**City of Salem Planning Board and City Council**

**JOINT PUBLIC HEARING**

**Monday, March 30, 2020**

The purpose of the public hearing is to provide interested parties with an opportunity to comment on the proposed three (3) separate Zoning Amendments summarized below:

1. An Ordinance Amending Zoning Section 3.1 Table of Principal and Accessory Use Regulations of the City of Salem Zoning Ordinance to delete the “Accessory Living Area” Accessory Use in its entirety and inserting an “Accessory Dwelling Unit” Accessory Use in the RC, R1, R2, and R3 zoning districts.
2. An Ordinance amending the Salem Zoning Ordinance relative to accessory dwelling units in the following three ways:
	1. Amending Zoning Ordinance Section 10 Definitions
	2. Amending Zoning Ordinance Section 3.2.4 Accessory Buildings and Structures
	3. Amending Zoning Ordinance Section 3.2.8 Accessory Dwelling Areas
3. An Ordinance amending the Salem Zoning Ordinance by adding a new Section 5.4 Inclusionary Housing and amending Section 10 Definitions by adding definitions related to the Inclusionary Housing ordinance.

The complete text of the three (3) proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance are on file and available for inspection by calling or emailing the City Clerk’s Office, 93 Washington Street, Salem, MA at 978-619-5610 or isimons@salem.com or the Department of Planning & Community Development, 2nd floor, City Hall Annex, 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA. 978-619-5685 or mwells@salem.com.

Presiding City Councilor Bob McCarthy opens the meeting at 7:00PM. 61 members of the public are viewing the meeting.

1. **ROLL CALL**

***Planning Board Members present:***

Chair Ben Anderson

Bill Griset

Kirt Rieder

Matt Smith

Matt Veno

Noah Koretz

DJ Napolitano

Carole Hamilton

***Planning Board Members Absent:***

Helen Sides

***City Council Members Present:***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [Robert K. McCarthy](https://www.salem.com/people/robert-k-mccarthy) | Ward 1 Councillor - Council President |
| [Christine W. Madore](https://www.salem.com/people/christine-w-madore) | Ward 2 Councillor |
| [Patricia Morsillo](https://www.salem.com/people/patricia-morsillo) | Ward 3 Councillor |
| [Timothy G. Flynn](https://www.salem.com/people/timothy-g-flynn) | Ward 4 Councillor |
| [Josh H. Turiel](https://www.salem.com/people/josh-h-turiel) | Ward 5 Councillor |
| [Megan Riccardi](https://www.salem.com/people/megan-riccardi) | Ward 6 Councillor |
| [Stephen G. Dibble](https://www.salem.com/people/stephen-g-dibble) | Ward 7 Councillor |
| [Domingo J. Dominguez](https://www.salem.com/people/domingo-j-dominguez) | Councillor At Large |
| [Ty Hapworth](https://www.salem.com/people/ty-hapworth) | Councillor At Large |
| [Conrad J. Prosniewski](https://www.salem.com/people/conrad-j-prosniewski) | Councillor At Large |
| [Arthur C. Sargent III](https://www.salem.com/people/arthur-c-sargent-iii) | Councillor At Large |

***City Council Members Absent***: None

***Others Present:***

Mason Wells, Planner

Amanda Chiancola, Senior Planner

Tom Daniel, Director, Planning Department

Mayor Kim Driscoll

Maureen Fisher, Assistant City Clerk

*Councilor Dibble motions that the joint public hearing be continued to Monday May 18, 7PM, 2020, and is seconded by Arthur Sargent*.

Lengthy discussion ensues as to why the matter should or should not be tabled for the time being.

