will park in their driveway.

Chair Curran – asked if the front stairway would be changed. Gregory replied that a new narrower stair with a railing will be installed.

Mr. Viccica – stated that a plot plan that show driveways, curb cuts, etc. need to be provided. Chair – added that their architect needs to provide plans showing; entrances, roof pitch, ridgeline, driveway, curb cut, and the demolition of the stairway to improve parking access. Mr. Viccica – suggested that a gable end roof be installed instead of a flat roof to add storage, and suggests a 20'x20' addition with the end offset 1 foot from the corner, as well as an updated plot plan with parking for further review.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Watkins makes a motion to continue to the next regularly scheduled October 18th meeting. The motion is seconded by Mr. Duffy.

Project	A public hearing for a petition requesting a Variance for relief from the provisions of <i>Sec. 5.1.1 (c) Parking Design</i> , to exceed the maximum allowable curb cut width.
Applicant	MICHAEL and ANGELA DIRUZZA
Location	13 GREENLAWN AVE. (Map 8 Lot 113)(R-1 Zoning District)

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application dated August 24, 2017 and supporting documentation

Michael Diruzza, 13 Greenlawn Avenue, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Diruzza stated that they want to extend the width of their driveway width from 20 feet to 30 feet, on the left side to fit a 4th car and remove an 8 foot piece of curb and sidewalk. Mr. Copelas – replied that eliminating a street spot for the applicants' convenience is not a legal reason to grant a variance.

Chair Curran – asked if a street parking spot would be eliminated. Mr. Diruzza replied yes; however, the street is tight to park on and the vehicle that parks in that street spot lives on their property.

Chair Curran – I do not know the existing topography of this property. What is the topography of the front yard?

Mr. Diruzza replied that there is a 1 foot slope on that location.

Chair Curran- requested that the applicant look at keeping the existing curbcut and adding a parking area in the front yard to the left of the existing driveway area.

Mrs. Angela Diruzza, 13 Greenlawn Avenue, added that cars parked on the street can be in the way of delivery trucks, emergency vehicles, and during snow emergencies there will be no roof for another vehicle, and the street spot is in front of their land.

Ms. Schaeffer – noted that a street tree may be impacted. Mr. Diruzza replied that an extended driveway will only become 8 feet closer to the tree.

Mr. Copelas – stated that widening the driveway and eliminating a street spot is problematic.

Mr. Duffy – The legal standard is a concern and the board will need measurements and more information to review. An angled area off their existing driveway could be done without eliminating a street space.

Mrs. Diruzza stated that the neighbors are in favor and haven't had an issue with eliminating a street space.

Mr. Copelas – stated that the three (3) criteria for a Variance are not met.

Chair Curran – suggested that the hearing be continued until a proposed plan could be generated.

Mr. Copelas – noted that the plan must show the existing driveway, tree, existing curb cut, and the proposed curb cut. Copelas also requested a more detailed narrative than provided.

St. Pierre – noted that a smaller curb cut could accommodate the angled parking scheme and it wouldn't take an entire space on the street.

Chair Curran opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Curran closes public comment.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to accept the Applicants request to continuation to the October 18, 2017 regularly scheduled meeting. The motion is seconded by Mr. Watkins. The vote was unanimous with six (6) in favor and none (0) opposed.

Project	A public hearing for a petition requesting a Special Permit per <i>Sec. 3.3.3 Nonconforming Single and Two-Family Structures</i> to allow the construction of a 7'x14' porch at the rear of the carriage house within the side yard setback.
Applicant	DANIEL ZANDALL and PHILLIP GILLESPIE

Location **35 CHESTNUT STREET (Map 25 Lot 2433)(R-1 Zoning District)**

Mr. Viccica recuses himself.

Documents and Exhibitions

- **Application dated August 29, 2017 and supporting documentation**

Mr. Jeff Grinnell, Contractor, was present to discuss the project. Jeff stated that they have a 13' x 42' deck that they want to extend another 42" and add an egress stair. The building is built on property the line and the deck will come in 1 foot on both sides from the edge of the building.

Chair Curran – asked if the shingled. Mr. Grinnell replied that the shingles were removed and they repaired the clapboards.

Mr. Copelas – asked about the use. Mr. Grinnell replied the 1 bedroom carriage house is a rental property and that will remain its use. Mr. Grinnell noted that the project has received approval for by Historic Commission.

Chair Curran opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Curran closes public comment.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy makes a motion to approve the petition for a Special Permit per *Sec. 3.3.3 Nonconforming Single and Two-Family Structures* to allow the construction of a 7'x14' porch at the rear of the carriage house within the side yard setback. The motion is seconded by Mr. Tsitsinos. The vote was unanimous with five (5) in favor and none (0) opposed.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

No minutes to review.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Review and vote to approve amendments to ZBA Rules and Regulations

Mr. Schaeffer – stated that the suggestions for amendments were reviewed. Beth Rennard, Esq., Salem City Solicitor, has not reviewed it. Chair Curran – noted that she wants to make sure they are asking for everything they need. The Board members discussed items to

include. St. Pierre – noted that his office will formalize denial process by Building Inspector and will explain why and the Historic Commission will also need a denial letter first.

Ms. Schaeffer – suggested that electronic submissions be allowed. Mr. Copelas – stated that he would prefer both. St. Pierre – noted that whether electronic is allowed would be a legal question.

Ms. Schaeffer – suggested that ‘architectural drawings’ be required for new structure and additions that will affect existing building footprint and minor alterations could be a hand-drawn plan. Mr. Viccica – suggested that the term ‘drawings’ be used because an architect isn’t always necessary to create drawings. Mr. St. Pierre – suggested that the drawings be called ‘scaled’ because 1 and 2 family houses require simpler drawings but 3 families require more elaborate drawings, and suggests that Mr. Viccica help with the language. Mr. Duffy – noted that hand drawn plans for 1 & 2 families are allowed and appeals should require better quality drawings.

Mr. Schaeffer – suggested that elevations, dimensions, proposed materials, exposed foundations are included. Mr. Viccica – suggested that median grades also be included. St. Pierre – suggested that streetscapes in relation to neighboring buildings. Viccica – noted that photographs from all four sides could also be used. Chair Curran – noted that Plot Plan should show the line of abutters. Ms. Schaeffer – added that curb cut requests should provide certified plot plans showing exist curb cut, proposed curb cut, street trees, hydrants, and any other sidewalk structures. St. Pierre – noted that plot plans showing existing and new curb cuts can be done by Civil Engineers at a lesser cost to the applicant than a Land Surveyor; however, certified plot plans can only be provided by Land Surveyors. Ms. Schaeffer – noted that boundaries between public and private parcels should also be shown and alterations within 2 feet of the property lines already require a certified plot plan.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion and Vote: Mr. Duffy made a motion to adjourn the September 20 2017 regular meeting of the Salem Board of Appeals, seconded by Mr. Watkins, and the vote was unanimous with six (6) favor and none (0) opposed.

The meeting ends at 9:00 PM.

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

http://salem.com/Pages/SalemMA_ZoningAppealsMin/

Respectfully submitted,
Erin Schaeffer, Staff Planner