



CITY OF SALEM

MEETING AGENDA

A public hearing for the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, September 17, 2026, at 6:30 p.m. via remote access. Public participation was possible via Zoom video and conference call.

Acting Chair Jonathan Berk calls the meeting to order at 6:30 pm

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Jonathan Berk, Elena Eimert, Tom Furey, Helen Sides, Josh Turiel, and Graham Wing (6)

Absent: Chair Kirt Rieder, Vice Chair Sarah Tarbet, Zach Caunter (3)

Arriving Late: (0)

Leaving Early: (0)

Also in attendance: Claudia Cunningham, Planner; Beth Rennard, part-time City Solicitor

II. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 56 Margin Street, 54 Margin Street, 7 High Street, 20 Endicott Street (Map 25, Lot 597), 24 Endicott Street (Map 25, Lot 595)

Applicant: Harborlight Homes and Lifebridge North Shore

Description: A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of Harborlight Homes and Lifebridge North Shore at 56, 54 Margin Street, 20 Endicott Street, 7 High Street (Map 25, Lot 597) and 24 Endicott Street (Map 25, Lot 595) in the Residential Two-Family District (R2), Coastal Resilience Overlay District (C-ROD), Flood Hazard Overlay District (FHOD), and Smart Growth Overlay District (SGOD) for Smart Growth Overlay Plan Review and Coastal Resilience Overlay Site Plan Review in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 7.4 Smart Growth Overlay District and Section 8.9 Coastal Resiliency Overlay District. Specifically, the applicant proposes the demolition of the buildings at 24 Endicott Street (Map 25, Lot 595) and 56 Margin Street (Map 25, Lot 597), the adaptive reuse of 54 Margin Street (Map 25, Lot 597), and the preservation of the façade of 20 Endicott Street (Map 25, Lot 597) to accommodate for a 22,806 square foot building comprised of 53 affordable homes, a shelter with 70 beds, and supportive programming space along with other site improvements. Thirteen parking spaces are proposed on site.

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

Pat Connolly of Harborlight Homes and Stefano Basso of SV Design are in attendance for the applicant.

The team has been working through the civil peer review, hoping to have something for October 15, 2026.

Mr. Basso shares his screen. On the memorial yard. They had a site visit with the Design Review Board (DRB) and community members and are making progress with the design. The egress has moved in to free up space for the memorial yard, losing a couple of parking spaces; the yard is smaller but in same location as current. The bell, benches, bricks, and WWII memorial will stay. They may add plaques to tell the history of the site. The yard now measures 28' x 17' x 9'. The egress from fire stairs comes through this way. The exterior siding has been lightened; the site visit led to a different color selection.

Public Comment

None

Planning Board Comments

Ms. Sides finds this much improved. She went on the DRB walk and feels the project is going in the right direction. The memorial yard changes seem to be an improvement, even to what is there currently. Recommends removing the wood panes between windows. Mr. Basso asks if there is another detail to add or simpler façade? Ms. Sides says simpler façade, it fits in the neighborhood more now.

Ms. Eimert mentions again that she is not voting but offers that the team has been working with the neighborhood as evidenced with the memorial yard.

A motion to extend the project deadline for forty-five days is made by Tom Furey, seconded by Josh Turiel, and passes 5-0, with one abstention.

Jonathan Berk	Y
Elena Eimert	A
Tom Furey	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Graham Wing	Y

A motion to continue to the October 15, 2026, Planning Board meeting is made by Josh Turiel, seconded by Helen Sides, and passes 5-0 in a roll call vote with one abstention.

