

**City of Salem Zoning Board of Appeals**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
August 16, 2023

A meeting of the Salem Zoning Board of Appeals (“Salem ZBA”) was held on Wednesday, August 16, 2023 at 6:30 pm via remote participation in accordance with Chapter 2 of the Act of 2023 and a Special Act extending remote participation meetings.

**Chair Peter Copelas calls the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.**

Chair Copelas explains how individuals can participate in the meeting remotely via Zoom, and that instructions to participate remotely can also be found on the Salem website. Mr. Copelas also explains the rules regarding public comment.

**ROLL CALL**

Those present were: Peter Copelas (Chair), Carly McClain (Vice Chair), Rosa Ordaz, Paul Viccica, and Hannah Osthoff. Also in attendance were Daniel Laroe – Staff Planner, and Jonathan Pinto – Recording Clerk. Those absent were: Nina Vyedin

**REGULAR AGENDA**

Location: **54 Charles Street (Map 32, Lot 134) (R2 Zoning District)**

Applicant: **Arslan Khudaynazar**

Project: A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of ARSLAN KHUDAYNAZAR at 54 CHARLES STREET (Map 32, Lot 134) (R2 Zoning District) for a Special Permit per Section 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single- and Two-Family Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to enlarge and convert a nonconforming single-family dwelling to a two-family dwelling by adding a two-story (2) addition and deck at the rear of the structure.

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application date-stamped June 29, 2023 and supporting documentation

Chair Copelas introduces the petition.

Attorney Bill Quinn introduces himself on behalf of the petitioner, who he explains lives with his sister and parents in a single family home in an R2 district. Mr. Quinn indicates the neighborhood is mixed use with single-family and two-family homes, as well as some four-unit condo buildings and a fire station a block away. The petitioners home was built in the 1950’s, and Mr. Quinn states it has nice landscaping. Mr. Quinn notes that the petitioner’s sister will be moving out and that he intends to keep the property and help his parents by allowing them to continue living there, but that he would like to add a second unit for extra income to help maintain the property. Mr. Quinn contends there has been no opposition or complaints in the neighborhood to date. The petitioner has been working with Flow Design for several months on the proposal, and the plan is for the petitioner to live on the first floor with his parents and rent the new apartment once completed. The petitioner seeks a special permit to go from a single-family to a legal two-family use under Section 3.3.5. The plan is to demolish a portion of the rear wall of the build and construct a two-story addition in the rear that allows adequate space to redesign the first floor and the new unit above. Mr. Quinn states there is

City of Salem Zoning Board of Appeals  
August 16, 2023 Meeting Minutes

currently a small deck, and that the proposal includes a rear deck to allow for continued use of the patio. Mr. Quinn indicates the existing property is nonconforming in many ways such as setback requirements, and therefor subject to the requested relief.

Darguin Fortuna of Flow Design Architects introduces himself and presents drawings and site plans, as well as images of the existing property. He describes the proposal, noting no impact on the front facade or sidewalk. Mr. Fortuna next presents floor plans and elevations.

Chair Copelas asks if the side setback is being decreased by the proposed new stairway, and Mr. Quinn indicates it is by a couple of feet. Mr. Quinn adds that there is adequate parking for the two units on the property and that the height of the building is not increasing.

Mr. Viccica asks why the new stairs from the second floor unit were proposed this way, given how close the next door neighbor is to their own setback. Mr. Viccica suggests it may be better to push the deck a bit to the other side and/or relocate the steps, perhaps closer to the cars, to preserve the abutters property.

Mr. Fortuna states those would be plausible solutions, and explains the reason behind the proposed stair location, noting wanting a view in to the street and to make the second egress more remote from the others in case of a fire. Mr. Copelas also suggests it may make more sense to have the stairs lead to the parking on the opposite side of the house. Mr. Viccica states it is better to not increase nonconformities if possible, and suggests a special condition for the stair location. Mr. Fortuna and Mr. Quinn agree on behalf of the petitioner.

Chair Copelas opens the floor to public comment but there is none.

Attorney Quinn discusses the grounds for a special permit.

**Motion and Vote:** Mr. Viccica motions to approve the petition of ARSLAN KHUDAYNAZAR at 54 CHARLES STREET (Map 32, Lot 134) (R2 Zoning District) for a Special Permit per Section 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single- and Two-Family Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to enlarge and convert a nonconforming single-family dwelling to a two-family dwelling by adding a two-story (2) addition and deck at the rear of the structure, subject to the following standard conditions:

1. Petitioner shall comply with all city and state statutes, ordinances, codes, and regulations.
2. All construction shall be done as per the plans and dimensions submitted to and approved by the Building Commissioner.
3. All requirements of the Salem Fire Department relative to smoke and fire safety shall be strictly adhered to.
4. Petitioner shall obtain a building permit prior to beginning any construction.
5. Exterior finishes of the new construction shall be in harmony with the existing structure.
6. A Certificate of Occupancy is to be obtained.
7. Petitioner is to obtain approval from any City Board or Commission having jurisdiction including, but not limited to, the Planning Board.
8. Unless this Decision expressly provides otherwise, any zoning relief granted does not empower or authorize the Petitioner to demolish or reconstruct the structure(s) located on the subject property to an extent of more than fifty percent (50%) of its floor area or more than fifty percent (50%) of its replacement cost at the time of destruction. If the structure is demolished by any means to an extent of more than fifty percent (50%) of its replacement cost or more than fifty percent (50%) of its floor area at the time of destruction, it shall not be reconstructed except in conformity with the provisions of the Ordinance.

9. All construction shall be done per the plans and dimension submitted to and approved by this Board. Any modification to the plans and dimensions must be approved by the Board of Appeals unless such changes are deemed a minor field change by the Building Commissioner in consultation with the Chair of the Board of Appeals.
10. Petitioner shall schedule Assessing Department inspections of the property, at least annually, to project completion and a final inspection upon project completion.

And the following special condition:

1. To design and construct the rear deck stair to not create a greater nonconforming side setback than currently exists.

Ms. Ordaz seconds the motion. **The vote is five (5) in favor (Peter Copelas, Paul Viccica, Hannah Osthoff, Rosa Ordaz, and Carly McClain) and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.**

Location: **6 Upham Street (Map 27, Lot 331) (R2 Zoning District)**

Applicant: **Cameron Schuh**

Project: A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of CAMERON SCHUH at 6 UPHAM STREET (Map 27, Lot 331) (R2 Zoning District) for a Special Permit per Section 3.3.3 Nonconforming Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to replace the second story (2nd) emergency-exit staircase. The current landing is 5'x8' and the proposed replacement landing would be 10'x15'. The current rear setback is 1.4' R2 district requires thirty feet (30) rear yard setback.

#### Documents and Exhibitions

- Application date-stamped June 27, 2023 and supporting documentation

Chair Copelas introduces the petition.

Mr. Schuh introduces himself and describes the property, noting his mother Kathryn Crawford owns the home and that he has been living there for three years. The property is a multifamily and Mr. Schuh resides on the second floor while renting out the first floor. Mr. Schuh explains that a second story staircase is their main entrance, but it is an old deck and staircase that is likely over 25 years old and not in good condition. Mr. Schuh indicates the proposal is to replace the stairs and deck with a larger landing area to have more usable space, with the stairs extending out just a little bit farther into the side yard. The proposal does not increase the rear setback nonconformity and does not add any new nonconformities. Mr. Schuh provides plot plans showing existing and proposed conditions, as well as photographs of the current stairs and deck. He adds that the catalyst for the proposal is safety concerns as the current deck is not in good condition and is likely not up to current code. The new deck would be rebuilt to code using recycled trex material and be ADA compliant with a gate at top, according to Mr. Schuh. Under the deck the petitioner states they would create a covered lattice area to store outdoor tools.

Mr. Copelas confirms that the stairs will be located in the same place, but will extend just a bit farther out. Mr. Shuh states that is correct. He adds that he was told a special permit was needed because the deck footprint was expanding.

Chair Copelas opens the floor to public comment but there is none.

Chair Copelas notes the application includes a clear statement of grounds and that the petitioner has addressed all relevant matters.

**Motion and Vote:** Ms. Osthoff motions to approve the petition of CAMERON SCHUH at 6 UPHAM STREET (Map 27, Lot 331) (R2 Zoning District) for a Special Permit per Section 3.3.3 Nonconforming Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to replace the second story emergency-exit staircase with a proposed replacement landing that is 10'x15', subject to the following standard conditions:

1. Petitioner shall comply with all city and state statutes, ordinances, codes, and regulations.
2. All construction shall be done as per the plans and dimensions submitted to and approved by the Building Commissioner.
3. All requirements of the Salem Fire Department relative to smoke and fire safety shall be strictly adhered to.
4. Petitioner shall obtain a building permit prior to beginning any construction.
5. Exterior finishes of the new construction shall be in harmony with the existing structure.
6. A Certificate of Occupancy is to be obtained.
7. A Certificate of Inspection is to be obtained.
8. Petitioner is to obtain approval from any City Board or Commission having jurisdiction including, but not limited to, the Planning Board.
9. Unless this Decision expressly provides otherwise, any zoning relief granted does not empower or authorize the Petitioner to demolish or reconstruct the structure(s) located on the subject property to an extent of more than fifty percent (50%) of its floor area or more than fifty percent (50%) of its replacement cost at the time of destruction. If the structure is demolished by any means to an extent of more than fifty percent (50%) of its replacement cost or more than fifty percent (50%) of its floor area at the time of destruction, it shall not be reconstructed except in conformity with the provisions of the Ordinance.
10. All construction shall be done per the plans and dimension submitted to and approved by this Board. Any modification to the plans and dimensions must be approved by the Board of Appeals unless such changes are deemed a minor field change by the Building Commissioner in consultation with the Chair of the Board of Appeals.
11. Petitioner shall schedule Assessing Department inspections of the property, at least annually, to project completion and a final inspection upon project completion.

Ms. McClain seconds the motion. **The vote is five (5) in favor (Hannah Osthoff, Peter Copelas, Paul Viccica, Rosa Ordaz, and Carly McClain) and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.**

Location: **1 Rosedale Avenue (Map 31, Lot 241) (R1 Zoning District)**

Applicant: **Paul and Beth Francis**

Project: A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of PAUL AND BETH FRANCIS at 1 ROSEDALE AVENUE (Map 31, Lot 241) (R1 Zoning District) for a Special Permit per Section 3.3.3 Nonconforming Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to remove an existing dilapidated solarium structure (sunroom) and replace it with a single-story addition. The petitioner also proposes to construct a new deck.

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application date-stamped July 13, 2023 and supporting documentation

Chair Copelas introduces the petition.

Architect William Nolan of Savoy Nolan Architects introduces himself on behalf of the petitioners. Mr. Nolan presents site plans and describes the property as a 1.5 story cape with detached garage. He also presents proposed site plans, and explains there is an existing solarium in need of repair which will be replaced by the petitioners proposal. Mr. Nolan indicates the home is small and that the petitioners have grandchildren, so they are looking to pick up additional floor area in addition to replacing the solarium by in-filling an existing corner between the solarium and what has been called the “harbor room” with a one story addition. The total additional square footage according to Mr. Nolan is 65 square feet, and that the property lines are not further encroached by the proposal. Existing floor plans and photos are presented. Mr. Nolan also notes that the existing low-level deck will also be extended in the proposal. Proposed floor plans and elevations are presented.

Chair Copelas asks to go back to the plot plan and asks about a note indicating the addition would go farther than verbally described. Mr. Nolan acknowledges the note was a copy error and clarifies the proposal matches his description. He also adds that the proposal was discussed with neighbors and that there has been no opposition to date.

Ms. Osthoff asks about the height of the new deck extension, and Mr. Nolan states it is between 12 and 15 inches.

Chair Copelas opens the floor to public comment but there is none.

Mr. Nolan discusses the statement of grounds for the special permit.

**Motion and Vote:** Ms. Ordaz motions to approve the petition of PAUL AND BETH FRANCIS at 1 ROSEDALE AVENUE (Map 31, Lot 241) (R1 Zoning District) for a Special Permit per Section 3.3.3 Nonconforming Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to remove an existing dilapidated solarium structure (sunroom) and replace it with a single-story addition and a new deck, subject to the following standard conditions:

1. Petitioner shall comply with all city and state statutes, ordinances, codes, and regulations.
2. All construction shall be done as per the plans and dimensions submitted to and approved by the Building Commissioner.
3. All requirements of the Salem Fire Department relative to smoke and fire safety shall be strictly adhered to.
4. Petitioner shall obtain a building permit prior to beginning any construction.
5. Exterior finishes of the new construction shall be in harmony with the existing structure.

