

**City of Salem Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, July 17, 2014**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, July 17, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. in Room 313, Third Floor, at 120 Washington Street, Salem, Massachusetts.

Chairman Puleo opened the meeting at 7:12 pm.

**Roll Call**

Those present were: Chuck Puleo, Chair, Ben Anderson, Kirt Rieder, Tim Ready, Vice Chair, Dale Yale, Randy Clarke, Helen Sides, Bill Griset and Matthew Veno. Absent: None.

Also present: Dana Menon, Staff Planner, and Pamela Broderick, Planning Board Recording Clerk.

**Approval of Minutes**

**Jun 16, 2014 Meeting Minutes** (joint public hearing with City Council)

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

**Motion and Vote:** Dale Yale made a motion to approve the minutes of June 16, 2014, seconded by Tim Ready. The vote was unanimous with nine(9) in favor and none (0) opposed.

**Jun 19, 2014 Meeting Minutes** (regular)

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

**Motion and Vote:** Bill Griset made a motion to approve the minutes of June 19, 2014, seconded by Dale Yale. The vote was unanimous with nine (9) in favor and none (0) opposed.

**Regular Agenda**

**Project:** A public hearing for an application for an Amendment to the previously approved Site Plan Review decision, North River Canal Corridor District Special Permit, and Flood Hazard District Special Permit. Specifically, the application proposes changes to the proposed buildings, landscaping, and parking, primarily in order to meet the requirements of the required Ch. 91 License issued by the MA Dept. of Environmental Protection. The number of residential units and square footage of commercial space remains the same.

**Applicant:** RIVERVIEW PLACE LLC

**Location:** 72 FLINT STREET AND 67-71 MASON STREET (Map 26, Lots 91, 95 & 97)

**Documents and Exhibitions:**

- Application date-stamped June 26, 2014 and accompanying materials
- Revised plan set submitted at the meeting

Atty Scott Grover of Tinti, Quinn, Grover & Frey, 27 Congress Street; presented for the applicant.

Additional presenters included:

- Jonathan Stone, O’Sullivan Architects, 580 Main St, Reading, MA; architect

- Chris Sparages, Williams & Sparages, 189 North Main Street, Middleton, MA; civil engineer
- James Emmanuel, James K Emmanuel Associates, 22 Carlton Road, Marblehead, MA; landscape architect

Atty Grover indicated that the overall footprints of the buildings have been reduced along with square footage of the residential areas. He provided an overview of the original plan approved in 2009. The original plan was extensively reviewed including peer reviews and Design Review Board input and a series of public hearings.

The revised project now consists of:

- 130 residential apartment units
- Approximately 5,000 square feet of commercial space,
- 260 parking spaces for residential use (per North River Canal Corridor overlay district)
- 10 spaces for commercial use
- 12 spaces for Flint Street neighbors to alleviate some parking congestion

Atty Grover described the proposed changes and context. After receiving previous local approvals, the state environmental approval process resulted in some required changes to the project:

- 100-ft offset from the canal is required so one building had to be moved.
- Chapter 91 license is required which prompted a MEPA review. MEPA required use of the 2013 Flood Plain Standards which prohibited residences on the ground floor for this parcel. Parking was substituted on the first floor instead of apartments for the building closest to the canal.
- The original 37 parking spaces reserved for the 5500 sf of commercial was revised to 10 spaces. The original number of spaces anticipated possible retail use which is no longer the case.
- Eliminated 1 level of the parking garage and reduced the height as a result of the reconfiguration.
- Moved building #1 (as shown on plans) back to comply with 100-ft offset from the river.
- Mason St building (#3 as shown on plans) is slightly smaller.

Atty Grover reviewed the color-coded plans which contrast the location of original buildings, the original plan and currently proposed location of buildings.

Architect Jonathan Stone continued the presentation with a more detailed review of the revised plan. No residences can be located on the flood plain (1<sup>st</sup> floor) so adjustments have been made to residential unit sizes. These changes enabled them to reduce the mass of the building if they also reconfigured parking. Now parking is distributed throughout the project and located closer to various user groups. The parking structure is now only 2 levels high. Site lines and access to the canal from the park above (Mack Park) remain the same.