Jonathan Berk	Y
Elena Eimert	A
Tom Furey	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Graham Wing	Y

B. 57 Wharf Street Units UCB and UCC, and 201 Derby Street (Map 34, Lot 408)

Applicant: Christina Granese f/b/o Pickering Wharf Complex, LLC; Rockett Manag & Realty CO

Description: A continuation of public hearing for all persons interested in the application of Christina Granese f/b/o Pickering Wharf Complex, LLC; Rockett Manag & Realty CO at 57 Wharf Street Units UCB and UCC, and 201 Derby Street (Map 34, Lot 408) in the B5 Central Development Zoning District, Flood Hazard Overlay District (FHOD) and Coastal Resilience Overlay District (C-ROD) for Site Plan Review and C-ROD Site Plan Review in accordance with sections 9.5 Site Plan Review and 8.9 Coastal Resilience Overlay District of the Salem Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the applicant proposes to demolish the second floor, third floor, attic, and roof of the existing building to accommodate 3 new floors with a total of 18 new dwelling units.

Mr. Turiel recuses himself. 7:26 pm

Attorney Grover is in attendance for the team. Michael Zmetrovich, with the management company, and Walter Jacob of Walter Jacobs Architects are also in attendance.

The engineering peer review has delivered the first letter this week. Will be working with series of conditions and hopefully have these for October. There was a letter included for this meeting from traffic consultant. The conclusion is that a residential use will be slightly fewer trips than the current office use.

Mr. Jacobs shares his screen. Comparison of existing v. proposed elevation sheet. Same footprint for the most part. Tower is less tall than existing. Alley between buildings will be lit and equipment moved to roof. Renderings with materials and colors now show materials to break up the massing as they work with clapboard and shingles and metal material.

The team is working on the landscape plan. There is not much space to add street trees but will add where they can on Derby Street (honey locust). Proposed native

plantings on roof, and on ground, native plants (grasses). And a little area on Wharf Street.

Plan to have the lighting plan with photometrics available in October. There will be subtle lighting in recessed spaces.

Public Comment

none

Planning Board Comment

Mr. Furey wonders about the radical change in windows on the rendering. Mr. Jacob says they are working to break up the massing and there is a mix of residential and other buildings in this part of town and they are trying to mix elements up a little. Can try to take photos to show what he is drawing from.

Ms. Sides would like to see the white part toned down and in a different material but likes the windows. She finds the structure eliciting the feel of wharf warehouses. And think of larger scale siding. Says they need to look at sign ordinance before moving ahead on signage.

Mr. Grover says there is no mechanism to refer to the DRB and the DRB doesn't have jurisdiction. Ms. Cunningham confirms that this was referred by the Planning Board to the DRB but that the DRB does not have jurisdiction in this area.

A motion to continue to the October 15, 2026, Planning Board meeting is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Graham Wing, and passes 5-0 in a roll call vote with one recusal.

Jonathan Berk	Y
Elena Eimert	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	R
Graham Wing	Y

C. 59 Boston (Map 15, Lot 321)

Applicant: Pediatric Associates

Description: A continuance of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of Pediatric Associates located at 59 Boston Street (Map 15, Lot 321) in the Business Highway (B2), Residential Multi-Family (R3), Entrance Corridor Overlay District (ECOD), and Coastal Resilience Overlay District (C-ROD) for Coastal Resilience Overlay District (CROD) Site Plan Review in accordance with Section 8.9 of the Salem

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

Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the applicant proposes plan improvements in accordance with CROD, interior renovations, an increase in parking spaces, and site improvements for ECOD compliance.

Bob Griffin of Griffin Engineering, Attorney Scott Grover, and Chris Vance are in attendance for the applicant.

Mr. Griffin shares his screen. The new site plan includes the ADA ramps and stairs discussed in the September 3, 2026 meeting; and a parking chart was added. Additionally, a tree was added along Boston Street; there are eighteen (18) to nineteen (19) trees now.

Public Comment

None

Planning Board Comments

Ms. Sides on signage. The signage is too big. Would like to see some of the signage removed.

Ms. Eimert appreciates the ramps, but it is not clear how they connect with parking area. Mr. Griffin says that the concrete walkway is level with the parking area. The strip connecting entrance Proctor Street sidewalks is painted, is there a way to make it a raised condition to make it more pedestrian friendly. Mr. Griffin says that the lot was built twenty (20) years ago, but they can consider it. She is glad the site is being reused but does find that it is a lot of parking, dramatically exceeding what is required. ECOD adherence is purview of the Building Department, but in terms of the trees, there are to be three (3) parking spaces to one (1) tree. Is there a way to get another tree on the site?