6. A Certificate of Inspection is to be obtained.
7. Petitioner is to obtain approval from any City Board or Commission having jurisdiction including, but not limited to, the Planning Board.
8. Unless this Decision expressly provides otherwise, any zoning relief granted does not empower or authorize the Petitioner to demolish or reconstruct the structure(s) located on the subject property to an extent of more than fifty percent (50%) of its floor area or more than fifty percent (50%) of its replacement cost at the time of destruction. If the structure is demolished by any means to an extent of more than fifty percent (50%) of its replacement cost or more than fifty percent (50%) of its floor area at the time of destruction, it shall not be reconstructed except in conformity with the provisions of the Ordinance.
9. All construction shall be done per the plans and dimension submitted to and approved by this Board. Any modification to the plans and dimensions must be approved by the Board of Appeals unless such changes are deemed a minor field change by the Building Commissioner in consultation with the Chair of the Board of Appeals.
10. Petitioner shall schedule Assessing Department inspections of the property, at least annually, to project completion and a final inspection upon project completion.

Mr. Viccica seconds the motion. **The vote is five (5) in favor (Carly McClain, Peter Copelas, Hannah Osthoff, Paul Viccica, Rosa Ordaz) and none (0) opposed. The motion is passes.**

Location: **73 Proctor Street (Map 25, Lot 3) (R2 Zoning District)**

Applicant: **Joseph and Valquirla Jourdan**

Project: A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of JOSEPH AND VALQUIRLA JOURDAN at 73 PROCTOR STREET (Map 25, Lot 3) (R2 Zoning District) for a Special Permit per Section 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single- and Two-family Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to convert a single-family home to a two-family home. The proposed new unit will be a one-bedroom unit. There will be no exterior changes to the property.

#### Documents and Exhibitions

- Application date-stamped July 17, 2023 and supporting documentation

Chair Copelas introduces the petition.

Architect David Jaquith introduces himself on behalf of the petitioners and describes the property. Mr. Jaquith presents photos of the existing property and explains that the petitioner is proposing to add a second unit, with most work occurring inside the property. The only exterior change would be adding a second egress door in the rear. Mr. Jaquith presents a map of the property as well as aerial photographs. None of the setbacks are changing with the proposal according to Mr. Jaquith, and there is adequate parking in the rear and driveway, with two parking spaces being added behind the deck. Mr. Jaquith presents proposed floor plans and also discusses the existing setback conditions. The proposal adds a new rental to Salem, and Mr. Jaquith states it does not change the neighborhood character. He shows existing and proposed floor plans, indicating the new unit

would be about 650 square feet and be a one-bedroom unit, leaving 1,650 square feet for the other unit.

Chair Copelas notes the home is deceptively large from the street view, where it appears much more modest.

Chair Copelas opens the floor to public comment but there is none.

Chair Copelas summarizes the statement of grounds.

**Motion and Vote:** Ms. Ordaz motions to approve the petition of JOSEPH AND VALQUIRLA JOURDAN at 73 PROCTOR STREET (Map 25, Lot 3) (R2 Zoning District) for a Special Permit per Section 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single- and Two-family Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to convert a single-family home to a two-family home with the proposed new unit being a one-bedroom unit, subject to the following standard conditions:

1. Petitioner shall comply with all city and state statutes, ordinances, codes, and regulations.
2. All construction shall be done as per the plans and dimensions submitted to and approved by the Building Commissioner.
3. All requirements of the Salem Fire Department relative to smoke and fire safety shall be strictly adhered to.
4. Petitioner shall obtain a building permit prior to beginning any construction.
5. Exterior finishes of the new construction shall be in harmony with the existing structure.
6. A Certificate of Occupancy is to be obtained.
7. A Certificate of Inspection is to be obtained.
8. Petitioner is to obtain approval from any City Board or Commission having jurisdiction including, but not limited to, the Planning Board.
9. Unless this Decision expressly provides otherwise, any zoning relief granted does not empower or authorize the Petitioner to demolish or reconstruct the structure(s) located on the subject property to an extent of more than fifty percent (50%) of its floor area or more than fifty percent (50%) of its replacement cost at the time of destruction. If the structure is demolished by any means to an extent of more than fifty percent (50%) of its replacement cost or more than fifty percent (50%) of its floor area at the time of destruction, it shall not be reconstructed except in conformity with the provisions of the Ordinance.
10. All construction shall be done per the plans and dimension submitted to and approved by this Board. Any modification to the plans and dimensions must be approved by the Board of Appeals unless such changes are deemed a minor field change by the Building Commissioner in consultation with the Chair of the Board of Appeals.
11. Petitioner shall schedule Assessing Department inspections of the property, at least annually, to project completion and a final inspection upon project completion.

Mr. Viccica seconds the motion. **The vote is five (5) in favor (Peter Copelas, Hannah Osthoff, Paul Viccica, Rosa Ordaz, and Carly McClain) and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.**

Location:        **107 Mason Street (Map 16, Lot 361) (R2 Zoning District)**

Applicant: **Ramon Hidalgo**

Project: A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of RAMON HILDALGO at 107 MASON STREET (Map 16, Lot 361) (R2 Zoning District) for a Special Permit per Section 3.3.3 Nonconforming Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to expand a nonconforming three-family home by adding a three-level deck. The required rear setback is 30 feet. The deck would be at 17 feet. Also, a Variance per Section 4.1.1 Dimensional Requirements for maximum height of buildings (stories).

#### Documents and Exhibitions

- Application date-stamped July 16, 2023 and supporting documentation

Chair Copelas introduces the petition.

Daguin Fortuna introduces himself on behalf of the petitioner and explains that a routine inspection of the building resulted in the awareness of a safety hazard caused by the current layout of the decks and egresses, where the second and third floor units must enter back into the building in order to exit. The proposal would allow for the occupants of the three-family to exit properly from the decks, as the existing three-story porch has no stairs or proper exit except for the first floor. Mr. Fortuna presents photographs of the property including an aerial view, as well as a site plan. Mr. Fortuna presents floor plans, and explains that the proposal will bring the building up to code. He also notes that there are eight letters of support from abutters, and presents proposed renderings.

Chair Copelas asks about the bumped out portion of the building in the rear, noting it appears to have been designed to house an interior rear staircase. Mr. Fortuna explains that there is a staircase in the bump out that goes to the basement, but that none of the units have access to the stairs. Mr. Copelas asks if the stairway has an egress on the first floor, and Mr. Fortuna states it does. Mr. Copelas asks if the petitioner considered making access to the stairwell instead for the units. Mr. Fortuna explains that many options were considered, including even closing off the porch to gain more interior space. That option proved to be too costly, and the option of providing access to the interior stairwell is not feasible because the stairwell abuts bedrooms and a closet on the second and third floor, and an egress cannot be through a bedroom. Mr. Fortuna further explains that this option would be costly and cause much disruption as the floor plans and layout would need to change.

Chair Copelas questions why the applicant is seeking a variance, noting that the special permit request makes sense. Mr. Fortuna indicates the building inspector suggested a variance be requested based on the height of the stairwell. Mr. Copelas discusses the higher standard for a variance compared to a special permit, and questions whether the variance might not be needed, or if there would be a solution that does not require the variance. He mentioned the interior stairwell and bump out again, and Mr. Fortuna shows floor plans and reiterates that the bedroom locations prevent that as a viable option. Mr. Hidalgo notes the stairwell also abuts a bathroom in addition to the bedroom and closet, and further explains that the change in layout would be more costly and disruptive.

Mr. Viccica acknowledges that while there may technically be other options, the petitioner has made it clear that the other options would involve renovations and destruction of the current interior

layout. Mr. Viccica suggests that this would qualify in his mind as a hardship, as the egresses are needed to comply with code. Mr. Copelas agrees, but again questions the need for a variance. Mr. Viccica states he is also unsure why a variance is needed. Mr. Copelas and Mr. Viccica discuss whether the Board should approve just a special permit with the understanding that a variance could be requested if necessary. Vice Chair McClain states she would be fine with approving both as a hardship was clearly articulated. Mr. Viccica agrees that a hardship exists because the building cannot be occupied without this legal means of egress. Ms. Ordaz also agrees with going forward with both the special permit and variance request, because even if the variance is not needed, a more restrictive burden has already been proven and it would not require re-petitioning or advertising, compared to coming back for a variance if one was needed but not granted.

Mr. Viccica states it would be helpful to have the building commissioner present, particularly if they provided direction on a petition because he is generally not a fan of a “belt and suspenders” approach to providing relief and ruling on variances that may be unnecessary.

Chair Copelas opens the floor to public comment but there is none.

Mr. Viccica asks if the third unit has always existed or if the petitioner is trying to create a new unit. The petitioner confirms it has always existed.

**Motion and Vote:** Ms. McClain motions to approve the petition of RAMON HILDALGO at 107 MASON STREET (Map 16, Lot 361) (R2 Zoning District) for a Special Permit per Section 3.3.3 Nonconforming Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to expand a nonconforming three-family home by adding a three-level, 17 foot deck, and a Variance per Section 4.1.1 Dimensional Requirements for maximum height of buildings (stories), subject to the following standard conditions:

1. Petitioner shall comply with all city and state statutes, ordinances, codes, and regulations.
2. All construction shall be done as per the plans and dimensions submitted to and approved by the Building Commissioner.
3. All requirements of the Salem Fire Department relative to smoke and fire safety shall be strictly adhered to.
4. Petitioner shall obtain a building permit prior to beginning any construction.
5. Exterior finishes of the new construction shall be in harmony with the existing structure.
6. A Certificate of Occupancy is to be obtained.
7. A Certificate of Inspection is to be obtained.
8. Petitioner is to obtain approval from any City Board or Commission having jurisdiction including, but not limited to, the Planning Board.
9. Unless this Decision expressly provides otherwise, any zoning relief granted does not empower or authorize the Petitioner to demolish or reconstruct the structure(s) located on the subject property to an extent of more than fifty percent (50%) of its floor area or more than fifty percent (50%) of its replacement cost at the time of destruction. If the structure is demolished by any means to an extent of more than fifty percent (50%) of its replacement cost or more than fifty percent (50%) of its floor area at the time of destruction, it shall not be reconstructed except in conformity with the provisions of the Ordinance.
10. All construction shall be done per the plans and dimension submitted to and approved by this Board. Any modification to the plans and dimensions must be approved by the

Board of Appeals unless such changes are deemed a minor field change by the Building Commissioner in consultation with the Chair of the Board of Appeals.

11. Petitioner shall schedule Assessing Department inspections of the property, at least annually, to project completion and a final inspection upon project completion.

Ms. Ordaz seconds the motion. **The vote is five (5) in favor (Peter Copelas, Hannah Osthoff, Paul Viccica, Rosa Ordaz, and Carly McClain) and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.**

## MEETING MINUTES

### June 21, 2023

Chair Copelas states that on page nine of the minutes he does not agree with the wording that Ms. Vyeding was “unconcerned with the hardship,” and instead suggests the minutes state that she “was satisfied that the hardship qualification was met. He also notes that on page 11 the word “inquires”.

Ms. Osthoff notes that there is a typo in the description of 41 Bertuccio Avenue where the size is listed in inches but should be feet. She identifies a similar error for 30 Bellow Road. Ms. Osthoff also notes a typo on page 12 where “Greed Ledge” should be changed to “Green Ledge”.

**Motion and Vote:** Mr. Viccica motions to approve the minutes from the June 21, 2023 meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals as amended. Ms. Ordaz seconds the motion. **The vote is four (4) in favor, one (1) abstained, and none (0) opposed. The motion passes**

### July 19, 2023

Mr. Viccica notes a correction on page eight where the vote number is incorrect. It should read “the vote is one (1) in favor and four (4) opposed,” not the current “five (1) in favor”.

**Motion and Vote:** Mr. Viccica motions to approve the minutes from the July 19, 2023 meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals as amended. Ms. Ordaz seconds the motion. **The vote is five (5) in favor and none (0) opposed. The motion passes**

## OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Chair Copelas discusses the future of the Board and planning department with his term coming to an end on December 8th. He notes his intention to step down off the Board. He and the Board members discuss potential options for Chair and the possibility of the planning department not wanting a brand new member as Chair. Vice Chair McClain states she does not have an interest in the role of Chair, noting her various other commitments and time constraints. Ms. Ordaz and Mr. Viccica also expressed an inability to take on the role, due to other obligations. The Board discusses the potential for Ms. Vyedin to step into the role. The Board acknowledges that Ms. Vyedin is not present to opine or provide input. Mr. Copelas states that if necessary he could continue on for a shortened period.

### Next Meeting

September 20, 2023

---

## ADJOURNMENT

**Motion and Vote:** Ms. Ordaz motions to adjourn the meeting. **The vote is all in favor. The motion passes.**

**The meeting ends at 8:35 PM on August 16, 2023.**

*For actions where the decisions have not been fully written into these minutes, copies of the Decisions have been posted separately by address or project at:*

<https://www.salem.com/zoning-board-appeals/pages/zoning-board-appeals-decisions-2023>

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Laroe, Staff Planner