Mr. Stone reviewed renderings of the proposed building exteriors. The renderings compared what was originally approved with currently proposed minor changes.

- Building 1 revives a traditional mill-building look with brick. 1<sup>st</sup> floor garage “windows” are shaped like upper floor windows and filled with grillwork.
- Building 2 is designed with a mill-housing row-house look with fire-separation walls.
- Building 3 is designed to complement the Mason Street residential look, with some use of brick. The commercial space is provided with a storefront look.

The Board requested additional clarifications from the applicant's team:

- Mr. Rieder explored the proposed fencing on top of walls over 4-feet exposed height. Civil engineer Chris Sparages explained these retaining walls are needed to support abutting properties that sit at a higher elevation, and that any retaining wall that is higher than 4-feet requires a fence on top of it per code. Mr. Rieder expressed concern they may be wrapping a private residence in some cases.
- Mr. Anderson explored the 10-ft elevation drop from Mason Street down the entry drive and his concern about using this driveway in winter weather, and sufficient turning room at the bottom of the drive. Mr. Sparages clarified this is a 2-way driveway onto Flint St, but left-turn only. The slope is 10%; the previously approved plan was steeper. Aisles are 24-ft wide to support 2-way traffic. Corners are rounded to facilitate safe turning.
- The Board asked for more detail on the lighting plan. Mr. Sparages advised the previously approved lighting will be switched to LED lighting. The applicant is sensitive to neighbors and has identified newly available fixtures with tilting heads. These enable a reduction in foot candles but maintain safety; their spillover needs to be researched. The Board encouraged the developer to consider full cutoff fixtures that eliminate spillover onto abutting properties.
- The Board inquired if all residential units will be offered at full market rate. Atty Grover advised 10% of the units will be affordable housing as required.
- The Board expressed some concern with the use of quick brick façade in certain areas including the residences due to possible maintenance problems. Mr. Stone will provide a detail of how it is attached on the next plan revision.
- The Board inquired about the dumpster location and details. Atty Grover advised the dumpsters have not been moved from the previously approved location. The proposal is still to provide fencing around the enclosure so the dumpsters are not visible.
- The Board asked for site renderings in both directions to show building elevations relative to the rest of the site, and any proposed roof top utility structures. The concern is for neighbors at higher elevations around the site—what are they looking at on the roof tops? Please show at next presentation.
- Several members of the Board expressed their appreciation for the thoughtfulness of the renderings by providing both existing residential photos and proposed renderings on the same plan.
- The Board inquired if the proponent has engaged the neighbors on retaining walls/fencing and other common issues. Atty Grover advised they did originally and now will reach out to a new neighbor before the next meeting.
- The Board explored the interface between the parking lot owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the applicant's property—what is the demarcation between the two properties (perpendicular to the river). Mr. Sparages advised there is a tree line and some chain link fencing owned by the state. Applicant indicated the state may require them to improve the access to the canal; they are awaiting Chapter 91 license instruction. Landers Symes of 50 Dodge Street, Beverly, offered that the State may require the developer to provide access from the State parking lot to the new canal walkway as there is now public access. The Planning Board encouraged the developer to work with the State on this boundary to prevent any “cow path” arising from foot traffic. Several members of the Board expressed concern that this corner is

already a pedestrian problem and unattractive, and should be addressed with the re-development of this site in a manner that will improve aesthetics and pedestrian safety.

- The Board inquired about the 30-ft wide roadway easement on the plan, and the proposed site design. Atty Grover explained that inclusion of the roadway easement was a condition of the original application approval, to align with the NRCC master plan. He doubts the city will actually seek this easement for a future road but did acknowledge the potential conflict.
- The Board pointed out discrepancies in the proposed landscaping, particularly street trees, among the various plans, renderings and the landscape plan.

Landscape architect James Emmanuel presented landscape plan and acknowledged the need to update all plan documents and ensure consistency. Same plant palette and sizes as previously approved; generally an increase in the number of plantings because there is more open space. Locations have shifted slightly but located similarly in relation to the buildings.

Civil engineer Chris Sparages reviewed the storm drainage design. The design meets all required standards. Runoff will be collected in deep-sunk catch basins for pre-treatment of pavement runoff, then piped to a treatment device. Storm water is then discharged into the river via a one-way valve. Soils are characterized as poorly draining/poor infiltration so the drainage has been supplemented by bio-retention cells.