Ms. Cunningham reiterates that one of the criteria of C-ROD is adequacy of design on pedestrian access.

Mr. Grover says there is urgency to open this as they are being forced out of their current site. Trying to open for the winter season. If the board is ready to vote, they would ask to take a vote that this is complying with C-ROD.

Ms. Cunningham shares her screen. The Board of Health has not provided review so only standard conditions are listed.

A motion to approve the decision is made by Graham Wing, seconded by Tom Furey, and passes 6-0 in a roll call vote.

Jonathan Berk	Y
Elena Eimert	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Graham Wing	Y

D. 75 North Street (Map 26, Lot 58), 3 South Mason Street (Map 26, Lot 54), and 2 Commercial Street (Map 26, Lot 57)

Applicant: 75 North Street LLC

Description: A continuance of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of 75 North Street LLC located at 75 North Street (Map 26, Lot 58), 3 South Mason Street (Map 26, Lot 54), and 2 Commercial Street (Map 26, Lot 57) in the North River Canal Corridor (NRCC), Entrance Corridor Overlay District (ECOD), Flood Hazard Overlay District (FHOD), and Coastal Resilience Overlay District (C-ROD) for C-ROD Site Plan Review in accordance with Section 8.9 of the Salem Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the applicant proposes to implement flood proofing measures in accordance with Section 8.9 of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to the previously approved multifamily residential building

Request to continue to the October 15, 2026, Meeting

This item was heard first.

Bob Griffin, Griffin Engineering is in attendance for the applicant to request a continuance.

A motion to continue to the October 15, 2026, Planning Board meeting is made by Graham Wing, seconded by Josh Turiel, and passes 6-0 in a roll call vote.

Jonathan Berk	Y
Elena Eimert	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Graham Wing	Y

E. 47 Congress Street (Map 34, Lot 448)

Applicant: Bohler Engineering f/b/o Prime Storage Shetland LLC c/o Prime Group Holdings, LLC

Description: Form B/Preliminary Subdivision Application

Molly Obendorf of Bohler Engineering is in attendance for the applicant.

Ms. Obendorf shares her screen. A preliminary plan was filed under Section 3.a of the City of Salem Subdivision Regulations in order to preserve the owner's right under the zoning bylaw that are in place today. The plan is fully compliant with the subdivision regulations and the zoning bylaw. The applicant plans to file a definitive plan in a timely fashion.

Planning Board Comments

Ms. Sides asks if this proposal is going through a current building and should they be hearing about the demo of the building? Ms. Obendorf acknowledges that the building will need to be removed if this goes forward.

Ms. Eimert pushes back that the Form B meets requirements. One of the charges put before us under the subdivision control on in the local regulations is to “ensure the provision of adequate access to all the lots in a subdivision by ways that will be safe and convenient for travel.” She understands that this is more related to an action that the subdivision filing created. But not practical in any way. Finds it deficient in any realistic way to receive a Form C on this plan. Ms. Obendorf says it is just a preliminary plan, adequate access to proposed lots would be included in the definitive.

Ms. Sides needs clarification. Mr. Berk says that they saw this with Bertini’s where it was done to freeze the zoning.

Mr. Turiel is not sure where this is effective – an existing site without an approved plan to move forward? If there was a subdivision, he wants it in conjunction with a set plan. We don’t have a plan or filing.

Ms. Cunningham shares her screen. The board should make a finding on if they find that the filing provides adequate information per Mass General Law Ch.41, Sec 81.L and how the plan does or does not comply with Salem subdivision regulations. Ms. Cunningham shares Ch.41, Sec. 81.L.

