

**City of Salem Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes - CORRECTED  
Thursday, September 4, 2014**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, September 4, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. in Room 313, Third Floor, at 120 Washington Street, Salem, Massachusetts.

Chairman Puleo opened the meeting at 7:09 pm.

**Roll Call**

Those present were: Chuck Puleo - Chair, Ben Anderson, Kirt Rieder, Dale Yale, Randy Clarke, Helen Sides, Bill Grisct, Matthew Venio and Noah Koretz. Absent: None.

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

Chair Puleo read into the record correspondence from Mayor Driscoll introducing newly appointed Planning Board member, Noah Koretz. A Salem resident, Mr. Koretz holds a JD from George Washington University Law School and a Master's degree in city planning from MIT. Mr. Koretz's legal experience includes real estate litigation (mixed use commercial, residential, construction and health code disputes). Currently working as program director for a Malden-based consortium receiving federal HOME funds for the creation of low-income housing. The program collaborates with the Malden redevelopment authority. Chair Puleo welcomed Mr. Koretz to the Board.

**Election of Officers**

**Nomination and Vote for Vice Chair**

Item tabled until Old/New Business portion of the meeting.

**Approval of Minutes**

**August 7, 2014 Special Meeting Minutes**

Minor edits were made to page six of the minutes, under "Board Discussion" of the agenda item to discuss the addition of a "Brewery, Distillery, or Winery with Tasting Room" use to the NRCC District.

**Motion and Vote:** Dale Yale made a motion to approve the revised August 7, 2014 minutes, seconded by Ben Anderson. The vote was unanimous with eight (8) in favor and none (0) opposed, Mr. Koretz abstained.

**Regular Agenda**

**Location:** 72 FLINT STREET AND 67-71 MASON STREET (Map 26, Lots 91, 95 & 97)  
**Applicant:** RIVERVIEW PLACE LLC  
**Description:** Continuation of the 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.**

**Documents and Exhibitions:**

Chair Puleo read into the record a request submitted by Attorney Scott Grover, representative of the applicant, with a request to continue to the September 18, 2014 meeting.

**Motion and Vote:** Helen Sides made a motion to continue the public hearing to September 18, 2014, seconded by Kirt Reider. The vote was unanimous with nine (9) in favor (Mr. Puleo, Mr. Anderson, Ms. Sides, Ms. Yale, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Rieder, Mr. Griset, Mr. Koretz, and Mr. Veno) and none (0) opposed.

**Location:** 9-11 Dodge Street, 217-219 & 231-251 Washington Street  
(Map 34, Lots 0403, 0405 & 0406)

**Applicant:** Dodge Area, LLC

**Description:** A public hearing of the application for Site Plan Review, a Planned Unit Development Special Permit, and a Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit for the construction of an approximately 190,000 square foot mixed-use development with residential units, commercial space including a potential hotel, a parking structure, associated landscaping, and pedestrian and transportation improvements.

**Documents and Exhibitions:**

- Petition and attached materials date-stamped July 10, 2014
- “Washington at Dodge Development Proposal” slide presentation dated Sep 4, 2014

Matthew Picarsic, Managing Principal for RCG, LLC (developer) presented for the applicant.

Other presenters included:

- David Giangrande, PE, MS; President, Design Consultants Inc., 120 Middlesex Avenue, Somerville, MA (civil engineering and land surveying)
- Matt Zerkowitz, IALD, LC; Principal, Available Light, 10 Derby Square, Salem MA.

Mr. Picarsic opened the presentation. The proponent has been working on the project for about 18 months. He invited questions from Board members and noted a larger contingent of the development team was present in the audience and available as needed. He summarized the project goals and scope of the project for the benefit of the Board.

**Project Goals:**

- Expand the downtown; this project is sited on the southernmost block of the B5 zone
- Increase number of downtown residents
- Improve the pedestrian environment

**Current “Base Program”, Approximately:**

190,000 square foot mixed used development on 1.5 acres of land  
111 room hotel  
81 apartments

3 live/work units  
14,000 square feet of retail space  
6,000 square feet of additional commercial space  
Parking structure with at least 245 spaces

Applicant has spent about 9 months working with the Salem Redevelopment Authority and the Design Review Board, resulting in significant changes to the architecture and plan.