The Board asked if the system will capture vehicle spills; Mr. Sparages confirmed yes, sumps inside catch basins will catch these spills. There is an operational maintenance plan for the storm water management systems including catch basins and Stormceptor units.

The Board also asked about the grade difference between the waterfront path and the mean high water - is it enough to require a guard rail? The applicant stated that they are awaiting Chapter 91 instruction on the exact detail needed.

***Chairman Puleo opened the hearing to the public for comment:***

- Ken Wallace 172 Federal St. has a failed retaining wall behind his house that is now a problem in determining who is responsible for repairs. For this project, who would own the retaining walls and would be responsible for repairs? Atty Grover advised the retaining walls will be owned by applicant. Mr. Wallace also asked: if the storm water valve is shut at high tide, and a heavy rain occurs, where does the water go? Mr. Sparages explained that if pressure behind the valve is higher it will open. The system is designed for 7 inches of rain in 24 hours. Mr. Wallace asked about rains at the rate of one inch per hour—would it fail? Mr. Sparages replied the design meets DPS standards.
- Andy Weinstein, owner of 38 Commercial Street, abutter by the Mason Street driveway; asked how pedestrian traffic from the new river walkway will be kept off his property. There is currently a problem with people cutting through. He is looking for landscaping or fencing. Atty Grover advised that the Chapter 91 review might discourage/disallow this. The approved plan does not include anything to inhibit cut-throughs. Mr. Weinstein observed the path of least resistance to get to the train station is to cut across his property. After exploring foot traffic options, the Board agreed with Mr. Weinstein that there is cause for concern and recommended

proponent and the abutter jointly develop a plan to address this. It may be appropriate to include the City in developing a solution.

- Chair Puleo asked if the fence type for the dumpster area has been approved. Atty Grover replied yes, there are details per the proponent (stockade wood fence) that were submitted with the previous application. The Board would like to explore the durability of what is proposed, and requested that details be provided.
- Jane Arlander, 93 Federal Street asked a series of questions that were answered by Mr. Stone:
  - What is the total residential square footage now? The previous proposal was 185,000-186,000 square feet. Mr. Stone replies that it has been reduced to 159,540 square feet.
  - What is the average residential unit size now? Mr. Stone replies that it has been reduced to 650-987 square feet with two 3-bedroom units at 1200 square feet.
  - How many parking spaces now? 282 total, including 78 outdoor spaces. Previously the outdoor parking spaces totaled 39.
  - Where is snow storage planned onsite? Mr. Sparages advised there are several and demonstrated on drawings. Ms. Arlander is concerned about melt running into a couple of Flint Street abutting properties; some of them have swimming pools. Mr. Sparages advised the project site is 7-10 feet in elevation below those backyards.
  - What is the change in buffer zone? Atty Grover advised the Zoning Board of Appeals granted some relief; the parking is now setback 7-feet (at the closest point) from the property line. Ms. Arlander is concerned about headlights affecting neighbors. Mr. Sparages pointed out the difference in elevation will prevent the headlight bleed over.
  - Ms. Arlander expressed concern regarding the parking lot exit onto Flint Street and asked if there is still a proposed 1-way egress? Mr. Sparages replied yes, left-turn only.
- Ken Wallace (172 Federal Street) followed up to ask if there will be an island to force a left-turn onto Flint Street and prevent a right turn? Mr. Sparages replied yes.
- Nina Cohen, 22 Chestnut Street, asked if there is provision for bike parking. Mr. Stone advised there are covered spaces for an estimated 35-40 bikes. Ms. Cohen also observed that the Flint Street fencing is covered in poison ivy and badly maintained at present; requested the owner address as it is hazardous to pedestrians using the adjacent sidewalk.
- Barbara Warren, 5 Hardy Street, Salem Sound Coastwatch Executive Director; suggested the developer approach the Commonwealth and request an easement to put a path through to the adjacent State owned parking lot. Ms. Warren asked if the parking garage is completely enclosed. Mr. Stone advised no. Ms. Warren asked about flooding in the garage. Mr. Sparages advised that as the garage floor drains are in a structure, they must be connected to the sewer system; there is no sump pump. Ms. Warren commented that if there is flooding enough to flood the parking lots the water may go into the sewers, which causes backups in our wastewater treatment networkk. Mr. Sparages stated this is a plumbing code requirement. Ms. Warren concurred and stated this is problem for the Cities of Salem and Peabody to address.