Mr. Turiel asks to see the plan again. Ms. Eimert asks about the grading of the proposed roadway. Ms. Obendorf says that it slopes to the cul-de-sac and away from public way with preliminary drainage system; grades are being maintained as are existing drainage patterns. Ms. Eimert says that the drainage area is sufficient to catch roadway runoff without affecting the adjacent body of water; Ms. Obendorf says yes.

Ms. Sides says that she has seen the plans for Shetland Park and wonders why they cannot see the plan and understand better what is going on.

Ms. Eimert thinks that the preliminary plan is to be shared with other departments, including fire, and she is wondering about life safety access. Ms. Cunningham does not believe this has been received. Ms. Obendorf says the diameter of cul-de-sac is compliant.

Ms. Cunningham shares the subdivision regulations. Ms. Eimert on section 2 – struggles with the idea the identifying the plans problems and planning for a future Form C.

Ms. Sides thinks consideration should be given to the “attractiveness of the street layout in order to obtain the maximum livability and amenity of the subdivision.” Doesn’t see any context.

Mr. Furey brings up rotaries and says that this is a major rotary and thinks this would be dangerous. Ms. Obendorf says that it is a dead end cul-de-sac, not a rotary.

Mr. Turiel is not comfortable approving without what comes next. Ms. Cunningham says the board should look at does this provides adequate information as prescribed by the definition of a preliminary plan; and with what is provided, does the Board feel any of the language in the decision is untrue or should there be additions/modifications. Ms. Sides does not find that shows attractive street layout or maximum livability of the subdivision.

Ms. Cunningham reiterates that the Board needs to determine if they think that this meets the definition of a preliminary plan, as state in Mass General Law.

A motion to disapprove the Form B/Preliminary Subdivision application is made by Josh Turiel, seconded by Helen Sides, and passes 6-0 in a roll call vote.

Jonathan Berk	Y
Elena Eimert	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Graham Wing	Y

F. 40 Bridge Street (Map 36, Lot 210)

Applicant: 40 Bridge Realty LLC

Description: A public hearing for all persons interested in the application of 40 Bridge Realty LLC located at 40 Bridge Street (Map 36, Lot 210) in the Business Highway (B2), Bridge Street Neck Overlay (BSN), and Coastal Resilience Overlay (CROD) Zoning Districts an amendment to Site Plan Review in accordance with Section 9.5 Salem Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the applicant proposes to amend the Site Plan Review decision

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

dated November 20, 2023. The amendment includes changes to the previously approved landscape plan including the request to remove condition 7b.

Peter Lutts is in attendance.

Two and a half (2.5) inch caliper trees are in the driving aisle instead of three (3) inches; and there are four (4) of them. Three and a half (3.5) would have been a bigger tree and difficult to drive in and out. And instead of doing low growth sumac, they did juniper.

Public Comment

None

Planning Board Comment

Ms. Eimert asks about the species substitution from the decision. Mr. Lutts says it was a mistake. Doesn't think it is a material difference, just an oversight.

Mr. Furey says what an eyesore this was over the years and the improvements are amazing.

Mr. Turiel says that he has done work for Lark affiliated hotels, but not this one. He appreciates the attention to detail in the project.

Ms. Sides the caliper of trees is a shame; they will grow. A

Mr. Berk asks if they need to wait thirty five (35) days before acting on this. Ms. Cunningham says this is true for Site Plan Review. Ms. Cunningham clarifies that zoning needs to be interpreted by the Building Commissioner. Mr. Berk would like to do a conditional approval while waiting for the approval from other departments.

Ms. Eimert asks about the bond with the city and has occupancy permit because of the bond to the city. This will release the bond.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Josh Turiel, seconded by Tom Furey and passes 6-0 in a roll call vote.

Jonathan Berk	Y
Elena Eimert	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Graham Wing	Y

A motion to approve the changes to the decision pending other department issues within the 35-day window is made by Josh Turiel, seconded by Tom Furey with changes and passes 6-0 in a roll call vote.

