

DRAFT

**MINUTES OF THE
PLANNING BOARD**

**MEETING OF
October 24, 2023**

A meeting of the Planning Board was held on October 24, 2023 in the Knightly Meeting Room at Salem Town Hall.

PRESENT: Keith Belair, Chairman; Joe Feole, Vice-Chairman; Bianca Carlson, Secretary; Paul Pelletier, Town Council; Sean Lewis; Damon Norcross; Linda Harvey, Alternate; and Jacob LaFontaine, Planning Director

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance. Chairman Belair introduced the board members and went over the agenda. There were no withdrawals.

OLD BUSINESS

1. TUSCAN VILLAGE MASTER DEVELOPMENT – Public Hearing for 300-unit apartment building, 80,800 sq. ft. first floor retail at 20-24 Via Toscana, Map 108, Lot 12657. Continued from 10/10/2023.

Abutters: Tuscan Village Block 1200, Tuscan South Village LLC, and Tuscan Village Jewel Building I LLC were all present.

Staff Comments:

This was accepted at the October 10th meeting. The applicant has received final outside engineering and traffic reviews.

He discussed revisions to the plan.

Comments were received from the outside design consultant.

We have a memo from Municipal Services Director Roy Sorenson regarding water usage.

NHDOT approval was received.

There are outstanding items like outside design consultant is still pending in terms of his final comments.

In terms of a few other items that need to be addressed, there are some items that need to be satisfied prior to site plan approval. That was conditioned on the conceptual master plan.

The purview of tonight’s meeting is to review recreation, circulation, and the affordable housing requirement.

In terms of recreation, the applicant has identified two additional areas as recreation spaces to the left, which is Overlook Park, and the in center is referred to as The Muse. There are children present at Tuscan Village. He discussed the recreation park and showed pictures of parks in Boston. The applicant has done an excellent job. They came back with a thoughtful conceptual package. He showed the area of Rec Park with overlays of those examples that we used, like

DRAFT

1 Charles River Esplanade Park. It would be appropriate to make these a condition. Probably prior
2 to tenant fit up we can have final design of these areas, and prior to final occupancy, we can have
3 areas fully designed, with the exception of Overlook Park.

4 He showed the area known as The Muse. He thinks this is an excellent idea. We talked about the
5 flexible space in the western portion of the park that would be used for popups. We questioned if
6 it has recreational value and the applicant heard that and they have programmed it.

7 He mentioned the pop ups. They can have them but when the popups aren't there, it can be used
8 for recreational purposes. The horse shown on the plan is a neat play structure, not that big but a
9 lot of elements to it. It was installed in a development in Texas. He also showed putting greens
10 that was Mr. Gross' idea. They really have thought how to program this space. It is thoughtfully
11 programmed and shows a good faith effort that they heard the concerns and are willing to
12 address those. We can probably condition it.

13 He then showed Overlook Park. This is the most conceptual aspect, there is no definite idea on
14 the direction of that.

15 He also discussed circulation and showed Mr. Pernaw's plan. He showed another example. But
16 the applicant said this wouldn't be acceptable because the tenant needs a certain amount of
17 spaces. But the applicant has reserved spaces to the south as employee parking. The
18 recommendation from Steve Pernaw was to reserve the spaces to the north. But those are closer
19 to the grocer, so they weren't acceptable to the applicant, but they did do some traffic calming.
20 The recommendation is to review this and determine if these traffic calming mechanisms are
21 appropriate or if they need to do anything else to modify it. We have comments from Mr.
22 Pernaw, who didn't think the movement backing out into the traffic aisle was advisable. There
23 will be a speed table and three-way stop sign. Mr. LaFontaine explained the changes that they
24 made, including the median that they eliminated so that they could re-orient the pedestrian
25 crosswalk. There are three spaces outside of the underground parking area and there was concern
26 from the outside design consultant and traffic consultant on those spaces as you exit the
27 underground garage area. They did discuss having those spaces be pick up only. Jacob is curious
28 to know the turnover rate for Whole Foods pick up spaces. There were comments about the
29 spaces. He had a comment about the one way circulation terminating at the loading dock. But
30 Mr. Pernaw didn't seem as concerned.

31 In terms of affordable, we have recreation, circulation, and the affordable aspect. He is going
32 back to 2020 when this discussion had started. He had submitted a memo at the time advocating
33 for workforce housing. We talked about the existing rates at Tuscan and we said that we want
34 some kind of affordable component with this project. There was a response from the applicant in
35 February 2021 and the idea was to do a preferred employee program and there will be a discount,
36 which he explained. We wanted modifications made and have it increased to people beyond
37 town employees. The applicant heard the concern and the applicant agreed to do 10 percent of
38 units. We wanted onsite but we compromised and said either on or offsite. That was February,
39 and that was the conceptual master plan that was approved in 2021. He discussed the number of
40 units. In March 2021 we went to town meeting with a zoning amendment that requires 10
41 percent of new multi-family housing units to be affordable for a project that exceeds the
42 underlying density. They did make good on their proposal to provide 10 percent. So the board
43 approved 74 units on Main Street.

DRAFT

1 The discussion tonight is whether the applicant has to adhere to the amendment of March 2021
 2 which requires ten percent of units be affordable. His interpretation was, he didn't question the
 3 fact that the ten percent on or offsite was met. He discussed this issue.
 4 His direction to the applicant was that a variance would be needed to satisfy the ordinance to
 5 allow ten percent offsite. The applicant has contested that and submitted a letter from their
 6 attorney with their interpretation of the ordinance. His thought is that the 300 units approved in
 7 August 2023 weren't considered in 2021 when the last conceptual master plan was approved. We
 8 reviewed this with the town attorney, but we don't have guidance tonight.
 9 The idea tonight is to discuss this and decide if the applicant needs to apply for a variance. They
 10 came in under the Large Scale Redevelopment Ordinance, which allows you to grant conditional
 11 relief for a variety of items, specifically from the zoning table which would apply in the density
 12 calculation. Under Section B, it says that all other zoning regulations shall apply. The question is
 13 if this zoning regulation applies, or if they are exempt from it. He thinks we are in a great place
 14 with the project on Main Street and with any future development. The applicant has made a
 15 commitment to provide any additional residential units accompanied by workforce housing
 16 which is a great benefit for the community and the development.
 17 His initial direction to the applicant was to apply for a variance to allow ten percent of units
 18 offsite where they were required in the multi-family projects.
 19 Recommend - continue the proposal so that we can address the outstanding items, satisfy
 20 conditions of approval from the conceptual master plan and receive our outside design consultant
 21 review.