Atty Grover informed the Board that the project will go to the Design Review Board on July 23<sup>rd</sup>. He is not sure whether they will be ready for the next Planning Board meeting on July 31<sup>st</sup>. Ideally the project would have both the Design Review Board and Planning Board satisfied before they present for Chapter 91 licensure. The applicant and Planning Board generally agreed to schedule the project for the next Planning Board meeting and coordinate with the planning department staff.

**Motion and Vote:** Helen Sides made a motion to continue the public hearing to July 31, 2014, seconded by Randy Clarke. The vote was unanimous with nine (9) in favor (Mr. Puleo, Mr. Ready, Mr. Anderson, Ms. Sides, Ms. Yale, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Rieder, Mr. Griset and Mr. Veno) and none (0) opposed.

**Project:** Request for release of Lots 2 and 4 from Covenant of the Definitive Subdivision Plan at 18 Thorndike Street  
**Applicant:** PATRICK DEIULIS  
**Location:** HUBON and THORNDIKE STREETS

**Documents and Exhibitions:**

- Letter to the Board requesting release of lots 2 and 4, dated July 7, 2014
- Instrument of release for partial release of lots from covenant (for lots 2 and 4)

Patrick Delulis provided an update on the project. Infrastructure is complete (water main, drain catch basin, etc.) excepting municipal services to the individual houses. Also remaining to be done is the binder/finish coat on the private way. There is a buyer who wants to purchase both lots and begin construction. Lots are prepared for foundations and the developer will complete the finish grade after the houses are constructed as part of the agreement with buyer. The applicant is not making a request for cash bond reduction at this time. All improvements have been put in place except for paving.

Ms. Menon reported that the bond funds originally submitted by the applicant are still intact at \$50,000. FST has reviewed the project and reported to the city confirming that this is a more than adequate amount to complete the required improvements. City Solicitor Beth Rennard has approved the draft lot release document.

**Motion and Vote:** Randy Clarke made a motion to approve the request for release of Lots 2 and 4 from Covenant of the Definitive Subdivision Plan at 18 Thorndike Street, seconded by Tim Ready. The vote was unanimous with nine (9) in favor (Mr. Puleo, Mr. Ready, Mr. Anderson, Ms. Sides, Ms. Yale, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Rieder, Mr. Griset and Mr. Veno) and none (0) opposed.

**Project:** After-the-fact request to allow an insignificant change to the previously approved Site Plan Review, Wetlands and Flood Hazard District Special Permit, and North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District Special Permit. Specifically to allow after-the-fact the demolition of a brick outbuilding, which according to the approved plans, was to be integrated into the new development.  
**Applicant:** NORTH RIVER CANAL, LLC  
**Location:** 28 GOODHUE STREET (Map 16, Lot 372)

**Documents and Exhibitions:**

- Letter to the Staff Planner requesting approval of insignificant change, dated July 10, 2014
- Plans approved by the Planning Board in 2007
- Construction Plans dated May 13, 2013

Thomas Galvin, architect, from JD LaGrasse & Associates, Andover, MA, presented.

Mr. Galvin assured the Board the demolition of the building without appropriate approvals was unintentional and explained the sequence of events that led to the error. There was a long lag between purchase, plan and start of construction (2004 – 2013). The existing building was not a stable structure; it was razed because it did not impact the character of the new building and the program for the demolished space was addressed elsewhere in the development (a community space was planned). Reduced square footage of roof and added green space to the site as a result of the demolition are viewed as benefits to the project.

***Board Discussion:***

Chair Puleo stated he did not recall and research of the minutes did not indicate any lengthy discussion about preserving the building. He clarified with Mr. Galvin that the community space in the new building provides the same square footage as the razed building would have provided. Mr. Galvin also clarified the original intent was never for public use—only residents—which is how the current space is used.