Jonathan Berk	Y
Elena Eimert	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Graham Wing	Y

G. 11 Summer Street (Map 26, Lot 459), 5-9 Summer Street (Map 26, Lot 461), and 15 Summer Street (Map 26, Lot 462)

Applicant: West House LLC, Emmerton House LLC, and Peabody House LLC,

Description: A public hearing for all persons interested in the application of West House LLC, Emmerton House LLC, and Peabody House LLC, all d/b/a The Salem Inn, located at 5,7,9 Summer Street (Map 26, Lot 459), 11-13 Summer Street (Map 26, Lot 461), and 15 Summer Street (Map 26, Lot 462) in the B5 – Central Development district and Urban Renewal Overlay for Site Plan Review in accordance with Section 9.5 of the Salem Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the applicant proposes the renovation of the existing 3 story building at 11 Summer Street to accommodate a hotel with 16 units. The applicant is proposing site renovations including an increase of parking, through exterior parking changes, and renovations of the existing 2 story garage. Other site improvements include landscape improvements, and solar car ports.

Attorney Scott Grover, Dan Ricciarelli and Julia Moradian of Seger, Michael Blier of Landworks Studio, and Katie Olyha of Stonefield Engineering are in attendance for the applicant. Dick Pabich, owner, is also in attendance.

Have been to the Salem Redevelopment Authority (SRA) and the DRB.

Ms. Olyha shares her screen. The improvements will be at 11 Summer Street. Access to the site is currently from Summer Street and nothing is changing. Predominantly impervious coverage under current conditions. Project proposes renovations of primary building and the accessory carriage house. Installation of solar carports, off street parking, EV charging stations, pocket park, drainage and utilities improvements as well. They are evaluating geothermal as well. Ingress one-way from Summer Street with one-way circulation through site and egress at 15 Summer Street. There will be twenty three 23 parking spaces proposed (one [1] in the garage of the carriage house. There will be a reduction of impervious coverage in the area. The modifications should provide an improvement overall.

Mr. Blier says the circulation through the site creates a campus feel and a sense of cohesion of this area of Summer Street. There is a continuity of planting along Summer

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

Street and a reduction of pavement in front of the buildings to create a Salem Inn garden.

Mr. Ricciarelli discusses existing building and says that they will restore the building back to its original Federal style. The inn will be fifteen (15) units and fully accessible. There will be a ramp on the exterior to get in the building. Have been to the Historical Commission for a Waiver of Demolition Delay (WDDO). They will be retaining the carriage house and will have schematic approval with DRB and SRA.

Public Comment

[11 Summer Street Public Comment 09.17.26](#)

Planning Board Comments

Mr. Furey praises the Pabich family and the proposed project.

Ms. Sides compliments the team thinks it looks great and likes the one way parking.

Mr. Turiel is enthusiastic about this project but points out that any work requiring access to an abutting property must be arranged with the abutter, they cannot walk on.

Ms. Eimert says that it is a beautiful project but asks how parking is currently provided. Mr. Pabich says that it is difficult. There are eleven (11) spaces and Curwen house on Essex Street has 17 spaces. Additionally, they rent spots at Riley Plaza and rely a little on on-street parking. This plan will make it easier. Ms. Eimert clarifies that the idea is that the center property will help manage parking needs of adjacent properties. She stresses that compact spaces can get tricky as cars are larger and these spaces do not always work out. Tandem spaces, one with an EV charging station, can also be tricky for guests. Mr. Ricciarelli says the spaces are parallel, not tandem.

Mr. Wing appreciates the renovation and wonders if they are going fully electric? (Yes)/ Mr. Pabich says that the only gas they have right now is for hot water. Using a geothermal system for that function in the future. Hoping to provide enough solar to power that and hoping to be net zero. Mr. Wing asks if there is any need for any pruning for clearance on solar canopies? (Already done).

Ms. Eimert is curious if employees bike to work and if they will have bike parking. They do have bike parking. Mr. Pabich says that the staff is encouraged to no bring their cars to work.