He reminded the Board the current surface parking lot (38 spaces) adjacent Washington Street was sold to the developer at market value; with the understanding the developer would make an equivalent number of parking spaces available for general public use. This sale of city property was authorized by vote of the City Council.

Mr. Picarsic's presentation was organized to "walk" the Board around the site using renderings and drawings to enable visualization. Key plan components such as utilities, parking, landscaping, architectural treatment, etc. were discussed multiple times in conjunction with each plan detail and/or view as the presentation continued following the perimeter of the site.

***Site Location & Context:***

Mr. Picarsic reviewed a map of the area and pointed out the location of the parcel and noted the surrounding buildings and streets. He stated the Historical Commission has issued a waiver of demolition delay for the buildings on the site. He pointed out the following key aspects of the site plan and inherent features of the site:

- Site grade changes across the expanse of the site
- Proposed hotel to be located along Dodge Street, currently referred to as the North Building
  - Hotel Lobby Corner at Dodge Street/Dodge Street Court
  - Drop-off treatment along Dodge Street Court
- South and West buildings are mixed use.
- Outdoor seating with space for tenant restaurant at street level
- Wide sidewalks to encourage pedestrian traffic; bump-outs to improve pedestrian access to street crossing (slow vehicular traffic).
- Two lower levels of parking structure accessed from Dodge Street Court
- Upper level (open air parking) accessed from Washington Street

***Board Questions:***

- The Board asked if the proponent has a hotel partner. Mr. Picarsic replied yes, a hotel management partner has been identified but a formal agreement is not in place. They are currently reviewing franchise options for branding. He also indicated the PUD application has a fall-back plan to utilize the hotel space for more commercial/retail or even residential. Specifics will be offered later in the presentation.
- The Board asked if the outdoor seating/restaurant is part of the hotel or an independent restaurant. Mr. Picarsic advised the goal is to have an independent restaurant. There is a planned breakfast room within the hotel.
- The Board asked for rendering/perspectives of the view corridor down Washington Street that shows the difference between the existing view and the view with the proposed development.

**Presentation Continuation:**

Mr. Picarsic continued the presentation by introducing the open air stair connector. This provides a link from Washington Street to the garage/open air parking court. The connector provides light and separates the hotel building from the “cube” commercial/residential building. The change in exterior materials denotes change in use.

- West façade: planned 2 levels of retail/commercial. Second floor of this building is accessed via stairwell in the west lobby and via the garage behind the building. There could be one or multiple tenants on this second level of the west building. The first level is at grade with the southern end of Washington Street.
- Separate residential and commercial lobbies. There is a separate elevator to access commercial space.
- Proposing to move curb lines as Mill St curves into Washington Street. Suggesting going from 3 to 2 lanes on this block of Washington Street (between Dodge Street and Mill Street/Washington Street intersection). On-street parallel parking recommended.
- West end building will be first floor/second floor retail or commercial; could be either. The exact mix will be market driven.
- The Board asked how pedestrians will know the commercial lobby entrance provides access to second level businesses. Mr. Picarsic advised the Design Review Board has discouraged too much signage on the exterior, so the architects are currently working on this issue.
- South Building: Have significant grade changes.
  - first floor live/work units
  - the plan deals with grade changes using multiple sets of steps in an attractive, modern townhouse style with strong vertical lines and a high level of landscaping.
- Open-air Parking Court:
  - 53 spaces including the 38 publicly available spaces required by the City for purchase of the space.
  - RCG will regulate these spaces, not the city. May be privately metered or operated as a pay to park lot. Board indicated the parking management plan will be critical in determining traffic flow within the site and the neighborhood. Mr. Picarsic advised the parking management plan is not firm at this time; and will be dependent on the actual types of commercial/retail tenants, and the final mix of commercial, residential, and hotel use.
  - Parking for residential units will be in the upper level garage (not open-air court) 1.5 spaces per unit minimum.

The Board indicated a firm interest in understanding the management of the 38 spaces available to the public, and to the development’s parking management plan as a whole. It is their responsibility to understand how the development fits into the entire neighborhood, including traffic flow.

- Engineering highlights:
  - A portion of the northern edge of the site is in the newly expanded FEMA flood zone.
  - Base elevation of the hotel has been raised above the flood elevation. All critical mechanical systems will be located above the flood elevation.
  - Existing parcel does not have a lot of existing utilities—surrounding public property/streets have significant underground utility services. Quite a bit of infrastructure will be relocated: city sewer, water main, Nation Grid gas, electrical distribution and transmission lines and phone lines.