Chair Puleo noted the approved plan shows the structure as attached; the developer needs relief.

The Board discussed the precedent this sets for future projects and a concern about how much time has passed without anyone calling the error to attention and seeking to address it. The Board agreed to reserve the right to require mitigation after the fact in this type of situation as a deterrent to future proponents and incentive to avoid this type of mistake. It was observed that the minutes relating to the project approval did not include discussion of preserving the building because there was no mention of demolition. The Board and the public could reasonably assume no discussion was needed as the building was shown on the plans.

The Board concluded the Site Plan approval was not tied to submitted construction drawings. It is unknown if the building inspector or building department approved the demolition.

Chair Puleo asked if a demolition permit was obtained, as an older structure like this would have required the historic commission to review and approve a demolition delay waiver. Mr. Galvin did not know these details. The general opinion among the Board is this would have been noted by the building inspector. When asked when the building was razed, Mr. Galvin advised the contractor mobilized in 2013.

The Board is seriously concerned there was an error with the clerk of works. Most members were rather shocked the demolition was never noticed or called into question by either the developer (as this building was in the plans), the building contractor or by city departments. At this time it is unclear if the error was within the city departments or within the documents submitted by the proponent.

The Board briefly discussed possible mitigation. The developer is already paying to realign the curbing in the area; there is an existing sidewalk that will also need to be realigned (near public storage property); there is a need to pour a new concrete sidewalk that will align with the new curblines.

Mr. Griset recommended the Board delay mitigation discussions until the next meeting when more information is presented.

**Motion and Vote:** Randy Clarke made a motion continue the discussion to July 31, 2014, seconded by Helen Sides. The vote was unanimous with nine (9) in favor (Mr. Puleo, Mr. Ready, Mr. Anderson, Ms. Sides, Ms. Yale, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Rieder, Mr. Griset and Mr. Veno) and none (0) opposed.

**Project:** Continuation of the public hearing for a petition requesting a Planned Unit Development Special Permit, Site Plan Review, and a Flood Hazard District Special Permit for the demolition of the existing Marina Building and the redevelopment of that site to include an expansion of the existing Salem Waterfront Hotel & Suites with associated parking and landscaping, and off-site parking at 13-15 Herbert Street and 25 Peabody Street.

**Applicant:** THE SALEM WATERFRONT HOTEL & SUITES, LLC

**Locations:** 19 Congress St (Map 34, Lot 489); 23 Congress St (Map 34, Lot 447); 223-231 Derby St (Map 34, Lot 446); 235 Derby St (Map 34, Lot 445); Congress St (Map 34, Lot 408); 13-15 Herbert St (map 35, Lot 321); 25 Peabody St (Map 34, Lot 436); The Remaining land of Pickering Wharf Condominium Trust (Map 34, Lot 408)

**Documents and Exhibitions:**

- Compiled updated plans, dated July 17, 2014
- Draft special condition #7, updated July 17, 2014
- Draft decision and special conditions, updated July 17, 2014

Attorney George Atkins of Ronan, Segal & Harrington, 59 Federal Street, presented on behalf of the applicant. Other presenters included: Tony Sasso, project manager, Salem Waterfront Hotel.

Atty Atkins summarized the status of the outstanding issues that have been addressed since the applicant's last appearance before the Board. Only a couple of issues are still outstanding.

- A draft decision has been circulated to the applicant and Board members. New language to replace paragraph 7—Utilities, was agreed to by the applicant. This special condition addresses the matter of the 36" drainage pipe believed to run underneath the existing marina building, and the responsibilities of the applicant and the City in regards to the exploration and potential relocation of this pipe.
- The applicant will provide \$15,000 for the city to build a crosswalk on Congress Street; location to be determined by the city.
- The applicant will present a trash receptacle location and maintenance plan for approval by the city planner. This plan will also need to be approved for the Chapter 91 license.
- The Board's concern about traffic flow through the site and how it impacts the immediate neighborhood has been reviewed extensively. The client continues to express concern about the safety factor within the project and the danger posed by cut-through traffic.