A motion to continue to the October 15, 2026, Planning Board meeting is made by Josh Turiel, seconded by Graham Wing, and passes 6-0 in a roll call vote.

Jonathan Berk	Y
Elena Eimert	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Graham Wing	Y

III. OLD AND NEW BUSINESS

A. Discuss and Vote

- i. **38 Norman Street (Map 26, Lot 464) decision extension request on Site Plan Review and Planned Unit Development Special Permit, decision dated April 14, 2022. The applicant requests to extend to April 14, 2028.**

Attorney Grover is in attendance for the applicant.

Concerned that the building permit process will take longer than the decision is valid, so requesting an extension.

Ms. Sides is excited for this to be started.

A motion to extend the Site Plan Review and Planned Unit Development Special Permit is made by Josh Turiel, seconded by Tom Furey, and passes 6-0 in a roll call vote.

Jonathan Berk	Y
Elena Eimert	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Graham Wing	Y

- ii. **Recommendation to City Council on Zoning Amendment relating to amending Section 3 to ensure entire clarity that Data Centers are not an allowed use.**

This item was heard second

Mr. Berk commends the Zoning Board of Appeals on their stewardship of this issue at their last meeting.

Mr. Furey feels that any data center would be opening up a Pandora's Box. Additionally, it would be a disaster in any area, particularly at Shetland Park.

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

Mr. Turiel says that data centers themselves are not a major problem they exist in Salem already and are essential to business operations. And there are differences between types of data centers. The work has been surrounding, not banning a company with a server room, etc. The issue with a data center is with what are hyper-scaler data centers dedicated to artificial intelligence processing that consume ten (10) to twenty (20) times as much power as a regular server and cost exponentially more. They also require intensive cooling. Trying to craft the definition as to where the line is between a normal business use v. large AI data center. Salem does not have the resources or space to support a hyper-scaler data center. He has been working with the City Solicitor and the Planning Department to define the line. The basic divider he came up with is a combination of approximately one (1) or more than five thousand (5000) square feet of space being used or approximately two (2) megawatts of power. One (1) server of the type commonly used in hyper-scale centers is consuming three thousand (3000) – four thousand (4000) watts of power. You cannot fit that many in a two (2) megawatt hosting service. These limits will not attract large scale operations.

Ms. Sides asks Mr. Turiel if by limiting physical space, we are taking into account smaller more efficient machines into small spaces. With language we need to be vague but strong. Wonders if applying specific numbers is the way to define it. Wonders about future technology that allows for more power draws in smaller spaces. Mr. Turiel says that the smaller the processor, the more concentrated the heat. There are three (3) sorts of things processed in data centers: storage uses, general computing, compute intensive application. The guide post is more or less the Verizon building in downtown. Ms. Sides asks how the building handles cooling. Mr. Turiel says that they have generators that run periodically if there is an extended power outage. They also have batteries, so they don't have to do that. They don't need extensive cooling because they are not doing intensive tasks.

Mr. Wing asks if thy put a limit on size/power, setting a cap makes an incentive to be more efficient.

Ms. Eimert says a lot of communities are looking at this right now. And there is interest to moving toward defining by electrical demand. She would be interested in seeing revised language. Sounds like the conversation is creating a distinction between acceptable future sites v. unacceptable threshold curious how they revise the language to get from a proposal that has a definition to a use allowance that this is banned throughout the city.

Ms. Rennard says there is a phrase added after the first sentence of the definition and added a phrase *"and has and aggregate power demand of two (2) megawatts or higher."* The recommendation needs to stay in the four corners of what was proposed. In looking at other communities, a lot have tiers addressing size and power usage. She thinks this is where the city needs to head and Thinks this needs more thought and more IT professionals around the table to come up with a subsequent amendment. Mr. Turiel has been discussing the idea of a special permit for uses that draw one (1) to two (2) megawatts of power; this was not mentioned in the advertising of the public hearing and therefore outside of the four corners. Ms. Eimert says that the concern then is if we say they are not data centers then they don't require a special permit, but if we're saying that those facilities are not data centers, which is what we are doing through this amendment, then they don't require a special permit. She doesn't see where they would be allowed in the city. Mr. Turiel says that way that this was initially written and advertised is constraining. Recommends looking at what Mansfield has done, that is the direction Salem should go in. But this step the way it has been written keeps away a large center being brought in.