- Overall Traffic & Parking Changes proposed in collaboration with city proposed traffic changes at this intersection.
  - Realign Dodge Street and straighten out the current jog—make it a true city street complete with crosswalks.
  - Add traffic control at Dodge St/Dodge Street Court with raised crosswalks to calm traffic on Dodge Street.
  - Changes to vehicular curbing to assist pedestrians around the entire perimeter of the site.
  - Dodge Street Court; Suggest changing the direction to one-way from New Derby to Dodge Street (currently 2-way vehicular traffic)
  - Dodge Street; Suggest elimination of parallel parking on north side, retain 2-way vehicular traffic and parallel parking on the south side.
- Bike Lane Discussion: The Board asked if bike lanes are proposed for Dodge Street or Dodge Street Court. Mr. Picarsic replied there is not enough space. The Board noted bike racks are planned; the objective of city is to improve and add bike lanes.
  - David Giangrande, Design Consultants Inc., advised the minimum standard is 4-feet. The plan does provide a 5-foot buffer along Washington Street to facilitate bike travel. Dodge Street is too narrow to accommodate a bike lane in addition to ADA accessible sidewalks, parking and 2-way traffic.

Mr. Picarsic advised the City has a plan to improve the Mill Street/Washington Street/Canal Street intersection. The AECOM plans for these improvements are referenced on RCG plans and renderings for this project. Based on these plans the proponent proposes to:

- Bump-out the curb turning right from south Washington Street northbound onto Washington Street. This will slow traffic, shorten the pedestrian crossing distance, and make pedestrians more visible to oncoming traffic.
- The plan effectively narrows Washington Street from Mill Street northbound to the Dodge Street intersection. Washington Street from Dodge Street to New Derby would remain the same allowing the current right-turn queue lane.
- The plan adds a pedestrian crossing over Washington Street into Riley Plaza from the north side of Dodge Street.
- Realign the curb cut into the site from Washington Street with Pond Street on the opposite side of Washington Street.
- Overall, from Washington Street to Dodge Street Court, street improvements are planned in conjunction with utilities relocation and construction of this development.

Board Discussion regarding proposed roadway/intersection changes:

- Some Board members expressed concern about narrowing the Washington Street corridor between Mill and New Derby Streets. Many people need those 2 blocks to figure out which of the 4 lanes heading into the Norman Street/New Derby Street intersection they should be in—reducing the distance to only one block to decide does not provide enough time/room and could promote accidents or more congestion.
- Other Board members pointed out that narrowing this block of Washington Street will make it easier for vehicles to maneuver from south Washington Street around the curve and into the left lane of Washington Street northbound, to follow Rt 114 Westbound down Norman Street.
- Throttling down Washington Street will slow down traffic which is a good thing.

- Creation of a “buffer strip” between the proposed on-street parallel parking and the two traffic lanes on Washington Street could provide more space for cyclists, but will it be confusing to only have it for one block?
- Board opinion was generally positive toward the proposed change on Dodge Street Court (one-way southbound vs. the current two-way). This represents an improvement and works with the current diagonal parking on Dodge Street Court.

***Additional Board Questions:***

- Are the trees shown on the surface parking court in planters or at-grade? Mr. Picarsic advised they are raised in planter boxes. He also notes the plan is to remove a few existing trees but the landscape plan provides for extensive tree planting to complement the pedestrian routes. He also volunteered that appropriate public art installations are planned for strategic locations around the site.
- Mr. Picarsic noted there is an exterior lighting plan. The Board asked if a photometric plan is available at this time; if not, please provide at the next presentation. In addition to a more detailed presentation of the lighting plan, the Board is interested to know the impact of the lighting plan with regard to:
  - spill over onto adjacent properties
  - concern over halo effect from over-lighting
  - type of light fixtures

The Board noted 80% of light fixtures in the renderings are modern and in keeping with building design. Some fixtures are faux historical and not in keeping with the other proposed fixtures. In some instances, these are matching the City’s street lights.

Mr. Picarsic continued the presentation with some details of parking:

- Lower level garage will be accessed from Dodge Street court. This level will be used by hotel guests; the entrance is located near the hotel drop-off area. It will likely be managed via an automated gate/ticket system.