In particular, the change in traffic flow at the Congress Street south driveway from two-way to one-way inbound has been reconsidered in acknowledgement of the Board's expressed preference that this driveway remain two-way. Due to the physical limitations of the site and various setback requirements, only a one-way road can be accommodated with the planned configuration of the new building. The city's peer reviewer on traffic, BETA Group, has submitted a written opinion that one-way inbound is preferred over one-way outbound at this driveway, if special considerations for the Hotel's shuttle golf carts are not included in the analysis.

The traffic engineers agree that the exit onto Derby Street is generally not a problem and does not encounter extensive queuing on Derby Street.

- The recent request for a contribution to the City for tree plantings on Congress Street has been accepted by the applicant.
- The request for language defining some internal traffic flow within the site is rejected by the applicant.

***Board Discussion:***

Various Board members addressed aspects of the draft decision as follows:

Chair Puleo spoke to the issue of parking and suggested the applicant be required to return to the Board if they lose the lease on the south Congress Street lot. He suggested the applicant pursue the possibility of purchasing the lot from National Grid. Atty Atkins advised the client will accept this change.

Mr. Rieder requested the additional trees not be limited to Congress Street, but also include Derby Street; at a total of five additional street trees, distributed three to Congress and two to Derby Street.

Mr. Clarke expressed concern at the absence of crosswalk striping on Wharf Street and Union Street where they intersect Derby Street and asked if the City or the developer own these parts of these streets. If the developer owns them; please stripe them. The developer has agreed to provide and maintain crosswalk striping if they own this part of the streets.

Mr. Clarke also requested clarity on where the golf carts park; Mr. Sasso advised they are in front of the hotel currently. The Board noted they cannot be parked on the sidewalk. Mr. Ready encouraged the developer to be diligent and enforce management of the golf cart parking as it is not a stipulation in the decision.

Mr. Clarke summarized his previous concerns regarding traffic flow within the project. While still not in favor of the one-way south driveway from Congress Street, he accepts the reasons to compromise on this issue. He is particularly concerned that the developer regularly blocks access to the Congress Street north exit from the parking lot with the use of traffic cones and requests a stipulation to prohibit blocking traffic flow in this manner.

During the ensuing general discussion of the traffic flow details, the Board requested and the applicant agreed to add a condition to install signage; 1) DO NOT ENTER sign to prohibit right turn from Wharf Street into the hotel complex (outside the PUD), and 2) ONE-WAY sign on the driveway east of the hotel. This signage will be noted on the site plan.

After extensive discussions regarding traffic flow within the site, the applicant agreed to a stipulation that there will be no blockade to prohibit traffic flow within the development between the Derby Street driveway and the bank exit at the north Congress Street driveway. This remedy was posed as a six-month trial period. In the event the applicant finds this negatively impacts business operations, the applicant may present evidence to the Planning Board and request the right to impose traffic flow limitations within the development.

***Board Discussion:***

Chairman Puleo, alternating with Ms. Menon, read into the record the draft decision, incorporating changes as discussed. The Board collectively edited the draft decision, careful to confirm agreement on the wording of edits.

**Motion and Roll Call Vote:** *Randy Clarke made a motion to approve the Site Plan Review application, the Planned Unit Development Special Permit, and the Flood Hazard District Special Permit for the proposed new five-story hotel building with 42 hotel units, with conditions, seconded by Ben Anderson. The vote was unanimous with eight (8) in favor (Mr. Puleo, Mr. Ready, Mr. Anderson, Ms. Sides, Ms. Yale, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Rieder and Mr. Griset, none (0) opposed. Matt Veno was ineligible to vote. The decision is hereby incorporated and made a part of these minutes.*

**Old/New Business**

Chair Puleo announced the resignation of Board member Tim Ready, effective July 30, 2014; and shared a copy of Tim's letter to the Mayor. The Board members all expressed warm thanks for Tim's service to the Board and the community and affection for his thoughtful generosity. He will be missed.

**Adjournment**

**Motion and Vote:** *Tim Ready made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ben Anderson. The vote was unanimous with nine (9) in favor (Mr. Puleo, Mr. Ready, Mr. Anderson, Ms. Sides, Ms. Yale, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Rieder, Mr. Griset and Mr. Veno) and none (0) opposed.*

Chairman Puleo adjourned the meeting at 10:55pm.

*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 8/7/2014