22
 23 Mark Gross, with Tuscan Village Development, is representing Tuscan Village Development
 24 LLC. What it comes down to is, you twice have allowed the ten percent to be offsite. That is the
 25 thing in this matter, is that the board has to be the administrative body that decides if we need a
 26 variance to allow what we already have offsite, to apply to the 300 units. You indicated in the
 27 2021 master plan in the approval, it says workforce housing for Tuscan Village Development can
 28 either be offsite or onsite. That determination was made in February and the ordinance wasn't
 29 passed yet. We made a commitment financially and to the town, that we'd provide an offsite
 30 location for this ten percent workforce housing. That was codified by this board in 2023 by the
 31 same condition that says ten percent of the 300 applies to the 74 offsite units. So the board has
 32 twice already codified the offsite issue. The issue is onsite as the ordinance indicates, or offsite
 33 per your two previous approvals.

34
 35 Kelly Jordan Price, attorney at Hinkley Allen and Snider, is representing Tuscan Village Master
 36 Development and Joe Faro. When Section 490-817 of the code was adopted, which requires the
 37 ten percent affordable requirement, Tuscan Village submitted an application for an amendment
 38 for its approved master plan for two buildings totaling 490 residential units. At that time it was
 39 agreed by the Planning Board that the workforce housing units could either be offsite or onsite.
 40 In direct reliance on that agreement, Mr. Faro sold a portion of the Main Street property, which is
 41 across from the site, for this 74 affordable unit development so that this requirement could be
 42 met for this project. He would not have sold his property but for his reliance on what he
 43 understood to be this commitment, with respect to his ability to satisfy the affordable
 44 requirement offsite. This issue was revisited this past August when an update to the master plan

DRAFT

1 was done. At that time it was for the approval of this 300 unit development in building 1300 that
2 we are talking about tonight. Section 7 of the approved and signed 2023 master plan update
3 explicitly states that the applicant commits to providing units equal to at least ten percent of any
4 additional residential units per the Joe Faro memo dated 7-27-23. Section 8 of that approved plan
5 explicitly states that the representations made by Mr. Faro in the 7-27-23 memo were
6 incorporated as part of the approval. The language in Mr. Faro's letter that was incorporated as
7 part of the Planning Board's approval says, "with respect to affordable housing, Tuscan will
8 commit that any future residential proposed beyond this current master plan for the Tuscan
9 Village project will provide for ten percent of affordable housing onsite. The ten percent
10 affordable requirement for the 300 residential units in building 1300 that are proposed under this
11 master plan update, is satisfied under the current 74 unit workforce housing project on Main
12 Street." So we respectfully submit to the board that this affordable housing requirement has been
13 satisfied and the board has already determined by its approval to the update to the master plan,
14 that the affordable housing can be satisfied offsite in connection with that 74 unit offsite project
15 for this 300 unit project for the building at 1300. There is also a note on the approved and signed
16 master plan, its note 2, which similarly finds that the affordable housing component for the 300
17 new units will be satisfied offsite. The board has already decided this issue and it shouldn't be an
18 issue that's being revisited at this time. Even if the master plan update was not approved by this
19 board with the offsite affordable housing component, this project is part of the innovative land
20 use control. As part of that, it empowers the Planning Board to change density requirements. So
21 the board has the power to change density requirements with respect to developments that are in
22 this zoning district. Tuscan Village is committed to the affordable requirement with respect to
23 what has been proposed. The offsite we believe, should satisfy that. Any future development, the
24 affordable will be satisfied onsite. There is a real question as to whether the workforce affordable
25 provision even applies at all to this project. She discussed the language of the regulation. There is
26 an argument that this workforce provision doesn't even apply to this project. But the applicant is
27 committed to meeting the ten percent arguable requirement, but we believe that the board already
28 decided that we can satisfy that requirement with the offsite project on Main Street.

29
30 Mr. Gross said, based on Steve Pernaw's last review, and he said he was leaving it up to the
31 Planning Board to decide, we took the 15 that are furthest away from the front door, and those
32 will be employee parking only. For the other 15, we put in traffic calming measures which he
33 discussed. The other two movements coming out of the site, which is exit only, and then
34 northbound traffic will be under stop control and that will slow down traffic for those 15 spaces
35 closest to the intersection. With it being employee parking, those 15 spaces, you won't have a lot
36 of in and out of those spaces. We don't see a concern with backing out and that's a ring road. We
37 eliminated the space that was closest to the exit from the underground parking garage. Those are
38 really for quick ins and outs. So we don't see a lot of that. Steve had recommended that people
39 back into those spaces. He was concerned that if those were spaces that people would bring
40 groceries out, the backs of the vehicles would be adjacent to the lane. But that's not the case, so
41 we don't think that's a good idea. We don't think he understood that. We believe that this will
42 work from a traffic management and flow standpoint. Mr. Gross wanted to get input from the
43 board on that. He will concentrate more on Rec Park. He showed pictures of it. We took
44 suggestions from the board. We had Halvorson overlay those different aspects onto it to give you

DRAFT

1 a comparison of the different locations. He showed the plans. This is taking those components
2 and fitting them in. It shows how you can take some of those components and put them in to the
3 space that's available. We can deal with designing this and having this tied in, as he
4 recommended, to the tenant fit up for the residential units. That is probably about a year away,
5 so that gives us a year to get this designed and finalized. We want to get it done sooner than that.
6 He then showed The Muse. With this, given what you have for tenants, like Tavern in the
7 Square, it's a family type sports bar, but more adult oriented, than what we have at the bottom of
8 the sheet with Friendly Toast, which is kid friendly. So we wanted to transition this Rec Area
9 from the bottom of the sheet, which is to the east, to the west. He mentioned seating and making
10 the space as flexible as possible so we can use it year round. He showed pictures of different
11 playground areas. We wanted to transition it to something that is recreational for adults, like a
12 putting green. Or sports related uses in the summer. And in winter we want to transition it into
13 uses for Christmas or the fall, like festivals. With the size of the development and the amount of
14 residential, you don't want everyone just going to Lake Park. You want different areas
15 throughout the development. He thinks these are good starting points. We just want to take the
16 year it will take to get this designed, and have it before we get tenant fitups and have it built prior
17 to occupancy. We want to get it built sooner than that because we will have active tenants
18 probably occupying next year. Whole Foods will probably be occupying in 2025. You will
19 probably see it built sooner than the occupancy of building 1300.