Configuration:  
2 handicapped  
12 compact  
87 full sized  
101 total

The Board asked what the plans are for security in the garage, particularly this level. Mr. Picarsic indicated they will likely use cameras. The Board encouraged the proponent to consider crime prevention throughout the development, and particularly in the garage. The Board asked if security details will be provided; currently the proponent does not have this level of detail for a security plan.

- In response to a request for clarification from the Board, Mr. Picarsic summarized access to various levels of the parking structure:

Lower level of the garage accessed from Dodge Street Court  
Upper level of garage accessed from a second Dodge Street Court entrance  
Open-air parking court accessed from Washington Street only  
A total of 202 spaces will be entering/exiting via Dodge Street Court.

- Provision for hotel deliveries will likely be made on Dodge Street and the north end of the parking court. The Board asked to know the width of Dodge Street Court to confirm the space is adequate for the planned activities. Mr. Picarsic advised the street width is 22-feet curb-to-curb.
- The Board specifically requested the proponent confirm lighting at the end of Dodge Street Court will not be less than what is currently available. The Board is concerned to preserve security for neighbors adjacent the site and tenants.
- Upper Level Garage is expected to include assigned spaces for residential units.
  - Configured:
  - 2 handicapped
  - 12 compact
  - 87 full size
  - Total 101
  - Bike storage, recycling
- Open-air Parking Court will include spaces for public use (replacements for the 38 spaces in the lot previously owned by the city). Other uses for the open-air court include:
  - Considering Zip cars
  - Snow storage
    - Board suggestion of electric car charging station
- Changes in on-street parking:
  - Combined net change is minus 2 parking spaces—detailed drawing identifying each space change. Proponent is adding loading spaces and taking away parking spaces.
  - Some loading areas are time-restricted, so they could be used for parking spaces outside of the loading zone times.

Board discussion indicated a general concern regarding the spaces on the open-air parking court. The proponent is requesting flexibility on how this area is managed, and the Board is seeking confirmation these spaces will truly be accessible to the public and a replacement for the spaces on the land sold by the City. The Board requested planning staff to provide clarification regarding the exact terms of the sale with regard to providing replacement parking and managing it.

Mr. Picarsic continued the presentation by noting that trash and recycling stations are noted on the site plan:

Lower level garage station will service the hotel/north building

Dodge Street Court station will service the first levels of the West/South Buildings

The Board asked if the landscape plan includes public barrels for trash/recycling? Mr. Picarsic replied yes.

### **ZONING REVIEW**

Mr. Picarsic summarized the zoning request and indicated the development meets all requirements:

- PUD (planned unit development) requested
- 3 parcels, entirely within B5 zoning district
- Exceeds minimum requirement for the site to be 10,000 square feet
- Mixed use program

In response to a Board question, Mr. Picarsic indicated the water table is 5 feet below lowest grade on the site; the garage will be waterproofed construction.

Building Height Calculations are a challenge due to the changes in grade across the site. Note that figures presented are averages—on some portions of the site building heights exceed these figures:

- North building 65 feet average
- South/west = 69.5 ft overall average
- 10' difference in elevation across the site

The Board requested the next presentation show renderings with adjacent buildings to illustrate height both abutting and all the way to Bridge Street and along Dodge Street.

Mr. Picarsic continued the presentation with a summary of the possible project program use configurations:

<b>Program</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Hotel Rooms</b>	<b>Residential Units (incl. Live-work)</b>	<b>Commercial SF (Pedestrian grade retail)</b>	<b>Overall SF Floor Area</b>	<b>Min. Parking Spaces (Min. Publicly Available)</b>
<b>Example A</b>	Base program	111	84	20,000 +/--(14,000)	190,000 +/-	245 (38)
<b>Example B</b>	Smaller hotel rooms and dwelling units	120	90	20,000 +/--(14,000)	190,000 +/-	245 (38)
<b>Example C</b>	No hotel, conversion to retail/residential	0	145	28,000 +/--(22,000)	190,000 +/-	245 (38)
<b>Example D</b>	Conversion of Resi floor to commercial	120	70	35,000 +/--(14,000)	190,000 +/-	245 (38)
<b>Example E</b>	No hotel and conversion of Resi floor to commercial	0	129	45,000 +/--(22,000)	190,000 +/-	245 (38)

The Board noted the request for approval is for a very broad mix of uses. Chair Puleo asked planning staff to work with the City Planner for a directive on figures that should trigger a substantial change in use. The proponent indicated their preference is to not be required to return to the Planning Board for approvals related to the potential use changes. They propose that the parameters given above define an “insignificant change” to program use.

**Board Discussion:**

No precedent for such broad approval, consult with City Planner. Generally, Board members expressed concern that the public is entitled to know what to expect and a broadly defined program use is not helpful to the City and other stakeholders in the downtown. This is a significant parcel size in the downtown and changes in the mix of residential/hotel or in the mix of commercial to residential/hotel significantly impact City services, traffic and neighbors.

The Board commended the proponent for looking beyond the lot lines to consider streetscape, curb cuts, etc. The Board requests for the next presentation include:

- HVAC for each of these buildings, roof equipment.
- Exhaust vents in relation to adjacent property



- Shadow study because they will be one of the taller buildings downtown
- Size of the parking stalls— including all variations that exist
- More consideration of speed tables for traffic management
- Tree species need to be detailed
- Parking garage signage in all the renderings appears too prominent, please present alternatives
- Pavement detail
- Perspective of snow storage has an odd sign, please clarify and reconsider how to designate the area.

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

- Josh Turiel 238 Lafayette Street, Salem; Ward 5 Councilor. Disclosed he worked for consulting firm Available Light who is working on this project. Overall very impressed by the overall design and the direction this project is moving. Stated he is enthusiastic to see something unique and different in terms of design. Regarding the scope of approval requested by the proponent, he supports some flexibility to allow fine-tuning the mix of hotel rooms vs. residential units. He agrees a large change should require Planning Board approval; such as all hotel rooms to all residential, etc). More than 20 rooms/units in one direction or the other are significant. He also supports most of the proposed traffic changes. Believes this will trigger more pedestrian traffic that will overflow to upper Washington Street. In his opinion one of the biggest traffic concerns is the gridlock in Riley Plaza—he offered the opinion this project and proposed road changes will not significantly impact the gridlock either way. The spaces sold by the City were not highly utilized. It was made clear during the sale process that once sold, the City has no further say in how the spaces are used or managed. City Council did hope the parking court would be used primarily by people using retail/restaurant businesses in the new development.
- David Eppley 69 Boston Street, Salem; Ward 4 Councilor. Indicated he is thrilled to see these plans. Wanted to underscore the need to provide a good definition of substantial change; it should redirect the proponent to the Planning Board for approval. In his opinion, if there is not a hotel that is a significant change and the project should return to the Planning Board for presentation of alternatives.
- Jim Kearney, 1 ½ Cambridge Street, Salem; Starbucks and other neighbors will not welcome loss of on-street parking on Dodge Street and Dodge Street Court. Other businesses on upper Washington Street will be negatively affected by the proposed loss of on-street parking.
- Hank Deschamps, owner of Deschamps Printing Company Inc., 3 Dodge Street, Salem; abutter. Concerned about loss of parking spaces. His business has 18 employees. They rent spaces from RCG that will no longer be available when this project begins. Additionally he is seriously concerned about the access for daily deliveries to his business. The proposed changes adjacent to the intersection of Dodge Street/Dodge Street Court could make it impossible for tractor-trailers to make daily paper deliveries. Currently tractor-trailers enter via New Derby St or Lafayette. The Board asked if his deliveries are time sensitive—yes usually mornings for tractor-trailer deliveries, but box truck work could be any time.

The Board suggested the proponent please show turning radiuses on the next plan revision. The Board also encouraged the proponent to consider how they will accommodate any other businesses who currently rent parking in this parcel.

**Motion and Vote:** Helen Sides made a motion to continue the public hearing to September 18, 2014, seconded by Kirt Rieder. 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, Mr. Koretz, and Mr. Veno) and none (0) opposed.

### Old/New Business

- **Board Nomination and Vote for the Planning Board representative to the Complete Streets Working Group.**

#### **Board Discussion**

Several Board members encouraged Randy Clarke to accept the nomination due to his expertise and interest in multi-modal transportation issues. When asked, Ms. Menon confirmed the commitment includes a monthly meeting; the structure of the work group is unknown but includes appropriate city staff from a range of departments as well as individuals from various Boards/Commissions. Collectively the Board reached consensus and formalized the appointment.

**Motion and Vote:** Helen Sides made a motion to appoint Randy Clarke to the role of Planning Board representative to the Complete Streets Working Group, seconded by Kirt Reider. The vote was unanimous with nine (9) in favor and none (0) opposed.

- **Continued Board discussion regarding the proposed amendment to the City of Salem Zoning Ordinance to add a definition for “Urban Agriculture”, “Hens”, “Run”, “Coop”, “Livestock”, and “Customary agricultural, horticultural and floricultural operations” under Section 10; to amend the Table of Principal and Accessory Use Regulations under Section 3.0 to add a new “Urban Agriculture” use, to be allowed by-right in RC, R1, R2, R3, B1, B2, B4, B5, I, and BPD zones; and to add a Section 3.2.7 “Urban Agriculture” under Section 3.2 Accessory Uses. This Board discussion is open to the public, but is not a Public Hearing.**

#### **Board Discussion:**

Chair Puleo confirmed the members had reviewed the collected data on practices in five different communities: Boston, Marblehead, Ipswich, Peabody and Reading. Data included copies of ordinances, Health Department regulations and other documents depending on how each community chose to address the matter.

Ms. Menon distributed a summary of feedback from some of the communities regarding their “lessons learned” and experiences to date.

#### **Board comment on the research to date:**

- Annual licensure renewal is a good way to manage compliance for those grandfathered in.

- People felt setbacks in Peabody are fair. Variation based on lot size seems to help. The Board was especially interested in the details of the Peabody requirements:
  - Lots under 10,000 square feet, a maximum of 6 hens, with pens/runs kept a minimum of 5 feet from the property line
  - Lots from 10,000 – 21,000 square feet, a maximum of 15 hens, with pens/runs kept a minimum of 10 feet from the property line
  - Regardless of lot size, pens/runs must be a minimum of 15 feet from the dwelling of an abutter.
  - Coop space must allow a minimum of 2 square feet per hen and 1 nest box per 3 hens.
  - Runs must allow a minimum of 4 square feet per hen.
  - Coops or pens shall not be larger than 120 square feet.
  - Coops and runs shall not be located in the front yard or a side yard that abuts a public street.
- Peabody philosophy is to grant permits; they will not deny based on ‘possibility’ but will revoke if problems arise. This seems to be a fair approach.
- Different setbacks for runs vs. coops offered in one community seemed to be a good idea.
- The Board re-iterated their philosophy that the Salem ordinance should be broad, primarily based on setback definitions, enabling the regulation to be provided by the experts in the Health Department.
- Most communities cap the number of chickens allowed.

Chair clarified that no recommendation is required of the Planning Board at tonight’s meeting. The joint public hearing is still open and will continue on September 11. The Planning Board should be prepared to make recommendation at its September 18th meeting; incorporating input from the public hearing on September 11<sup>th</sup> and possibly some response from the Board of Health regarding the draft regulations.

- **Nomination and Vote for Vice Chair**

Chair Puleo opened the floor for nominations and discussion. The Board asked for a recap of member seniority:

Helen Sides

Randy Clarke

Kirt Reider and Ben Anderson appointed at the same time

Collectively the Board reached consensus and formalized the appointment.

**Motion and Vote:** Matt Veno made a motion to appoint Ben Anderson to the role of Vice Chair for the Planning Board, seconded by Randy Clarke . The vote was unanimous with nine (9) in favor (Mr. Puleo, Mr. Anderson, Ms. Sides, Ms. Yale, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Rieder, Mr. Griset, Mr. Koretz, and Mr. Veno) and none (0) opposed.

- **Salem State traffic negatively impacting Loring Avenue**

A Board member inquired about the best purview to raise concerns regarding the increase in traffic problems on Loring Avenue due to Salem State traffic. Other members noted there is no local review process as they are a state entity. Recommended concerned parties approach the Salem State Neighborhood Advisory Committee.

## Adjournment

**Motion and Vote:** Helen Sides made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Dale Yale. 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, Mr. Koretz, and Mr. Veno) and none (0) opposed.

Chairman Puleo adjourned the meeting at 9:49pm.

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 9/18/2014*