Those in favor of tabling it state that:

* This is a stressful time, the beginning of a state of emergency, and the zoning matters are not urgent, but changes will be permanent. Everyone will be much more comfortable with the COVID-19 situation in a month or two, even if it is not over.
* Addressing the issues of those unable to pay rent or mortgages is a more pressing matter that should be resolved immediately.
* Some Councilors feel they cannot give the matter its due consideration.
* Council members are unable to research the topics at this time.
* The Zoning Enforcement Officer has not received a Draft copy of the language (though it is noted that he would be participating in the meeting as a member of the public, and does not vote as do the Planning Board and City Council)
* Many members of the public, especially older citizens, are unable to access zoom.
* It is poor practice to even open a meeting to discuss these issues at this time.
* Previous Ordinances considered were originally poorly written, but much improved when presented the next time around.

Those in favor of moving forward tonight state that:

* Tonight’s presentation is important for information gathering, and input from the Planning Board and Mayor are important.
* These matters did not suddenly appear but were brought to the City Council two months ago (January 2020), and the Councilors were provided a timeline then, though no one knew how this would turn out. The Council has had time to study the matter and now is the time to begin the process.
* There is no guarantee when the crisis will end, or that any date certain will work out. To put off City business, whether essential or not, is not a good precedent to set.
* While the current COVID-19 crisis demands our attention and the City’s response, the issue being discussed tonight will not go away and will become even more urgent once it is over.
	+ The pandemic has deepened the housing affordability crisis. We kept saying “a lot of people who rent are one crisis away from being homeless.” This could be that crisis.
	+ The Council needs to recognize that and be proactive in this moment, preparing for this ongoing crisis.
* 60 members of the public are online or on the phone right now, who want to hear about these issues, so the Board and Council should take advantage of their presence.
* All emails submitted to the City Council have been read.
* For those unable to access zoom, opportunities to learn were provided, as well as a phone number posted on SATV so they could call in. The meeting itself and the call-in number are also being broadcast live on SATV. The number of people participating online is indicative of interest in the matter. Other means still exist, as they always have, for participation by the public, including email, letters and phone calls.
	+ This format may actually have some advantages over the traditional, in person meetings, where typically the same people show up and say the same type of things. Meeting online allows those who are unable to come in person, such as those with scheduling issues, physical disabilities, or unmet child care needs, to be present.
	+ Ilene Simons and the Planning Board staff are praised for their efforts; a dry run was practiced via Zoom so there is definitely no lack of ability to participate.
* It is noted that all three matters will be continued in this ongoing public process; having said that, the matter of Inclusionary Zoning will likely be heard at a future meeting, not tonight. The matter is not “on the clock” until the public hearing closes, which will not happen for several more meetings.
* Several Planning Board members echo the Councilors who wish to move forward tonight

*Councilor Dibble motions that the joint public hearing be continued to Monday May 18, 7PM, 2020, and is seconded by Arthur Sargent*.

*The motion* ***fails*** *in a roll call vote with 11 members voting; four (4) in favor and seven (7) against. The meeting shall remain open*.

Councilor Dibble Yes

Councilor Dominguez Yes

Councilor Flynn Yes

Councilor Hapworth No

Councilor Madore No

Councilor Morsillo No

Councilor Prosniewski No

Councilor Riccardi No

Councilor Sargent Yes

Councilor Turiel No

Councilor McCarthy No

11 members voting, 7 no, 4 yes, so the matter does not carry, and the meeting will remain open.

Mayor Driscoll opens the presentation. Tom Daniel and Amanda Chiancola will also be presenting. Both measures, Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) and Inclusionary Zoning, have been endorsed by Affordable Housing Trust Fund Board AHTFB). She also wants to be clear that the tools we are looking at are policy tools on the heels of adaptive reuse. ADU and Inclusionary were two other tools identified as being desirable, in community forums. In addition to these policies, the City is exploring development projects, leveraging public lands and spaces, housing, and utilizing developments by the North Shore Community Development Coalition (CDC). She notes that it can take a long time to get a project off the ground even when the City or a developer owns the land. While the City is excited about upcoming redevelopment CDC projects, they are still many years away from happening. ADUs can happen sooner. Individuals may have spaces that they can convert. Several ADUs already exist and are grandfathered, and the City wants to make it easier to do that going forward. The ADU ordinance previously before Council, now has 8 co-sponsors so it is well understood and supported.

For the development of Inclusionary Zoning, the City worked with the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), to consider the formula they are applying. The Planning Board had been incorporating Inclusionary Zoning in the many projects before it, at the rate of 10% at 80%, but having an official Ordinance will better serve our community.

Mayor Driscoll reiterates the need for this. In working with homeless families, there is the realization that this is a severe need that will only get worse post-COVID-19. There will not be any votes tonight, but we may have this tool post-COVID 19 to keep people in the loop, people who may not have child care, or may not be able to sit in chambers for hours [during an in-person meeting]. Seniors are seeking housing, families sheltering in place in motels and family shelters, so it is an urgent need. She praises Tom Daniel and Amanda Chiancola for their efforts.

Additional information about ADU Ordinances, and the issue in general, in other communities, can be found here:

<https://pioneerinstitute.org/economic_opportunity/study-boston-area-communities-should-loosen-restrictions-for-accessory-dwelling-units/> (Includes a link to the study referenced, which was completed by Amy Dain in July 2018)

Tom Daniel presents information on the Accessory Dwelling Units Ordinance amendment:

* Timeline is described; a grant was obtained to study implementation of ADU ordinance
* Worked w/MAPC in 2018, initial public meeting in March 2019; work on ADU and publicly owned land were prioritized
* ADU was put forth last year; this is an updated one with tools outside of the Ordinance
* 2019 work w/MAPC was extensive, looked at national and Mass. best practices along with data for Salem

Amanda Chiancola: ADU Ordinance Overview

* What is an ADU?
	+ Self contained
	+ Within, attached, or detached
	+ Generally for smaller households of 1-2 people
	+ Typically rent for less than standard apts. as they may be in an attic, basement, attached, or above a garage
* Current Ordinance refers to “Accessory Living Areas,” which have many names, such as in-law apts etc.
	+ Limited to caretakers and family members
	+ Requires a special permit and must be a self contained residential unit that shares the same lot as another home
* ADU recommendations
	+ Amend purpose: “to add rental units to the housing stock to meet the needs of smaller households; to make housing units available to households for those who might otherwise have difficulty finding housing”
	+ Remove tenant restrictions
	+ Allow in multifamily homes of 4 or fewer units
	+ Changes the process; the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) currently uses specific criteria, but still requires a public hearing. The ZBA may condition, but special permits are not well received by homeowners b/c they are discretionary. The amended Ordinance aims to mitigate neighborhood concerns at front end rather than by special permit
	+ As of July 2019, 37 communities around Boston allow them
* Proposed process:
	+ Performance Standards [that must be met for “by right” ADU compliance or construction]:
		- 2 parking spaces
		- No net tree loss
		- New construction must meet the underlying dimensional standard
		- Does not exceed 800 square feet
	+ ONLY if a proposed unit meets ALL of the above performance standards, can it be constructed “by right” with a building permit only, no special permit required.
	+ Construction of an ADU requires a special permit if does not comply with any Performance Standard, in which case it requires both a special permit AND building permit
* ADU design
	+ New front door not allowed
	+ Cannot exceed 1.5 stories
	+ Cannot exceed 18’ in height
	+ Must comply w/same setbacks as primary home (even if primary home itself does not comply)
	+ ADU must be smaller than primary home
* Accessory to primary home
	+ Owner of primary home must live in primary home or ADU
	+ Can never be sold separately from primary home
	+ Utilities for ADU and primary home (electric, gas, water, sewer) must be on a single service
* ADUs are an opportunity for private homeowners to create “naturally affordable” units, as such basement/attic units that lack some amenities, so are more affordable w/no public subsidies, but tax incentives for homeowners are offered if the unit is restricted as affordable. A loan pool is another incentive. A homeowner could take out a loan from city to create the ADU, but in exchange the unit must be affordable

Planning Board Member Matt, Veno who was only listening before, “arrives” at 7:56PM.

Councilor Ty Hapworth asks for clarification about setbacks; the new unit would have to comply with existing, current setbacks even if the existing home does not.

Councilor Dominguez asks about the table of income levels; this has to do more with inclusionary zoning. Under discussion now are supplemental programs which would incentivize ADUs.

Tom Daniel notes the Mayor's submission from Feb. 13, a cover letter that included the entire package of the Ordinance, such as the loan program and tax exemption; this is probably the document Dominguez is referring to, re income limitations and max rent. The table is shown.

* Studio income limit 60% AMI: $49,800, Max rent $1,245
* 1 BR income limit 60% AMI: $56,880, Max rent $1,333
* 2 BR not likely for an ADU of <800 square feet, but 60% AMI: $64,020, Max rent $1,600

It is noted that the numbers are not part of this Ordinance but are part of the incentives. People can charge whatever they want but the property tax break ties the ADU to affordability and certifies that rent is appropriate and that the tenant is at a level of income commensurate with the ADU level; also the loan will be an incentive. Councilor McCarthy notes that this information will be distributed to everyone.

He also notes that those on the meeting should not be communicating on their personal numbers. Since the call in # is no longer on the bottom of the SATV screen, he repeats it: 1-888-475-4499, for those who want to call in. Prompt w/ID number is 447831204, then follow prompts to be in the attendee portion of the meeting.

Planning Board Chair Ben Anderson does not have any comments but solicits them from other Board members.

Kirt Rieder asks for clarification regarding parking, that it is not two additional spaces dedicated to the ADU. Only one space is required for the ADU, plus whatever additional spaces are required for the home. For example, if square footage mandates 1.5 spaces and the ADU needs an additional space, this would mean that three spaces in total are required. Also, Mr. Rieder notes that it is more conventional to discuss net loss of inches vs. individual trees. This can be clarified.

Councilor Dibble voices his concerns, feeling that the current Ordinance requiring that an ADU only be allowed to be installed and exist as long as it is being used by family members or caregivers, could be tweaked or changed. He is concerned that “every single family house in Salem can now become a two-family, and two- three- and four- unit homes can add another unit.” He wonders how many eligible units could be produced, if every eligible property owner added an ADU.

Councilor McCarthy counters that this is not a fair question, as it is very complicated to figure out which homes would be able to provide parking, and accommodate the appropriate setbacks, etc. So to make a blanket suggestion like this is not fair. Councilor Dribble “clarifies” that his is a more specific question, not “how many houses do we have in Salem that could do this.” Amanda Chiancola will look into this, but notes that the cost of constructing an ADU is between $40,000 and $80,000 at a minimum, so not every home that could accommodate one, will have owners that will build one. Councilor Dibble throws out the figure of 10,000. Tom Daniel reiterates that there is no way to estimate. Matt Smith of the Planning Board comments that the Board and Council can check with area communities who already have an ADU ordinance in place, to get a sense of what actually happens.

Undaunted, Councilor Dibble presses on, speculating that there may be 10,000 eligible properties in Salem and that, if each one added an ADU and two people moved in, there would be 20,000 new residents. He notes that of course the figure will be lower, however there are no taxes on ADUs, so who will pay for the services of those living in them? They will still use Salem’s resources such as schools, utilities, etc. He feels that discussion should occur regarding limiting the number of units that can be constructed.

Councilor Madore feels that these questions were answered last time the Council through this process. A report has been issued by Amy Dain, who studied all communities that allow ADUs. A June 2019 Table of all communities who adopted such Ordinances was made, to see how many ADU units were actually produced, and generally it amounted to no more than 5-6 units per year over 3-5 years, so we are exaggerating to say we will have tens of thousands of Single Family owners invest tens of thousands of dollars to create rental units, and take on a restriction on their property to provide an affordable unit to family in need. The economics don’t work. A link to the study itself can be found in this article: <https://pioneerinstitute.org/economic_opportunity/study-boston-area-communities-should-loosen-restrictions-for-accessory-dwelling-units/> It will be sent to Councilors. Another opinion article by Amy Dain can be read here: <https://commonwealthmagazine.org/opinion/give-accessory-apartments-a-shot/>

Amanda Chiancola says the list of 37 communities is pulled from the above report. One permit per 1,000 homes would lead to 1.8 units being built every three years.

Councilor Turiel appreciates the hyperbole of Councilor Dibble, noting that, theoretically, every single family through four-family home could theoretically try to build, leading to the addition of 8,000 units. However, it is obvious that that is hyperbole, and we are looking at small numbers. Just because you can build an ADU on your property doesn’t mean you are going to. Many homes will not be able to due to setbacks. These are units that max out at 1000 square feet, and may only be constructed by right at 800 square feet. They will be linked by deed forever, and may not be split into another lot. What is before us may not be perfect but the fundamental premise is sound. There is unfilled demand for ADUs, and they will alleviate pressure on the rental market, and while it’s not the only answer, it will advance the cause with minimal, if any risk. 10,000 people are not coming into a deed restricted, with tax free properties and flooding the schools. If the market demands, there might be a couple dozen a year if homeowners want to build them.

Councilor Hapworth notes that it is important to point out this is a bottom up, not top down, mandate. Thus, if 10,000 people want an ADU, that means if people are against it they won’t be built there. It is not innovative in any community, not even Salem. Housing has always adapted to demand, and currently there are so few areas that can be developed, that what gets built is too big and generates pushback against housing. This would be gentler density and a different growth pattern, and would add affordability. It’s not that every single-family neighborhood will become an R2.

Councilor Flynn notes that many of his constituents with single family homes are concerned about their neighborhoods becoming R2s and asks if removing R1 zones from the Ordinance has been considered. It has not been. The current Ordinance is limited to R1 so that would be a drastic change from what is embedded. R1 will still be an R1 zone, as these are accessory, not second units. Councilor Flynn insists that his constituents do not want this, and it is not what they signed up for.

Councilor Sargent feels that the potential number of units that may be built seems like a small number to gain for such a zoning change. It may be more suited for Marblehead, Wenham, Swampscott, etc, not suited for areas with lots of rental units. Salem is 50% rental units, and while the City needs affordable housing, everyone believes Salem is already doing its fair share of affordable housing. He feels that the numbers do not reflect the claimed housing crisis.

Councilor Prosniewski notes that ADUs would favor seniors who will be able to stay in the City, as well as smaller families looking to move in. There is a larger aspect than numbers and population. Salem is not Rowley or Hamilton-Wenham. We have seen gentrification because the City is desirable, and allowing seniors and younger families to live here is important.

Councilor Dominguez notes the importance of affordability; to alleviate the situation, the City must adjust to make sure we meet the needs of low income, elderly, and veterans, who should have access to a solution.

DJ Napolitano, Planning Board Member, notices the angst of several Councilors, and is hearing the same arguments as last time. Two of them are completely contradictory; one is that, “imagine every house did this, how many additional units would that be” vs. “we won’t get that many people doing this so it will not benefit the City.” He comments that it can be one or the other, not both. the arguments that either everyone will do this and it will completely change the R1 zone, or that it’s not worth the effort because not enough people are moving into Salem to make it worthwhile are incongruous.

Presiding Councilor McCarthy opens to public comment, specific to these two matters, and the number to call in is posted on the screen as it is no longer scrolling on SATV.

#599 - no comment

#624 - John Casella 8 Beckford St. Concerns:

* Strain on infrastructure
* Increased density
* Potential number of units

#693 - no comment

# Adam Kucken - No comment

#AllenH1954 - No comment

#Alice Merkl, 28a Federal St. notes her statement of support for this City Council meeting on the ADU and Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) Ordinances. With IZ set to 10% at 60% AMI, it will bring a solid measure of affordability into developments. The addition of ADUs creates naturally affordable living spaces but also allows homeowners to stay in their homes. There was great support of ADUs at previous Council meetings, and Salem needs to take all steps possible to alleviate the housing crisis.

#Alvi Ibanez - no comment

# Bonnnie B - no comment

#Carol - no comment

#Chris - no comment

#Chris (gmail.com) - no comment

#Chrissy D - no comment, expresses disappointment in Councilors

#Cynthia Nina-Soto,6 Laurent Rd. Salem, President of NS Association of Realtors, represents 1200 local realtor members, and is in support of the ADU Ordinance. Allowing by right ADUs is a commonsense approach while not disturbing the existing character of the neighborhood. It allows owners to create and provide housing to a wide range of those who need it. By nature of their size, ADUs are more affordable. Many residents including seniors are looking for additional income, businesses that are are hiring, and young adults who want to remain in Salem can be helped by this. She commends Salem on its efforts. Councilors please remember that we have close to 200 homeless students in our school systems, and Councilors will do their jobs if we can help them. They are our future. Every little bit counts.

#darleenmelis

#Dustin Luca (Salem News reporter)(skip)

#Ellen @ comcast.net - no comment

#Eric Duhaime,15 Symonds St., agrees w/Councilor Flynn that residents who purchase in R1 want to be surrounded by single family houses, so why not limit ADUs to R2 and R3 zones that already have a higher density of people? Off street parking would not be adversely affected.

#jeffcohen - Submitted email to Councilors

#Jenny Lynch, 38 Charles St. submitted an email, on behalf of the League of Women Voters re ADU, and also personally supports this Ordinance.

#John McHarrie - No connection

#Patrick Maguire - No comment

#patrickkennedy - SATV online (skipped)

#Sue Kieley

#Josiah Fisk, 358 Essex St. with an office at 10 Derby Square, sent in a long, technical email pointing out errors and ambiguities. He supports the intent of both Ordinances and approves of how the ADU one is written. Some loopholes exist, which may be intentional, but this is unclear; they are pointed out in the email. However, they could result in not having owner occupancy. Regarding the potential number of new ADUs, he has heard that in the past there has been low activity in other towns, in our City the ordinance we have right now is very restrictive. Having an accurate projection is crucial. He is glad there is support for continuing the hearing, as others will want to comment.

#Galaxy Tab A @comcast.net - no comment

#Fred Biebesheimer, 17 ½ River St. is disappointed that this meeting happened, and feels it was inappropriate given all that is going on. Councilor Madore raised the fact that this will add only 5-6 units per year, so why are we bothering? He feels that, since the Planning Department does not have facts for how many units could actually be created, this shows the Ordinance has not been thought through. This number needs to be known before making this decision. He is also concerned about enforcement, noting the case of an AirBnB where it has been more than a year dealing with one renegade landlord. Another example would be investors who claim to live there, etc.

#Steve Kapantais

#WILLIAM LEBLANC - no comment

#Meg Twohey, 122 Federal St., seconds Fred Biebershemer and feels that Tim Jenkins’s special permit ideas are good, especially given AirBnBs. She notes that the Ordinance is attached to the Agenda, but the website says a full text of Ordinance will be provided soon, and wonders if what is attached to the Agenda is correct or if there is more information for residents to review. She also requests that the meeting be continued. Everything on the agenda is before residents. Ilene Simons clarifies that on Thursday documents were not ready, and other items were posted afterward.

#Kim - no comment

#Natalie FrankeOtten

#paulwright

#Mark Tuttle

#Hannah Diozzi - no comment

#Pavel - no comment

#JSK-

#Nichole McLaughlin,4 Roosevelt Rd., supports the ADU Ordinance. She lives in an R1 neighborhood, and is not concerned that this will change its character if passed. She is concerned about the change in character in Salem if affordable housing is not created by any means available to us. There will be changes to our character and density if affordable housing is not available. She does not believe there will be a huge rush to build units; some arguments/calls for numbers of how many could possibly be built she sees as a scare tactic and does not appreciate it.

#Lindsay Morsillo

#Michael Kraft - no comment

#Melissa Stockbridge, 2 Oakland St, in favor, is a single family homeowner, who has an unbuildable lot attached to her property w/carriage house on that lot, and would consider putting in an ADU b/c affordable housing is important to her. She volunteers a lot for such causes, and also she is in an R2 zone surrounded by multifamilies but hers is a single family. She believes in affordable housing, and would like to have the opportunity to provide it

#Riley LeBlanc

#mlatulippe

#Stan Franzeen - no comment

#Steve Kapantais 23 A (street?) is opposed to the ADU Ordinance.

* Income limits only enforceable if homeowner takes advantage of tax credits
* As written does not promote affordable housing, rather at or above market rate
* Tax abatements or subsidized home loans are less than renting a market rate unit so homeowners will not take advantage of them
* A 1 BR ADU in a single family neighborhood will fetch higher rent than a 1 BR in a multi family neighborhood
* Tax abatements will be taken advantage of. If taking advantage of ADUs for a family member, homeowners will take advantage, if family member meets income criteria, using public tax dollars
* Also someone considering early retirement could take out a home loan, abatement, move into the ADU and rent the house at market rate
* Ordinance is an attempt to create affordability but will create market rate housing, ADUs built for family members will be subsidized by taxpayer dollars

#andrew - Andrew Meegan, 65 Dearborn St., opposed, feels that this is not going to solve the housing crisis, and opens up too many doors for opportunistic people to attach $250,000 additions to their houses. By right requirements are too loose, and the neighbors have no control over what is built; this needs more work

#Lorelee Stewart, 7 Barnes Rd., is in favor of ADUs. Notes prior issues re ensuring that (*inaudible, feedback)*. She feels that the incentives address concerns that came up last time, and that any gains in affordable housing are critical

#Kristin

#Kate Jordan - no comment

#linda Tim Jenkins, 18 Broad St. In support, however, he feels ADUs should be by special permit as it is difficult to build “one size fits all” and ADUs could be impacting tight suburban neighborhoods. If 1-2 dozen/year are built, it will not overload the ZBA or PB to determine suitability. He is concerned about the loss of green space. Having ADUs be by right puts the onus on the homeowner to see if they comply w/underling requirements

#686 - Carole Carr 7 River St. Concerns:

* Enforcement of ADU rules, not only building of units but demolition of units once no longer used
* Who will make sure the principal owner is residing in one of those buildings?
* Will pit neighbor against neighbor. R1 residents want to keep it that way. Concerned about density, infrastructure, R2’s becoming R3’s, etc.
* What about the process in place for people to do something similar? Cites current sites under development as being required to provide more affordable housing
* Concerned about character of neighborhood
* Wants hearing to be continued, more study needed

#830 - Mary Whitney, 356 Essex St. Unit 2. Concerned about public participation in the meeting, as she had technical difficulties. She supports continuing the meeting, Concerns: ordinance needs more work, questions why we don’t ask current developers to include affordable housing rather than have existing residential neighborhoods solve the problem

Councilor McCarthy thanks all Board members and members of the public who participated. The intent was to let everyone be heard and to process the information. He also thanks Mason Wells and Ilene Simons for working out the technology. He feels the process was handled well despite objections to starting the meeting and allowing presentations. He recommends a motion to continue.

*Councilor Turiel motions to continue the meeting to 7PM on Monday April 13, to hear all 3 items, starting with inclusionary zoning.*

All matters will be kept open until they are complete. Councilor Dibble is concerned that not everyone who wanted to speak was able to. He also feels that the two ADU items should be handled together but Inclusionary Zoning should be heard separately as it is a separate issue. Presiding Councilor McCarty comments that the issues will be kept together for now, but if in 2 weeks there is no progress, they will be separated.

*The above motion is seconded by Councilor Dibble, and the motion carries.*

*A motion to adjourn is made by Councilor Sargent, and the motion carries*

The meeting ends at 9:50PM

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/planning-board/webforms/planning-board-2020-decisions>

Respectfully submitted,

Stacy Kilb, Recording Clerk

Approved by the Planning Board on XX/XX/2020

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A § 18-25 and City Ordinance § 2-2028 through § 22033.