20

21 Chairman Belair asked for public input. There was none.

22

23 Mr. Feole mentioned workforce housing. He is OK with utilizing the Main Street workforce
24 housing to satisfy the needs of the current development. The applicant has stated that any future
25 plans for more residential, the workforce housing will be onsite. As far as needing a variance, he
26 would like to hear from the town attorney on that. We didn't have a variance prior to using the
27 Main Street workforce housing, right?

28 Mr. LaFontaine said, when the last conceptual master plan was approved in 2021, the ordinance
29 wasn't adopted yet so it was above and beyond anything our ordinance required.

30 Mr. Feole said he is OK using the Main Street workforce housing with the additional 300 units to
31 satisfy the amount. He would like to hear the town attorney's interpretation of the applicant's
32 opinion, and if there is any ambiguity in our ordinance, the way its worded, maybe we can have
33 the town attorney look at that too so that there are no legal challenges.

34 Chairman Belair said he concurs with Mr. Feole. He thinks the agreement with Ross was done in
35 good faith. He doesn't see an issue with applying it here. It's a win for the town. We got 74 units.
36 And anything that happens beyond that we get more.

37

38 Ms. Carlson asked, prior to the master plan update, there are 490 units?

39 Mr. LaFontaine said that the math didn't make sense, but he spoke with Mr. Gross, and he
40 reminded Jacob that when the conceptual master plan was approved in 2023, they provided us a
41 schedule and they accounted for all the residential that was approved on site, which he explained.

42 Ms. Carlson said she is fine with the offsite units being used, but her concern is if there are 409
43 units, ten percent of that is 49. There are 74 built, which leaves 25 in the bank, and with the 300
44 units, ten percent of that is 30, so there 5 are missing.

DRAFT

1 Mr. Gross explained that we looked at the original master plan from 2016 and 2018 to determine
2 what the density was from those two master plans. There was 885 units. So those 885 units that
3 were approved under the 2016 and 2018 master plan consisted of 100 townhouses, 250 units for
4 Corsa, 165 assisted living units, and 20 senior housing units, 275 units for Hanover I and in
5 building 2000 there were 75 units. So that's the base number of 885. He discussed the numbers
6 including what was originally proposed in each of the housing developments. Then the 74 units
7 allows us 740 additional units. He discussed what was included in that. He mentioned that at that
8 meeting Joe agreed that we would only use 300, and the other 143 we wouldn't even consider as
9 available density for any other projects.

10

11 Ms. Carlon asked, so we are still shy?

12 Mr. Gross said no, and he explained why.

13

14 Mr. Norcross asked, how many units are there? Corsa has how many units today?

15 Mr. Gross said 256.

16 Mr. Norcross asked how many Hanover has.

17 Mr. Gross said 281.

18 Mr. Norcross asked about Artisan.

19 Mr. Gross said 70.

20 Mr. Norcross asked, are there any other residential units that are built or being built other than
21 this 300?

22 Mr. Gross said, Hanover 2 which is 230 and Dolben 2 which is 260.

23 Mr. Norcross said, the buildings that were built that you subjected yourself to 10 percent were
24 the 256 at Corsa and the 281 at Hanover?

25 Mr. Gross said those were already built and approved, and they were not required to be ten
26 percent.

27

28 Mr. Norcross said he is trying to calculate, what is built and already approved to be built,
29 including the 300, what is that number? Are we under 740 units? The math does show that there
30 were buildings built that have nothing to do with the ten percent. Then you only add in the units
31 that were subject to the 10 percent that was agreed to, and then applied on the 300. If you do that
32 math, you are under 74 units. At the end of the day, are you meeting the ten percent level of the
33 new things after the update, and he thinks answer is yes. Why are we revisiting this?

34 Mr. Gross said, the way he understands it, the town attorney was going to make a determination
35 because in order for us to appeal that, we need a determination that we need a variance. The town
36 attorney was going to issue that, until he and Attorney Sokol spoke at length about all these
37 issues that Attorney Price brought up. And he decided that there was probably some merit to the
38 issue of if we needed to provide any workforce housing for this project. Given all the
39 information about how the board acted in terms of the on/offsite, which is the issue, he felt that
40 since the Planning Board had already made that determination twice with the on and offsite
41 issue, in 2021 and 2023, he was leaving it up to you to make the determination on if we need a
42 variance.

43 Mr. LaFontaine said he doesn't question the fact that the condition of approval was met, and the
44 board made that determination. He explained that the reason we are here is because we adopted

DRAFT

1 the ordinance in 2021, which he then read, regarding projects needing affordable units. He
2 doesn't think it's compelling to say that residential is not an allowed use in the Commercial
3 Industrial District, therefore there is no density. He thinks the density would be zero and you are
4 exceeding it. But they did come in under the Large Scale Redevelopment Ordinance, which
5 allows you to waive all sorts of things, which he discussed. He explained why it's complicated.
6 Because they are under the innovative land use, that's where it gets murky.

7 Mr. Norcross asked, should we just wait on an opinion from our town attorney?

8 Mr. LaFontaine said, we can but he thinks the attorney was waiting to get a feel from the board.
9 An administrative decision can come from the Planning Board. They are responsible for
10 interpreting the ordinance and Jacob is too. We can get more guidance from the attorney, but it
11 got kicked to this board.

12

13 Mr. Lewis asked, if we waive something, does it have to be a motion?

14 Mr. LaFontaine said, it could be that formal. You may want to, since you are making an
15 administrative decision. If you state that they need a variance, that would be appealed. If you
16 decide they don't, that may get appealed by an aggrieved party, but he doesn't know that it
17 would happen.

18 Mr. Lewis said, if we take action here, he would still like to have the attorney review the
19 language that we use for that motion.

20 Chairman Belair said, if we have a concurrence that it works, then we don't need a motion.

21

22 Mrs. Harvey said, there was a suggestion made earlier that our attorney make recommendations
23 on changes that could be made to zoning to alleviate this issue in the future. She would like to
24 hear what our attorney says about that. We can discuss what they recommend, and take it to
25 Town Council, and they can make a zoning change to get us out of this in the future. For the
26 immediate time, she thinks we should put this to bed for the evening and wait until we hear from
27 our attorney.

28 Mr. LaFontaine said he thinks the concurrence from the board, is that right now it sounds like the
29 board is comfortable with workforce housing offsite. He can speak with the attorney about the
30 concurrence from the board.

31 Chairman Belair asked Jacob to find out if we are making a mistake. He thinks the agreement
32 that Ross and Joe Faro made was in good faith and they honored it and he doesn't think it was
33 done with any malice. He thinks we can get a win out of it. So we are good with that one.

34

35 Joe Faro said, to him there is no reason why it should not be clear. We had a specific
36 conversation with Ross and Jacob in 2020. When he first heard that idea, because of the
37 development as it was at that time, visualized and the costs involved, he found it difficult to
38 figure out how to do that and we continued to work with Ross and Jacob, and we figured out how
39 to do that. There was a conceptual master plan approval, which is a legal document by which we
40 were then approved, to put the workforce housing offsite. And we made a multi-million dollar
41 commitment based on that approval. And that commitment had a formula attached to it by which
42 the workforce housing would work. We ratified it again in August 2023. For him, everyone can
43 question it, but not only do we have those documents, but we have conversations that took place
44 with board members and with Jacob and Ross. When we looked at the extra units, we said we

DRAFT

1 understand that there is a need and we will fulfill that need. Not only with the 74 units, but with
2 the additional ten percent and that will be on site. He has a problem with revisiting it. He doesn't
3 think you would want him revisiting all the commitments he has made. It is in writing, and it is a
4 hand shake and he honors his commitments. Those are two master plan updates that are signed
5 approvals and were voted into action by the Planning Board, and we then went and made
6 significant decisions and proceeded with our project based on those decisions. So for him it is
7 very clear.

8
9 Mr. Lewis said, one thing that was hanging him up on this project, is whether or not we had
10 anything on the record. At the time it didn't sound like we did, but now it sounds like we do. We
11 had a note on the master plan and language in the 2021 update. We actually have legal
12 documented language.

13 Mr. LaFontaine said that's correct. He thinks the condition to workforce housing is met. This
14 board did reinforce that in 2023. The only hangup is where the amendment came in. That is why
15 this came up. It wasn't to revisit the discussions in 2020. He explained that the question needed
16 to be raised. When the town approved the amendment in 2021, these 300 units weren't
17 envisioned and that's why the question came up. Certainly the applicant has satisfied the 2021
18 condition and he thinks the board hasn't determined that the condition of 2023 was met when
19 you approved the master plan in August. So it was separate from the condition. As they did in
20 2021, they were under no obligation to provide any workforce housing. They did that in response
21 to comments from the public and from the board to their credit, and it was a great success for the
22 development and the community as a whole. But the hang up for the question came up because
23 we had this amendment that other projects are subject to, and we have this project that has been
24 ongoing since 2016 when we approved the first master plan. That's where the question was
25 raised.

26 Mr. Lewis said he just wants to understand all the pieces and if there are I's to dot and T's to
27 cross, he wants to do that. He is fine with this. He wants to hear from the town attorney, but he is
28 fine with letting this go.

29
30 Attorney Price said her understanding is, her partner John Sokel spoke with town counsel and
31 they felt that the board was empowered to make the determination if a variance is needed. And
32 we believe that a variance is not needed for all the reasons we articulated and we respectfully
33 request that the board make the determination that we don't need a variance, and we can satisfy
34 the affordable housing requirement offsite.

35 Mr. Norcross asked to table this matter. Do we have an issue with 60 versus 80 percent? Is it 60
36 or 80?

37 Mr. LaFontaine said, it is 60 percent for a portion and as low as 30 for others, but 80 percent
38 wouldn't qualify. He discussed this.

39
40 Chairman Belair mentioned circulation.

41 Joe Feole said he doesn't have any problem with how it's designed. He has never seen a good
42 parking lot in his life. It is not any worse than anything he has ever seen so he is OK with it.

DRAFT

- 1 Mr. Lewis said his only concern is the Door Dash quick pick up spots. He asked Mr. Gross to
2 talk about sight lines from the garage. How do you envision that working? He is thinking there
3 will be a fender bender.
- 4 Mr. Gross said, when you come out of the garage, you'll be stopping. So anyone backing out,
5 you will see them. It is a direct line of sight but they won't be backing out into the direct path of
6 those people exiting. They are coming up at an incline, so they are going slow to begin with.
7 Those spaces, they are not like regular customer spaces, so you may not get anyone in them at
8 all. It is not like Walmart where you pick up groceries.
- 9 Mr. Lewis asked, do we envision a door that specifically serves those spots?
- 10 Mr. Gross said he thinks they have to walk around to the main entrance.
- 11 Mr. Lewis asked, can we eliminate these spots?
- 12 Mr. Gross said, he can't say that we can eliminate them, but if he had to guess, they may not use
13 them for that purpose. It's not a lot of in and out. We will have an answer for you at the next
14 meeting.
- 15 Ms. Carlson said she doesn't think eliminating the spaces is the way to go. She doesn't think
16 they are in a good spot, but any spaces we can get is worth having.
- 17 Mr. Pelletier said this parking plan, with parking for personnel use is a great idea. There is
18 nothing wrong with this plan.
- 19 Mrs. Harvey said that part of the changes are, pedestrian bridge is no longer proposed to garage.
20 What are we talking about?
- 21 Mr. Gross said, the pedestrian bridge between the parking garage that is now built and the
22 building next to it. So this one will not have that. Residents who park in the garage will have to
23 go to the ground floor and walk, and there is an entrance on the ground floor for residents.
- 24 Mrs. Harvey asked, so they don't have to go outside?
- 25 Mr. Gross said yes, they will a little.
- 26 Mrs. Harvey said, its typically men that design these things and women walk outside with high
27 heels.
- 28 Mr. Gross said it has nothing to do with that, it's a cost consideration.
- 29 Mrs. Harvey said she is also thinking quality of life. Bridges between parking areas and
30 residential units if you are in dressy clothes, it's a selling feature. It can increase the value of
31 your property because you don't have to walk outside in the rain or snow.
- 32
- 33 Ms. Carlson said, as someone who has designed a few of these, she doesn't see it impacting
34 anything.
- 35 Mr. Gross said, every other residential development, there is no covered parking. Hanover and
36 Corsa are all open walking areas.
- 37 Mrs. Harvey said, some people did suggest that it may be a good idea to have a parking garage
38 over there.
- 39
- 40 Chairman Belair mentioned recreation.
- 41 Mr. Gross said he thinks we are going in the right direction.
- 42 Mr. Lewis asked about a splash pad.
- 43 Mr. Gross said he received a text from Joe Faro with an article about a child dying from an injury
44 at a splash pad.

DRAFT

1 Mr. Feole said he appreciates you listening to the board. This is what we intended. It fits with the
 2 spirit and architecture and the aesthetics of the development. He thinks it will be an economic
 3 driver and he appreciates you putting the architectural concepts together.
 4 Ms. Carlson thinks it looks great and it was exactly what we were pushing for. Thanks for
 5 listening.
 6 Mr. Pelletier said that the design team did an excellent job, it looks great. We are here to build a
 7 beautiful area with accommodations for everyone. Regarding The Muse area, to keep that
 8 seasonal, is a very good idea. He thinks it will be very attractive. If you can put lots of seating in
 9 this area because there will be pedestrians moving back and forth from the parking lot, to the
 10 downtown by the fountain area. He foresees a lot of foot traffic in that direction and people will
 11 want to take a break walking from the fountain to their car.
 12 Mr. Gross said, very similar to Lake Park, it has bench seating around. There is plenty of those in
 13 that area.
 14 Mr. Norcross said, for those who don't see the outside consultant's notes, he then read those
 15 comments, saying it is an inclusive, welcoming place for all. Also, on the bike bridge, is that part
 16 of this site plan? What is the status of that?
 17 Mr. Gross said, when the railtrail is built, which is now a town project, funded with grants and
 18 Tuscan share, that will be the time to put that bridge in and it would probably coincide with
 19 where it is coming into the site.
 20 Mr. Norcross asked, is the bike bridge conditional?
 21 Mr. LaFontaine said we haven't conditioned it but we asked about it. It is shown as a future
 22 pedestrian bridge. There are some items that need to be sorted out prior to the railtrail. If the
 23 applicant doesn't feel that the timing makes sense now, then hopefully we can figure it out at
 24 building 4000.
 25 Mr. Gross said it doesn't make sense to put it in if we don't have a railtrail to go to. The town is
 26 on its way to get the final part of that approved, which is the crossing at the Coke plant, but that
 27 will take a little time. It is in process with NHDOT and all those agencies.

28
 29 **MOTION by Mr. Feole to continue the Tuscan Village master development.**

30 **SECOND by Mr. Lewis.**

31
 32 **VOTE ON MOTION: 6 - 1 (Mr. Pelletier opposed.)**

33
 34 Mr. Pelletier said his opposition is, due to the fact that he feels all the aspects and all the
 35 conditions have been granted, especially for workforce housing.
 36 Chairman Belair said, we still have some outstanding items.

37
 38 **NEW BUSINESS**

- 39
 40 1. MAIN STREET 380, LLC SITE PLAN – Public Hearing for 28 age-restricted residential
 41 units at 380 Main Street, Map 76, Lot 7303.

42
 43 **MOTION by Mr. Feole to accept the Main Street 380, LLC site plan application as**
 44 **complete.**

DRAFT

1 **SECOND by Mr. Lewis.**

2
 3 **VOTE ON MOTION: 7 – 0**
 4 **UNANIMOUS**

5
 6 Abutters: There were no abutters present.

7
 8 Michael Malynowski, Allen and Major, civil engineers, is here with Kim and David Abair, the
 9 owners, and Suzanne Brunelle from Divine Millimet, the attorney. This is our second or third
 10 time that we have been back for this site. Currently, we are looking at building 3, which is the
 11 rear building. It is a two story office building consisting of about 15,000 square feet. The
 12 proposal is to convert that two story building in the back, to 24 age restricted housing units and
 13 associated improvements. We have added additional landscaping to enhance the islands in the
 14 front. The middle building was approved last month or the month before for a daycare use. We
 15 are providing some additional buffer between the previously approved daycare use, and the
 16 assisted living. We have proposed 206 parking spaces. It is a net decrease of 16. Fifteen of which
 17 were lost during the daycare conversion for a playground and we have an additional one space
 18 that is being removed along the northern side. There is an aisleway to the north side of the
 19 building. We are proposing to take out some of the pavement and add some additional
 20 landscaping up against the building and address the throat in that area. So we have a net loss of
 21 one space. The plans call for 81, we have 206, so we meet the requirements. Part of the previous
 22 approval included new water lines that are being installed for fire protection that was approved
 23 under the daycare use. We have a new septic system expansion that currently sits under the
 24 parking lot. Due to the new residential units, we have expansion of that septic system that is
 25 being proposed. All three buildings have their own systems. Based on the load, we have adequate
 26 capacity for the entire site. One of the comments from the town was to provide some trip
 27 generation information to Steve Pernaw, the town’s outside peer reviewer. We did provide a
 28 memo summarizing our findings. Based on our report we submitted, we have a net increase in
 29 traffic from when the site was office. There were three buildings of office space. We have a net
 30 decrease overall. During the AM peak we have a slight increase. During PM peak we have about
 31 50 cars and that is mostly due to the daycare use.

32
 33 Staff comments:

34 They are converting 2 buildings to 28 age restricted residential units. Building 1 will continue to
 35 have an office component which is great because it is a mixed use along Main Street, which we
 36 like to see.

37 They are on town water and private septic.

38 We got comments from the Health Officer that stated a new septic design will be needed for the
 39 residential use.

40 He met with Mr. Malynowski and they made a lot of modifications to the site.

41 They submitted elevation drawings and both buildings are attractive.

42 We spoke about sight distance. Typically we have it reviewed by the Safety Officer. This just
 43 needs some brush to be cleaned up. He showed pictures of the site.

DRAFT

1 Mr. Malynowski did talk about the travel lane behind the building. They did remove some
2 pavement so that this could be narrowed a little as a traffic calming mechanism. We need the
3 aisle width so that fire can review that.

4 Regarding parking, they eliminated 15 spaces previously for the daycare. They will eliminate
5 additional spaces. The trip generation memo was provided and is being reviewed by the traffic
6 consultant. We are waiting for his memo.

7 The impact fee is to be calculated.

8 NHDOT approval is needed because that portion of Main Street is a State road.

9 There is a comment about relocating two ADA spaces, which he discussed. Mr. Malynowski said
10 they are proposing to keep those and provide two additional.

11 Another comment was that the applicant should note lot coverage and building coverage. He
12 thinks they'll still meet that.

13 He mentioned parking calculations. Here we are significantly overparked. They require 81
14 spaces, and they provided 206 spaces. One comment was that the board should discuss the
15 possibility of eliminating additional spaces to increase open space, and improve site circulation.

16 One comment from Mr. Pernaw was, this is large expansive pavement, so is there an ability to
17 eliminate some of the space here? Do we really need one way circulation and is it more
18 pragmatic to have these spaces be at 90 degree angles? You can do that because they will be
19 significantly over parked if no modifications are made.

20 He noted that if this came in under the Senior Housing Overlay, fifty percent of the area would
21 have to be open space. His thought was that even though they are here under a variance, they
22 should still be cognizant of the requirements that we request for senior housing developments.

23 At least ten percent of units are dedicated to be affordable per our ordinance 498-17. The board
24 should discuss if this proposal constitutes one or two multi-family projects, to determine how
25 many units are required. He thinks it would be reasonable, there are 28 units, 4 in the front
26 building, and 24 in the rear. If you interpret the rear building to be one project, then building one
27 is separate. You need 4 but it is reasonable to say, it's one project and then you need 3.

28 A planting schedule has been provided.

29 He mentioned circulation. He would like Steve Pernaw to comment on this. His only concern is
30 that we'll have a play area that will be fenced, but his assumption is that people exiting the site
31 will be traveling at a slower speed than people entering. So he wants Mr. Pernaw to review the
32 circulation. Mr. Malynowski said that they narrowed this out to try to address some of that
33 concern.

34

35 Mr. Malynowski then explained that it will be employee parking. The front of building 2 is split
36 so you have half of a first floor coming into the lower level and then a full second story accessed
37 from the back where the playground is. The main entrance is on the lower level, so the parking
38 spaces in front will be primarily where drop-off would be. To use parking along the back and
39 next to the shed for employees makes sense and eliminates traffic.

40

41 Mr. LaFontaine thinks that's a great idea to designate it employee parking. The concern was just
42 being cognizant of the mix of uses on this site. Designating those as employee spaces would be
43 helpful.

DRAFT

1 He had comments about landscaping. The approved plan is old, but they add pines that were
2 planted. Some are missing, and the thought was to replace evergreens. You can see the street at a
3 distance away. There is not a lot of visibility, but our ordinance talks about replacing vegetation.
4 They did an excellent job on other properties in town so he doesn't doubt that they will do an
5 excellent job here. But the comment was to just supplement areas that need it. He showed
6 pictures of the site including the area that will be narrowed.
7 Our ordinance talks about ground level mechanicals being screened. This is set far back, which
8 he showed on the site. You can see it from the street, but it is not prominent. But the board can
9 discuss if anything needs to be done there or if you are OK.
10 They have added vegetated screening which is great.
11 The plan states that no wall sign is proposed. If a freestanding sign is proposed, it should be
12 located on the plan, and a detail should be provided. They have an attractive sign but it is in the
13 right-of-way. If they replace that, we want them to show something.
14 The public safety impact fees will need to be calculated.
15 We still have Engineering, Fire Department and Police Department comments pending.
16 He has comments from the Health Officer.
17 Recommend – continuance. We are waiting for approvals from staff and the outside traffic
18 consultant.
19
20 Chairman Belair asked for public input. There was none.
21
22 Mrs. Harvey said, in the site plan, it says pedestrian circulation. It only mentions the sidewalks
23 inside the property. On our last two senior housing developments we have required that the
24 developer provide sidewalk access to the adjacent places where people will want to go. There is
25 that mini mall area on the corner of Main Street and Hampstead Road, which will be an
26 attraction for this age group. It is not a very long distance to the first entryway into that
27 development, but she thinks a sidewalk on the edge of Route 97 should be considered for that
28 section. And some kind of lighting. She thinks that is important for the 28 units going in. That is
29 an important consideration.
30 Mr. LaFontaine said, it is age restricted, not under senior housing. It is here by variance.
31 Chairman Belair said, he doesn't think that applies since it's not senior housing.
32 Mrs. Harvey said, it is age restricted which gets it into that category.
33 Mr. LaFontaine said it is 55 plus, but it is a self-imposed restriction. They could have come in
34 under the Senior Housing Overlay ordinance, which allows developments similar to this, but
35 instead they went to the ZBA and got a variance for use and density and then they came before
36 this board for that. So it is not here under the Senior Housing Overlay ordinance.
37 Chairman Belair said, and that is a State highway.
38 Mr. Malynowski said, for us to put a sidewalk in, we would have to go through the State, which
39 he would bet that they won't allow us to put a short section of sidewalk, since there are none
40 now.
41 Chairman Belair said it is not required but it's a suggestion.
42
43 Mr. Lewis asked, the age restriction is 55 plus?
44 Mr. Malynowski said yes.

DRAFT

1 Mr. Lewis asked, why is it in two buildings rather than a single building? This eventually will
2 come down to, is this one project or two? Should I ask for 4 affordable units or should I ask for
3 3?
4

5 Suzanne Brunelle, attorney from Divine, Millimet and Branch in Manchester, said that we
6 appeared before the ZBA on October 3rd. We initially filed for 6 variances. We received 4
7 variances and withdrew 2 with regards to the ten percent requirement on the affordable housing.
8 It is pretty high level, we were not making much traction there, so we withdrew. The idea is to
9 maintain a mixed use there. They are beautiful buildings and the first one is designed for
10 professional offices and we'd like to keep that on the bottom floor. It is less traffic and the idea
11 of using top levels, there is not a lot of office being rented these days. So they thought it would
12 make sense to put housing there. We see this as one project. It will be built out at the same time.
13 We were looking for the lower number, but we are looking at it as one project with multi-use.
14 It's a unique property and the idea is to keep the unique use.

15 Mr. Lewis said he gets the idea that it is all one project, but it is two distinct buildings. Is that just
16 a matter of, there are two existing buildings and that is why you are doing it?

17 Attorney Brunelle said, we are, there are three buildings and she explained what will be in each.
18 Regarding the age restriction, it is a self-imposed restriction.

19 Ms. Carlson asked, this is one lot?

20 Attorney Brunelle said yes.

21 Ms. Carlson said she imagines it being one project. So the ten percent should apply to the
22 project, the 28 rather than the 24 and 4.

23 Mr. LaFontaine said that makes sense. He read what the ordinance says. It does allow the
24 Planning Board some leeway for interpretation. They will be built concurrently and it is all one
25 site, to interpret that the 28 units are one project and they require 3 units as opposed to 4.

26 Ms. Carlson said she thinks it would be fair to say it is one project. If the affordable component
27 of it is self-imposed, how would compliance work with making sure the units stay affordable?

28 Attorney Brunelle said that the applicant wants to provide affordable housing and they want to
29 do it voluntarily. The ordinance doesn't have specific provisions as far as what to do. We have
30 discussed this with the town. They would like to handle this privately and file a report annually
31 that they are meeting the criteria in the ordinance. When third parties are involved, it is
32 complicated and expensive. We have 28 units. They are a well-known commodity and have other
33 properties here. We are looking to handle it privately.

34 Ms. Carlson said she has no problem with it being done privately. She was curious of the
35 logistics of it.

36 Mr. LaFontaine said that the staff recommendation is that there be a affordable housing
37 restrictive covenant and historically, we have a third party review. In the past, we have used
38 Neighborworks to audit it. They don't do multi-family audits. We did have a meeting with them
39 yesterday to get guidance and they said they would not be willing to provide third party review
40 since this is multi-family. They suggested that we ask New Hampshire Housing.

41 Ms. Carlson said she doesn't think it is necessary to go through the State, but if there was some
42 sort of third party involved to cross check.

43 Attorney Brunell said that many towns take care of it internally. We are talking about three units.
44 The reason we went for the variance, and she thinks we have a very good legal argument for it,

DRAFT

1 but since there is no requirement for that zone because of the use they were putting in there, that
2 we are not overburdening it so we don't trigger the requirements to even look at this because we
3 are not increasing the density. These applicants are happy to voluntarily move forward with the
4 age restriction and the workforce and meet the criteria, but their concern is third party review. If
5 they are able to provide certificates to you annually and be reviewed and you can put some
6 enforcement provision in there, if they are not meeting that criteria, and it gets recorded at the
7 Registry of Deeds.

8 Mr. LaFontaine said, it is not a willingness not to do it, he would be happy to do it. But we have
9 a lot going on. Other communities have a greater staff capacity. He would like to explore with
10 New Hampshire Housing.

11 Chairman Belair said, so the onus is on you to come up with a condition so that you don't have
12 to do more work.

13 Ms. Carlson said it is also important to handle this now because it could be setting a precedent
14 for future developments. She thinks having another set of eyes on it could be helpful.

15
16 Mr. Lewis agree with Ms. Carlson. They are not coming in under Senior Housing Overlay, is that
17 because of the 50 percent lot area rule? Because 50 percent of lot area would have to be open
18 space.

19 Mr. Malynowski said, the attorneys have looked at that. What we are doing here, it doesn't fit
20 either of those. Attorney Brunelle had indicated that by statute we don't fit the mold, so it's how
21 can we apply rules for something we don't fit to?

22 Mr. Lewis asked, what, if any, discussions were had about turning some of that parking into
23 wooded area, and general upland?

24 Mr. Malynowski said it is always tough to go to a developer when they are trying to actively re-
25 use a funky shaped lot. It's tough to say you need to tear up pavement just to tear up pavement. It
26 is an expense that he can't push onto his client or suggest to his client unless there is an absolute
27 need. It is an existing facility that is unique in its shape and character. It's tough for him to say,
28 tear up pavement just to tear up pavement. It is buffered. The building is almost 400 feet from
29 the road. There is a large wetland system that screens the vast majority of that site. There is
30 existing vegetation on the perimeters of the site, that screen the site. To go in and tear up
31 pavement, it's tough to justify that.

32 Mr. LaFontaine said, the idea wasn't just to tear up pavements, it is to improve site circulation.
33 He mentioned what Mr. Pernaw's comments will be. This is a pretty substantial change of use so
34 it is an opportunity to consider comments like this.

35 Chairman Belair said, up until three years ago, we thought office buildings would be worth using
36 but they are not. And we just learned that New Hampshire is 20,000 housing units in the hole.

37 They want to use something that is not being used for something that can be used. We shouldn't
38 make this too complicated. This is not in an industrial park. It is a little complicated. It is 3 office
39 buildings and they want to turn it into something that will help. We just talked about the other
40 place, and getting units. We need to figure out what we have to do to make this work. He doesn't
41 see why it shouldn't.

42 Mr. LaFontaine thinks it will work. There are some things we can discuss with the applicant.
43 They have already made several amendments to the original proposal which we appreciate.

DRAFT

1 Mrs. Harvey is wondering about the words and definitions that are being used. We have been
 2 using the term affordable housing which is different than workforce housing. She discussed the
 3 difference. The distinction needs to be made. We don't have an affordable housing ordinance
 4 because we replaced it with the workforce housing ordinance. They are two different things so
 5 that distinction needs to be made in the conversations that are being had here.
 6 Mr. LaFontaine explained what is in the ordinance.
 7 Mrs. Harvey said, the term affordable housing has been being used in the conversation here, and
 8 if that is not the accurate term then we need to make that correction.
 9 Attorney Brunelle explained that this project doesn't qualify for workforce housing under the
 10 statute. Its age restricted and they are all studio apartments being proposed. She mentioned the
 11 workforce housing ordinance and it uses the word affordable in the definition.
 12 Mr. LaFontaine explained that the RSA defines the workforce housing. We have workforce
 13 housing and this ordinance points out 60 percent ARI. He explained this.
 14 Mrs. Harvey asked, are we talking about workforce housing by definition of the income levels,
 15 or affordable housing by the State's definition for affordable housing, which is a much lower
 16 income level?
 17 Mr. LaFontaine said we don't reference the State RSA in this ordinance. He explained the
 18 ordinance.
 19 Ms., Carlson asked, do you have an idea of what the proposed AMI would be?
 20 Attorney Brunelle said, we do not. She explained that there is overlapping.

21
 22 There was discussion of this issue.

23
 24 **MOTION by Mr. Feole to continue the Main Street 380, LLC site plan.**
 25 **SECOND by Mr. Lewis.**

26
 27 **VOTE ON MOTION: 7 - 0**
 28 **UNANIMOUS**

29
 30 2. TUSCAN VILLAGE JEWEL BUILDING 1, LLC – Public Hearing for a conditional use
 31 permit for vinyl murals at 100 Via Toscana, Map 108, Lot 12577.

32
 33 **MOTION by Mr. Feole to accept the Tuscan Village Jewel Building 1 LLC application as**
 34 **complete.**
 35 **SECOND by Mr. Lewis.**

36
 37 **VOTE ON MOTION: 7 – 0**
 38 **UNANIMOUS**

39
 40 Abutters: There were no abutters present.