Mr. Berk says options are to recommend as is, recommend with Mr. Turiel's changes and a year on a committee, or rejection and having a more formal process as to what a data center is. Mr. Turiel says there is a need for a next step to go back in with proposal that looks like Mansfield. If we recommend what the solicitor put in, the immediate issue is removed and there is time for a long-term solution.

Ms. Sides asks for clarification as to the addition of language regarding size. Mr. Turiel says that putting size in puts the risk of stepping on edge of four corners. If we start with what has been recommended and come back and work on square footage definitions, etc. Ms. Sides asks if Ms. Eimert is satisfied with this? Ms. Eimert thinks that is a wise path. Struggling with what this ends up looking like but thinks this needs far more scrutiny beyond how this was advertised. Ms. Rennard says that with this addition, would have data center generating over two (2) megawatts, then data center using less than, and where would those be allowed. Thinks these needs thought and don't see the changes being in the four corners and need to readvertise. Ms. Eimert asks if as written, does the "primarily designed or used to house" language mean that like the hospital could expand. Mr. Turiel says that the language is related to information technology. Mr. Berk asks what if the hospital needs an off-site server facility? Mr. Turiel says it is more likely that it is regular business operation; the hospital has its own server site at Mass General in Boston and most of the hospital's data is in the cloud.

Ms. Eimert asks if Mr. Turiel is committed to the “and/or. “Ms. Eimert would feel more comfortable with two (2) megawatts draw AND five thousand (5000) square feet. Mr. Turiel says if they are setting one limit, power draw is more important.

Ms. Eimert says the language will be incorporated into the zoning but a working group a recommendation would not be. Ms. Rennard says she can draft an order to create a working group to review this.

Mr. Furey asks if Prime can say that they will hold hostage for the development on the site. Mr. Berk says that they should not discuss Prime and specific projects. Mr. Turiel says this is more about “in general” what we want to see is developable in Salem.

A motion to recommend to the City Council the adoption of the zoning amendment with the proposed addition of the text provided by the City Solicitor, and there will be established a working group with at least a Planning Board member, a Zoning Board of Appeals member, a member of the Planning Department, a City Solicitor, and a City Council member, is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Graham Wing and passes 6-0 in a roll call vote.

Jonathan Berk	Y
Elena Eimert	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Graham Wing	Y

iii. Recommendation to City Council on Zoning Amendment relative to amending Section 5 to require no parking for two-family dwelling units.

Mr. Wing clarifies R2 zoning or two family? Ms. Eimert says that it is amending the use table for two family dwellings.

A motion to recommend to City Council is made by Josh Turiel, seconded by Helen Sides, and passes 6-0 in a roll call vote.

Jonathan Berk	Y
Zach Caunter	Y
Elena Eimert	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Graham Wing	Y

B. Review and Discuss FY27 Community Preservation Plan – Request for Comment/Input

Ms. Eimert would like to revisit this at the October 15 meeting. s

IV. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Draft Minutes from the September 3, 2026 Meeting

A motion to approve the September 3, 2026 meeting minutes is made by Josh Turiel, seconded by Helen Sides, and passes 6-0 in a roll call vote.

Jonathan Berk	Y
Elena Eimert	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Graham Wing	Y

V. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn is made by Josh Turiel, seconded by Helen Sides, and passes 6-0 in a roll call vote.

Jonathan Berk	Y
Elena Eimert	Y
Tom Furey	Y
Helen Sides	Y
Josh Turiel	Y
Graham Wing	Y

Adjourned at: 9:55 p.m.

Minutes Approved on: