

**CITY OF SALEM
JANUARY 9, 2019
CONTINUATION OF A
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING BOARD**

A Continuation of a Joint Public Hearing of the Salem City Council and the Planning Board was held in the Council Chamber on Wednesday, January 9, 2019 at 7:00 P.M., for the purpose of continuing discussion on an Ordinance to Amend an Ordinance Relative to Zoning by adding a Municipal and Religious Adaptive Reuse Overlay District to facilitate the appropriate reuse of eligible buildings and thereby protect and advance the general public welfare within Section 8.0 - Special District Regulations by adding Section 8.7 – Municipal and Religious Reuse Overlay District. This Ordinance Amendment includes sections 8.7.1 through 8.7.11 outlining respectively, Purpose, Location, Eligibility, Dimensional Requirements, Uses Allowed by Special Permit, Site Plan Review, Historical Commission and Design Review Board Review, Affordability, Parking and Loading, Conflict, and Severability.

The Ordinance Amendment provides a tool to allow for reuse of eligible buildings that will best serve the community but will minimize impacts to surrounding neighborhoods while also facilitating historic preservation, economic development, housing production and environmental sustainability and resilience.

Notice of this meeting was posted on December 17, 2018 at 8:49 A.M.

All Councillors were present

Councillor Stephen Dibble presided.

Councillor Stephen Dibble introduced the members of the Planning Board members in attendance: Ben Anderson, Chair, Bill Griset, Kirt Rieder, Matt Smith, Carole Hamilton, Helen Sides and Matt Venio.

Also, in attendance were the Mayor, Amanda Chiancola, Senior Planner and Tom Daniel, City Planner (arrived later),

Council President Stephen Dibble read off a list of names who submitted emails for the record.

Councillor Dibble asked Amanda to talk about the revised ordinance that was submitted to the City Council.

**CITY OF SALEM
JANUARY 9, 2019
CONTINUATION OF A
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING BOARD**

Amanda Chiancola stated after listening to the many were many concerns, some revisions to the original ordinance submitted had been made. The table of dimensional requirements were revised under the heading new construction to be reflective of the underlying zone. However, they felt only one approving body shall remain. They favor the DRB and Historical Commission's recommendations but need to have only one approving body. This ordinance will give a clear permitting path to reuse//redevelop the vacant sites located at Immaculate Conception, St. James and 5 Broad Street.

Councillor Dibble talked about the last Joint Public Hearing (not related to this matter) where the public couldn't comment at the planning board where they discuss the matter and then the Council has to take actions on new topics not talked about at the Joint Public Hearing. So, let's get everything out tonight so public can comment.

Councillor Turiel concerned with the parking requirements even if it just applies to one property. Doesn't have a problem with the density with the property on Hawthorne Blvd. just problem with using the garage – there needs to be some other way to solve the parking. No other property has a problem with parking.

Mayor responded that the parking mimics the B-5 District. Capacity exists in the Museum Place garage except sometimes in October, busy weekends and Snow Emergencies. We are trying to decide and solve parking when we don't even know what the use of the building will be or how many units are planned. The Planning Board can regulate that issue by putting additional conditions on project. Just trying to design a path to create the use. Not trying to solve the problem without knowing what is going to be built. There is some capacity in our garages.

Councillor Dibble understood that the underlying basis for the ordinance was for historic preservation and reuse to protect these buildings then why isn't review required by the Historical Commission or DRB?

Amanda Chiancola stated the difficulties of having 2 different bodies approve one project That's way ask for their recommendations. Can't think of another ordinance that requires 2 bodies that approve the same project or special permit. Having multiple bodies to approve makes the process more complicated There are 9 Planning Board members who are absolutely excellent at what they do.

Matt Veno apologized for holding up the first joint public hearing.

**CITY OF SALEM
JANUARY 9, 2019
CONTINUATION OF A
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING BOARD**

Ben Anderson, Planning Board Chair asked if specialty food stores include convenience stores?

Amanda will double check on the definitions.

Ben Anderson asked about handicap parking if projects fall under Salem Housing Authority or Elderly. Do they require less spots?

Councillor Dibble asked Amanda about exemptions?

Mayor responded – Not sure of exemption depends if Quasi State Agency or State Agency. Will get clarification

Kirk Rieder – Comments included the following: In Section 8.7.1 Purpose – Redevelopment uses should come first. Is there a legal difference in the definitions of the word parcel, lots, property, building? They are used interchangeably throughout ordinance, like to see it consistent and use the word property. 8.7.3 Eligibility under #5 Cemeteries, and Conservation Areas should be added to list with public parks. Keep 8.7.4 – dimensional requirements - as existing, fences and mooring walls put in (8) . Paragraph that starts with “Any rooftop construction” there is a strike through of new construction, therefore does the last sentence still need to be there? Height should be measured to cornice but not above ridge line not top out above steeple. 8.7.7 last sentence first paragraph word detached both should go through review. Shouldn’t it be any project regardless if attached or detached should go through review.

Amanda Chiancola if Council and Planning Board find it not applicable it doesn’t hurt for it to be there.

Opened up to the Public

Mickey Northcutt – 9 Northey St. resident and CEO of NSCDC. Supports ordinance. Full disclosure working to redevelop schools on Federal Street and Hawthorne Blvd. It’s extremely early in the process and have no plans yet. Do not have full site control of these properties yet and wanted to wait to see how this process was to play out. We have done new and conversion housing projects and its very important and critical for us to have the community neighborhood involved in the process, but didn’t want to get into that before this was resolved. We did have one meeting with Federal St. neighbors, mostly

**CITY OF SALEM
JANUARY 9, 2019
CONTINUATION OF A
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING BOARD**

positive. Bid on right to develop these schools to preserve historic building. Elderly housing, affordable housing, give us guidance.

Councillor Milo said when we see your face we think of affordable housing. Normally, projects are based on Market rate with 10% affordable. Can you tell us if your properties will be different or more than 10%?

Mickey Northcutt replied if successful it will be greater than 10%; a majority of the units would be affordable and hopefully 100%. Sometimes we have mixed income in the same building, but still mostly all affordable. We are beholden to our funding programs/sources that dictate what we build or who we serve; we need to follow their standards. Which normally involves talking to the people in the neighborhood. Since haven't started yet, can't give a definitive answer, but Federal Street makes a lot of sense to be senior housing since near the community life center.

Councillor Furey – Also agreed that Mickey is the Human face of Housing in Salem. Do you see any major impact to the density of these areas or living within the structure?

Mickey Northcutt replies – Living within structure of school or building. By using tax credits, we protect the historic exterior of building to be left intact. We don't rehab by adding major stories or change the physical appearance. Currently, we are assessing the shape the buildings are in. If in really bad shape if feasible money wise.

Councillor Furey asked can you point to a building maybe like these that you did.

Mickey stated he never converted a school before but rehabbed 19 buildings in the point area. i.e. if metal doors then back to wooden doors.

Councillor Madore – Mentioned to Mickey the last time the spoke, he mentioned different pathways for redevelopment. Also, asked him if he had a chance to look at the ordinance that is now in front of them and what he thought of the ordinance.

Mickey replied he thought it was good and was balanced. They would live with whatever comes out of the process. It gives a framework to work with. If this ordinance is not in place then he would go through the 40B process. Not legally possible to get all the variances needed any other way. 40B is a comprehensive permit. Think this ordinance has more oversight, in good way, before give one application to the ZBA they get input from other boards but all through ZBA.

**CITY OF SALEM
JANUARY 9, 2019
CONTINUATION OF A
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING BOARD**

Councillor Madore asked Mickey if he thought this ordinance would give more local ownership/control over developments then 40B process.

He replied yes.

Councillor Dibble – at the last meeting we saw concept photos. Can you build without new construction? Would that affect you or do you need new construction or you just strictly rehabbing.

Mickey responded the parking lot has nothing to do with them. The church wants to keep the parking lot to the right of the Church, so its not on the table for the CDC. Our focus is just on redevelop schools as they exist would look at it if included. Parking lot not part of Archdiocese RFP.

Gary Gill, 12 Pope St., Salem – New Ordinance all loopholes taken care of. The two properties on Lafayette St. old rectory and school finish off for curb appeal and affordable housing. Drawings that we saw on back of parking lot were pretty large if they could build above the steeples they will. This ordinance looks a lot better than last one.

John Carr, 7 River St., Salem – Served the first 25 years on the Historic District Commission and was responsible for creating each district. Since he left no new districts have been created. While on Commission former schools such as Cogswell School, Phillips School and Oliver School to name a few have been rehabilitated, so when I hear we need this ordinance for a clearer path because it is suggested that without it no renovation of historic schools can be done it's complete and utter bunk. It has been disproven because it's been done over the last 30-40 years. Since leaving the commission, I have been representing the neighborhood always on a pro-bona basis. Each case the developer had a sit down with neighbors and come up with a solution to satisfy both sides. This ordinance assumes one size fits all, but it freezes out the neighborhood folks. It diminishes the role of the public. The way development gets done is a give and take. There are flaws in this ordinance including the premise, the number of properties, the list of properties it includes. Can the ordinance be fixed? I think it has improved but not there yet. Reminded of a situation, where 6 Councillors showed up at a planning board hearing in which the Councillor's own vote was not being interpreted by the planning board how it was meant. There was a proposal for a certain height restriction. The previous City Planner, Lynn Duncan went to the Council and said it was too inflexible let's makes it a number of stories. So, the Council amended it to say 4 stories not 40 feet in height. At that hearing, the non-elected board overrode the elected

**CITY OF SALEM
JANUARY 9, 2019
CONTINUATION OF A
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING BOARD**

boards vote even though that was not the intention of the Council. So, the Salem Oil and Grease project ended up being approved by the Planning board with 4 stories on top of a garage. Lawyers look at every syllable to get something done. System isn't broke. It has worked all these years for example the Salem Jail even with new construction. Every historic building in Salem is working its way through the system. Also, the very idea that the Historic Commission can only make recommendations is reprehensible.

Councilor Dibble recognized Tom Daniel has arrived. Councillor Dibble asked Mr. Daniel if there was an easier path for getting these buildings reused and if he like to respond to Mr. Carr's comments.

Tom Daniel – In response to Mr. Carr's comments. Only way to redevelop these sites are with this ordinance. If doing it the old way was the easier path then we would be doing that. Without going project by project over the last 40 year, some of these projects were done under a different framework by Use Variances. City not able to grant use variances. The City ordinance does not allow the granting of use variances. There was litigation that said municipalities can't grant Use Variances unless it specifically states it in our zoning ordinance. This change happened in the mid -2000's. Premise is not flawed but needed. Ordinance needed to allow 5 Broad St. and others to be redeveloped. Right now, 5 Broad street is in the disposition process but the RFP stated working in parallel with this reuse ordinance.

Councillor Gerard – Whole purpose of this ordinance is a comprehensive plan for how to develop all these properties.

Tom Daniel responds – looking at as regulations exist today, to provide a path that's clear and still engages the public. Not trying to skirt the public as suggested. We had two public meetings before we even started to work on this ordinance. Path to allow these properties to be legally be repurposed and still have public participation.

John Carr stated – it's not a use variance - a use variance would be illegal when it's a nonconforming use. Residential use is a permitted use.

Tom Daniel – Not an attorney. Relying upon other attorneys involved in this. Existing Use of 5 Broad Street is a municipal use which is an exempt use, therefore cannot have a change in nonconforming use because use itself is not non-conforming because it is an exempt use since it is an exempt so providing a path to use other than 2 family structure.

**CITY OF SALEM
JANUARY 9, 2019
CONTINUATION OF A
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING BOARD**

Councillor Turiel – Understand rationale behind this for 4 properties – if we try to do it on a site by site basis then spot zoning. So, understand we need this. We have parameter change of use as long as building is at least 3,000 square feet. If really have concerns than can tweak that number. Don't have use variances anymore so we need this. Ease some concerns by tweaking number in section 8.7.32

Fred Biebesheimer, 17 ½ River St. – Concerned with what properties are covered. If age of building more gets older – concerned about implications promote historic preservation but not have historic commission as approving board – worthwhile step to have all involved.

Resident of 3 River St. – Why do we need this? Mickey's comments said don't need this because he can use 40B; he's willing to go with this or the other. Existing Zoning Ordinance has check and balances – allows neighbors to be involved; there's a back and forth. Also skeptical of the ordinance not very specific and allows for significant interpretations. This works in the developer's favor. The developers always have best lawyers and neighbors limited resources. Lastly, who is pushing this proposal? Would we need this if the churches weren't shrinking and needing funds and trying to maximize the value of their property. Why can't the Church and the current city administration who are so passionate for social justice, heard nothing substantial about more housing for needy veterans, seniors and affordable homes – 10% is just not enough.

Jane Arlander, 93 Federal Street. Does this ordinance really facilitate environmental sustainability and resiliency? 8.7.1 states one of the objectives is for environmental sustainability and resiliency, but there are no specific measures in this ordinance. This will increase density, increase water, sewer and electricity, loss of green space, increase traffic. We are a coastal community. We must be progressive and make sure we reflect the environmental impact and climate change. This ordinance does not do this. Amendment to new construction not be allowed in FEMA zone or Flood Overlay District only new construction that is separate from the building.

Polly Wilbert – 7 Cedar St. – Need for affordability. 10% doesn't make a dent. Seniors have to leave Salem. This ordinance should increase 10% affordability to 20% and there should be residency requirement to move into these buildings. I ask the City Councillors to stop trying to fix Boston's housing problems. Parking Garages for private parking burdens our community. We should ask for report on all parking permits that are presently bought and required to be bought from our parking department to get fact-based information. Some of these are large buildings, large lots and dense development. You could have

**CITY OF SALEM
JANUARY 9, 2019
CONTINUATION OF A
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING BOARD**

500 s.f. with lots of units. When a resident or developer buy permits or passes there is no guaranteed parking esp. on weekends, snow emergencies and in October. We need the #s on Riley Plaza also. When we include schools in the overlay, MSBA grants include a 50-year encumbrance on selling schools which puts in place pay back in full or portion preclude grants with 10 year look back if this happens. Transparency is important, the list should be the list and included in the ordinance so it doesn't leave it open. If you want to include a parcel in the future then amend the list. This would be applied to unknown parcels. We are a historic city not diminish history. At this point, old town hall and City hall could be redeveloped into housing. In section 8.7.5, #11 should include museums. Concerned about number of stories allowed in flood zones. Leave public hearing open. The planning board can bring back their comments at next joint public hearing.

Darleen Melis, 115 Federal St., - She seconds the idea that the historic commission that their recommendations needs to be incorporated. Also concerned about the MSBA money. Not a trigger for review of MSBA in Ordinance so relying on institutional memory.

Carol Carr, 7 River St., Feel very strongly that the Historic Commission not just a recommendation but a requirement before making a decision. Is the proposed ordinance better than what we have now? Why is it better? Not easier but better? Make a list of what are the advantages to neighbors and then a list of advantages to the developers. Compare two list who is greater beneficiary, the residents or the developers to make money. Do you know enough about this ordinance to feel confident better than process we have now?

Tim Jenkins – 18 Broad St. – Speaking for Historic Salem tonight– Enjoyed working with Amanda and Tom on this. A lot of progress on the ordinance is being made. Key points – support reuse of historic buildings and welcomes the changes to the new construction provision of the ordinance. Appreciate that the ordinance will comply with standards of the underlying zoning prevail to keep scale of neighborhood. Getting much closer to National Trust Model. Bring back use of underutilized buildings. Should be some standard for minimum lot area per dwelling unit for existing buildings because now it means unlimited number of units put into it. Prefer minimum lot area of new construction be added. Right now, it's 500 s.f. prefer it be underlying zoning but if not then 3500 s.f. to limit the size of new construction to reflect B-3 or NRCC. Historic Commission should have review and recommendation. 5 Broad St. will have to be reviewed anyways since already in a historic district. Only jurisdiction over the exterior not interior. Agrees with Amanda would be redundant and only have one authority.

**CITY OF SALEM
JANUARY 9, 2019
CONTINUATION OF A
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING BOARD**

Barbara Cleary – 104 Federal Street. Focus on density, fixes have been positive. Didn't realize no density requirement in B-5. Don't think that is a good standard, I think there should be at R-3 or NRCC standard since close to neighborhoods. Keep Public hearing open. Not to have any open dialogue is detrimental. Suspension of the the rules and allow public testimony at planning board. If planning board makes changes it would be good to hear and have input. Should add non-profit museums to list.

Tyler Terry – 22 School St., Consider what the best-case scenario and worse-case scenario would be with this ordinance. The ordinance should require historic oversight and review.

Justin Whittier, 10 River St., Revisions made to the Dimensional Table is good. Still has concerns about the density. New Construction should be more explicit i.e. additions and free standing. Approval from Historic Commission and DRB should be needed. No hardship to go through 2 more layers of approvals. It's only an inconvenience to the developers. A list of properties should be included to avoid spot zoning. Eligibility of criteria but to include any property would have to be voted on by City Council.

Josiah Fisk, 358 Essex St., 10 Derby Square (office address) – Agrees with Councillor Turiel 3,000 sq. ft. limit smaller than many houses shouldn't need an exception form something so small. Increase that limit to a more appropriate limit. Issue with parking net loss of parking and net increase of residential structures. Relying on this parking with the residential density would be unwise. Mr. Rider's comments were great. We should all read things this carefully. Rationale why we need this because cannot use No Use Variances. No rationale for any other part of this proposed ordinance. Learned things said at the end of the last meeting. For example, Mayor said only example of which properties being affected not part of ordinance. However, St. Joseph's properties not on list. This Ordinance is not ready – continue to leave the public hearing open.

Jeff Cohen, 12 Hancock St. In Support of this Ordinance. Although Vice-President of SERC – but not representing the committee. But does appreciate Jane Arlander's comments. 8.7.8 Affordability – 10% too low and also believe 80% median income is too high, should be more like 50% for median.

**CITY OF SALEM
JANUARY 9, 2019
CONTINUATION OF A
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING BOARD**

Fawaz Abusharkh – 4 Harrison Rd. – Leave public hearing open for recommendations and amendments. Mayor's statement about flexibility because we don't know what is going to go there. I believe the opposite; don't know what properties this covers in the future. We should protect the citizens now and not help developers. Developers have ways to get what they want. We need to cover all of the basis now. Still need historic commission to have say.

Anne Whittier – 10 River St., Spoke about the process – thank you for keeping the hearing open. Some wanted to close the meeting and since it was kept open some good revisions were made. Issues raised from the last hearing were incorporated and some better revisions were made because of this. Some feel we have to build more and build faster expediate this matter because time is not our friend. Some people felt these meetings take too long, need to minimize time and number of meetings. But you may not be here in 5-10 years, but the residents have to live with the consequences. Still tonight, some issues still unresolved such as the list, the public library, old town hall and city hall are on this list. This Ordinance creates a pathway for properties we don't want to see redeveloped.

Lou Siarriani – 6 Botts Courts, - Council has heard many good comments about the detriments of this ordinance. Have more input from public, let planning board work on revisions. Two detail: 1. Density, it's way too low (500) not reasonable or practical – take a good look at that. 2. If Building within preview of historic commission they would only have a recommendation role. Important for historical commission be able to review these historic buildings.

Jessica Herbert, 70 Webb St., Also, like to thank everyone who worked on this. Would like to echo comments made at the December 13th meeting, that the Historic Commission having inclusive jurisdiction especially over the new construction. Fit within the neighborhood - design, fabric and material involved. Three years ago, a Historic Planner joined the planning department so not a burden to work on these projects. Why should the Historic Commission be involved in new construction– unforeseen conditions. We work well with the other boards. New construction needs to fit and compliment the neighborhood. There are 601 properties in 5 historic districts a few more is not a big deal.

Beth from Broad St. – Read an Article about Urban Village. Salem is an urban village. Take a little more time. Salem is a city but town like characteristics. Preserve the character of Salem.

**CITY OF SALEM
JANUARY 9, 2019
CONTINUATION OF A
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING BOARD**

Councillor Sargent. If Mickey Northcutt was doing all the development then there would be no problem, but zoning goes with the land not the developer and we get a lot of unintended consequences this way. Once zoning is changed it's changed for a long time if tried to change it back, because something went wrong, we would have lawsuits if someone bought property based on zoning and then we changed it. Research will show that not all schools were done with a use variance but with non-conforming use to another, variances from setbacks, parking and height set back. Without a zoning change we give less by right but more by negotiation and citizen and neighborhood input and with that leverage we end up with better projects getting done. Less worry about appeals and the 20 days passing goes more smoothly rather than a 2-year lawsuit. If we need rezoning to do things by right and say we can't redevelop properties using one non-conforming use to another and can't give variances for set-backs. If this zoning goes forward 5-10 years from now build based upon this zoning the developers will want more.

Councillor Gerard – Commented on Jane Arlander's comments on environmental considerations under 8.7.5 - i.e. Laundry mats and dry-cleaning facilities consistent exposure. Do we need them or take them out? Why those specifically?

Amanda Chiancola – Uses modeled after the NRCC uses – looking at a village concept of neighborhood services. If Council doesn't feel it's appropriate, then you can take it out.

Councillor Gerard – Comments on process – People not able to speak after we close the public hearing Councillor Gerard doesn't understand the fear – There's more opportunity to speak when recommendation comes back from the planning board and it's on our agenda again and if necessary, it is referred to a committee then public can speak at those meetings. So, there is plenty more opportunities for public input to have continuing dialogue. We represent the public.

Councillor Milo – Process is working having this back and forth discussion – making this ordinance better each time. Let's get this to a point where we can refer to planning board, it's a good product.

Councillor Turiel – Noted that Joint Public Hearings process both bodies listen to public by leaving the public hearing open Planning Dept. looked at initial concerns and took them into account. Working with new revisions now. Before the planning board can actually work on this, and get something back to work with. We have to close the public hearing for the Planning Board work on Ordinance. Once it comes back to us, we can put it into

**CITY OF SALEM
JANUARY 9, 2019
CONTINUATION OF A
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING BOARD**

committee. Yes, public comment ends, but more public input doesn't stop until second passage. There is ample opportunity for the public to weigh in on it.

Councillor Flynn – Stated after listening to the comments from the first public hearing glad the ordinance came back with improvements but still has to be some changes. These buildings have stayed vacant for quite a while. We represent the public so we shouldn't rush this through and keep the hearing open. And see if we can tweak it a little more. This will have an effect on the City long pass us.

Matt Veno viewed the public hearing process to listen and gather information not the venue of tweaking and working as a working group. The appropriate place for that would be committee meetings. Recommend that public hearing be closed so Planning Board can deliberate and give it back to the Council. Time frame restraining but those are mass general laws for zoning not ours.

Council Dibble – Council has 90 days to act, but this includes Planning Board time.

Councillor McCarthy – Reiterated that the Planning Board's recommendation can't be done until we close the public hearing. 21 days after the hearing closed for Planning Board to act. Council has 90 days from the close of the hearing date to vote. Still can have committee meetings if referred. If 90 days pass then restart Public Hearings

Councillor Milo – had a question on the dates. If we close the hearing then the planning board meets on 1/17. Then about 2 months.

Tom Daniel to address concerns – Were there specific items you like me to address?
Question regarding sustainability resiliency: Answer: The Idea here looking at Sustainable approach to development biggest piece of that buildings are being re-used and not demolished. Intrinsic value of adaptive reuse is the most sustaining approaches of doing development. Jane Arlander comment looking at not permitting development in the Flood Overlay District the planning board gives special permits if qualify so consistent with process in place. Question about 10% affordability not enough and want more like 20%. Answer: Amanda leading housing policy analysis and development working with MAPC on Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance. This draft reuse ordinance is consistent with process in place of using 10% affordable housing and then 80% market rate. Working with MAPC for level of affordability for Salem. Inclusionary Ordinance coming this year, but this ordinance first. Only for private sector, developer for profit requiring 10%. But new ordinance market rate that is right for Salem. Question: Salem Residency

**CITY OF SALEM
JANUARY 9, 2019
CONTINUATION OF A
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING BOARD**

requirement. Answer: The Fair Housing Act does not allow residency requirement. Certain projects can have preferences. What the CDC and SHA does is different.

Councillor Dibble – Suggestion instead of overlay why not zones. Is this possible?

Tom Daniel – We are trying to establish standards of properties in order to not single out certain properties; it would be considered spot zoning.

Councillor Dibble – Question about a lot of comments that Historic Commission has approval.

Tom Daniel – Ordinance requires Historic Commission make a recommendation. Ordinance does require recommendation even if property is outside the historic district. If inside, their approval still required. That process is no different. Expanding the Historical Commission if outside their jurisdiction then add their recommendation.

Councillor Dibble – Questions on minimum lot area per dwelling for existing buildings and New Construction. Comments to change to 500 ft to 3500 or to the underlying zone

Tom Daniel – The Model for this ordinance is mirroring the B-5 where there has been reuse of existing properties. If existing building no minimum lot area requirement. New construction mirrored also after the B-5. The 500 s.f. to allow for some flexibility understanding there are other constraints on the site that are required such as lot coverage and parking. Suggestion of using 3,500 s. f. as in NRCC from one perspective makes sense. Tie this ordinance with other uses permitted in the NRCC. However, the 3,500 s.f. has not worked in the NRCC in terms of being able to comply; it has not been feasible. All residential development in the NRCC has sought relief, not feasible developments there, more in the range of 1,000-2,000 sq. ft. So, I don't think 3500 sq. ft makes sense but I'm sure the Planning Board will deliberate on this. They have the benefit of looking at other projects. The 500 s.f. lot area per dwelling unit is for new construction. We can look at the language for new construction whether it is defined as free standing or new addition as part of existing building. The Planning Board can clarify this language. Parking always an important issue. Many people have cars and they are aggravated by parking. Properties within the B-5 requires if existing, 1 space per unit and can be provided within 1,000 ft of municipal or private parking. Number of passes required to be purchased we know how many sold and who is buying them. We will look at that data. Affordability – we'll be back after full analysis with MAPC. Right now, 10%

**CITY OF SALEM
JANUARY 9, 2019
CONTINUATION OF A
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING BOARD**

minimum. Inclusionary Ordinance may be different and then replace it within this ordinance.

Councillor Furey asked if the Mayor could come up to give concluding remarks.

Mayor - I have heard the concerns from last hearing loud and clear; some additional changes have been made. Dialing back new construction concerns tweaking some of the language. Know there are still some disagreements about having Historical and DRB Approval. These are valuable recommendations, but the comprehensive process to review projects and coming up with projects that work in our community by our Planning Board is second to none. We spend a lot of time thinking about housing. We'll be filling up the Council's plate with lots of Housing Policies taking a lot of Council time. I am conscious about urgency around housing. We need housing. Often times there is pushback when new housing projects come up. But these are housing options in existing buildings, that are vacant, dormant often dilapidated. I'm worried about these projects not getting developed your neighborhoods. Historic adaptive reuse is not easy and with the economy softening it's going to get harder to make these numbers work. The time it takes to get projects done in Salem is significant and I value that, but need to be conscious about not making decisions not advancing things is a decision to leave these properties in these conditions. We need to meet dire housing needs. I want to get things right but I don't think perfection and time to delay any further. Plenty of time for public input with Council. There will be some things we won't agree on i.e. Historic and DRB approval. The need is so great and it takes time. Inclusionary Housing coming up after this. I'm anxious because the need is so great and the time takes so long. Pressure of people needing to move out of Salem. Don't want to create so many hurdles that it delays the time to get these projects done. We only received 3 proposals for 5 Broad Street. Kidding ourselves if they will come. Want to put properties back into use. Old pathways of use variances do not exist. The pre-existing non-conforming use long gone they are vacant and no longer apply. We need to press go. Hope you vote to close the public hearing.

Councillor Turiel moved that the hearing be closed. Seconded by Councillor Furey. It was so voted. Councillors Dominguez, Flynn and Sargent were opposed.

Councillor McCarthy moved that the matter be referred to the Planning Board for their recommendation. It was so voted.

On the motion of Councillor Furey the hearing was adjourned at 9:48 P.M.