41
 42 Farley Gates, representing Arif Jacksi, of Alphagraphics out of NYC and part of the Jones
 43 Group. He is here to make sure we can get a permit for those final graphics. The proposal is to
 44 cover the windows that have stud walls behind them to enhance the environment there. Our

DRAFT

1 request is to put vinyl graphics to display an atmosphere in the environment it exists in. It is to
2 cover up a space that is filled with windows, so it is just to conceal stud walls.

3
4 Chairman Belair said, we have a letter that spells out the criteria. We can reference the letter.

5
6 Staff Comments:

7 He showed the existing building which is Shake Shack and they are proposing to add vinyl
8 murals to those 6 panels to the rear that are currently blacked out. They require a conditional use
9 permit. It will be a total of 105 square feet each for three panels. Each 3 panels will be two
10 murals. They require a conditional use permit because under the sign standards they can
11 incorporate art work. He explained the standards. There is a provision in the ordinance, and we
12 did this for the murals on Tuscan Market. He showed what is currently there and what they
13 propose. He showed the full mural.

14 He then showed an example of the mural at Penn Station in New York with the same artist. And
15 another one that the artist did in Connecticut. One thing he was impressed with of Shake Shack is
16 that they incorporate local landmarks. He showed one in China with bamboo. He also showed
17 other locations. He thinks they did thoughtful things in other locations.

18 One recommendation is that, if the board is comfortable with the graphics proposed, that in the
19 future if and when its replaced, that they incorporate local landmarks so that it is more in keeping
20 with Tuscan. If the board feels strongly that they want something that does convey a sense of
21 place then it would be appropriate to direct that to the applicant, and they can come in with a
22 revision similar to the other examples we saw. He tried to contact Ari Jaffey and he was trying to
23 reach out to the client but Jacob hasn't had a response.

24
25 Mr. Gates said, one concern is getting the graphics up because behind it is stud walls. We have
26 black vinyl up to conceal that because it is unsightly. Our hope is that we can put these up and
27 change them at a later date. Mr. LaFontaine had mentioned incorporating some New England
28 themes and things like the Rockingham Mall, Old Man of the Mountains, and LL Bean, to bring
29 a little back to the environment that it is in.

30 Chairman Belair asked, why wasn't that done to start with?

31 Mr. Gates said, this is typically what they do. They do whimsical things and when people ask to
32 incorporate it into the space, they try to bring it back. Our only concern is that we are getting to
33 the time of year when we can't do graphics when it is under 45 degrees. They are re-addressing
34 that and hiring local artists to incorporate local things like the racetrack and amusement parks
35 and the things Jacob recommended.

36 Mr. Lewis asked, what is the timeline here? How close are we to seeing Shake Shack open?

37 Mr. Gates said, they are opening in 3-4 weeks.

38 Chairman Belair said he saw that they are opening on the 30th.

39 Mr. Lewis asked, is it possible to incorporate a condition with a time limit? This will open soon
40 and they need to have something up there. It is probably better than a black wall. Is there a way
41 for us to set a hard date and then talk about putting new graphics in? He suggested that they
42 speak with the Salem Historical Society and work with Mr. Gross who put a great deal of effort
43 into their building designs. Is that possible?

DRAFT

1 Mr. LaFontaine said he thinks so. We want some commitment from Shake Shack. The worst case
2 scenario is it goes up and we say 6 months from now, you need to come back in and revise the
3 murals. And they don't come back, and we are trying to chase them. He thinks it's worth a shot
4 to address it that way, and then in six months, hopefully they come back. But probably prior to
5 the sign permit being issued, if Shake Shack submits something that re-iterates that commitment
6 it would give us that enforcement mechanism. The alternative is if you took a hard line approach,
7 that no we are going to keep as is and come back with something that satisfies us and we'll
8 approve it, but if the board is comfortable with these graphics for like 6 months and Shake Shack
9 submits something.

10 Mr. Gates said that six months is more than enough time. They are actively pursuing it. Their
11 concern is that we are getting into November and under 45 degrees we can't install it so that's
12 the concern.

13 Mr. Lewis said, when we talk about a new design, he wants to see something specific to Salem.
14 He would like to see Canobie, and see references to the track and local history. Your client knew
15 they were going to open, and that they had an opening date in cold weather. We can either have
16 you leave stud walls up or allow this graphic.

17
18 Mr. LaFontaine read the following conditions:

- 19 1. Sign shall be modified within 6 months of installation to incorporate dramatic elements of the
20 region Salem and Tuscan's unique sense of place and shall be reviewed by the Planning Board.
- 21 2. All representations made by applicant or agents and all notes on the plan are incorporated as
22 part of the approval.
- 23 3. We want written confirmation from the applicant that shall be submitted prior to issuance of
24 currently proposed murals.

25
26 Mr. Norris asked, has Tuscan Development approved this design? Do they have to approve this?

27 Mr. LaFontaine said yes. They would have had to submit a letter of authorization which is in the
28 packet. His predecessor thought it would be a good idea to hire Mr. Gross to provide our
29 oversight of the signage at Tuscan Village. So any time signage comes in, Mr. Gross submits a
30 letter of compliance and it serves as authorization of the property owner.

31 Mr. Pelletier asked, has this mural already been printed?

32 Mr. Gates said no.

33 Mr. Pelletier said, they can go back to their files and get something similar. He mentioned trees,
34 lakes, or ponds may look better. This one looks like Taco Bell. The bright yellow has no bearing
35 on what Tuscan is all about. Anything is better than this.

36 Mr. Gates said, they already contacted a local artist.

37
38 **MOTION by Mr. Feole to grant a conditional use permit for Tuscan Village Jewel Building**
39 **1, LLC with the 3 conditions as stipulated by Mr. LaFontaine.**
40 **SECOND by Mr. Lewis.**

41
42 Mr. Feole said, Jacob mentioned that they need a commitment from Shake Shack. But Mr. Feole
43 thinks they made a public commitment.

DRAFT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

VOTE ON MOTION: 7 - 0
UNANIMOUS

MOTION by Mr. Feole to adjourn.
SECOND by Mr. Lewis.

VOTE ON MOTION: 7 - 0
UNANIMOUS

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

For further information, kindly refer to the DVD dated 10/24/2023, located in the Planning Office.

Minutes by: Susan Strugnell, Planning Board Recording Secretary
Approved: Planning Board
Date: