

## City of Salem Zoning Board of Appeals

### **Meeting Minutes**

September 20, 2023

A meeting of the Salem Zoning Board of Appeals (“Salem ZBA”) was held on Wednesday, September 20, 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, Nina Vyedin, and Hannah Osthoff. Also in attendance were Daniel Laroe – Staff Planner, and Jonathan Pinto – Recording Clerk. Those absent were: None

#### **REGULAR AGENDA**

Location: **124 Boston Street (Map 16, Lot 157) (B2 Zoning District)**

Applicant: **Farrandia, LLC**

Project: A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of FARRANDIA, LLC at 124 BOSTON STREET (Map 16, Lot 157) (B2 Zoning District) for a Special Permits per Section 3.3.2 Nonconforming Uses of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to change the existing nonconforming use as a 1-family dwelling above the existing first floor retail, personal service or office use to another nonconforming use to have two dwelling units above the first-floor retail, personal service or office space. Also, Section 3.3.3 Nonconforming Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to extend, alter, and change the existing nonconforming structure. In addition, variances from Section 4.1.1 Dimensional Requirements for maximum lot coverage for all buildings. Also, 4.1.1 Dimensional Requirements for minimum side yard setback and Section 5.1.5.6 Design to use existing driveway of about 11.5 feet in width which is slightly less than the 12' width required for driveway which is primarily used to provide for overnight parking.

#### Documents and Exhibitions

- Application date-stamped August 30th, 2023 and supporting documentation

Chair Copelas introduces the petition.

Attorney Bill Quinn introduces himself on behalf of the petitioner, and explains the building at 124 Boston Street has existed for over 100 years. He describes the neighborhood and area as mixed use, and notes a nearby bakery, strip mall, and restaurant, along with residences. Mr. Quinn indicates his client purchased this property this year for the purpose of investing in Salem, renovating the building, and managing it. The building is occupied by some sort of commercial or office space on

the first floor, but Mr. Quinn notes that under current zoning it is illegal to have residences over a commercial space in the B2 district. There are ones that exist, that he states must have been grandfathered in. In this case, Mr. Quinn explains the petitioner is seeking to put his real estate company on the first floor, and would like to renovate the existing third floor to add a second residential dwelling which would be a two bedroom apartment. The renovations would also add an additional means of egress to the third floor (there is currently only one) as a rear wood-framed stairway. Floor plans and architectural renderings have been provided. The third floor character will not be altered by dormers or any other additions aside from the egress. Mr. Quinn indicates there is adequate legal parking, with an existing garage and two legal parking spaces. Mr. Quinn presents the plot plan and other supporting documentation, demonstrating existing and proposed conditions. There is an approximate two percent increase in lot coverage with the proposed changes. Mr. Quinn also presents the parking, noting five spaces in total.

Chair Copelas asks what is currently on the third floor of the building. The petitioner presents the existing floor plan, noting it contains a kitchen, bathroom, and two bedrooms. He states the second and third floor are currently one unit, but not occupied since he purchased the property. Chair Copelas asks if the petitioner knows if the property was previously being used as two dwellings since there are two kitchens, and the petitioner states that he believes it was.

Ms. Osthoff asks if the only change to the property will be the exterior staircase, and the petitioner confirms that is the case.

Mr. Viccica asks if all five parking spaces will be dedicated to the housing, or if one or two of the spaces will be for the business on the first floor. The petitioner states two of the spaces will be for the commercial space.

Mr. Quinn discusses the special permit and variance requirements, and contends the proposed use is not any more detrimental than the existing use. The Board and Mr. Quinn discuss the variance from Section 4.1.1 Dimensional Requirements relating to side yard setback, and determine that it is not required.

Ms. McClain states she lives in the area and thinks the proposal will be a benefit to the neighborhood.

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

**Motion and Vote:** Ms. McClain motions to approve the petition of FARRANDIA, LLC at 124 BOSTON STREET (Map 16, Lot 157) (B2 Zoning District) for a Special Permits per Section 3.3.2 Nonconforming Uses of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to change the existing nonconforming use as a 1-family dwelling above the existing first floor retail, personal service or office use to another nonconforming use to have two dwelling units above the first-floor retail, personal service or office space, as well as Section 3.3.3 Nonconforming Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to extend, alter, and change the existing nonconforming structure, and variances from Section 4.1.1 Dimensional Requirements for maximum lot coverage for all buildings, and Section 5.1.5.6 Design to use existing driveway of about 11.5 feet in width which is slightly less than the 12' width required, 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 shall obtain street numbering from the City of Salem's Assessor's Office and shall display said number so as to be visible from the street.
9. Petitioner is to obtain approval from any City Board or Commission having jurisdiction including, but not limited to, the Planning Board.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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, Paul Viccica, Nina Vyedin, Rosa Ordaz, and Carly McClain) and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.**

Location: **75 North Street (Map 26, Lot 58) (BPD, NRCC Zoning Districts)**

Applicant: **75 North Street, LLC**

Project: A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of 75 NORTH STREET, LLC at 75 NORTH STREET (Map 26, Lot 58) (BPD, NRCC Zoning Districts), 3 SOUTH MASON STREET (Map 26, Lot 54) (NRCC Zoning District), 2 COMMERCIAL STREET (Map 26, Lot 57) (NRCC Zoning District) to re- develop a new four-story transit oriented mixed-use development that will consist of 60 units and a small commercial office space on North Street. The applicant is seeking variances per section 4.1.1 Dimensional Requirements from lot area per dwelling unit where 3,500 sq.ft is required and 742 sq.ft is proposed. A variance from Section 8.4.9 Parking Requirements where one space is proposed and 1.5 spaces are required. And a variance from Section 8.4.9.c Each unit has a separate exterior entrance if located within 100 feet of a residentially used parcel in an abutting zoning district. This parcel is within 100 feet of a residentially used parcel.

#### Documents and Exhibitions

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

Chair Copelas introduces the petition.

Attorney Scott Grover introduces himself on behalf of the petitioner, and states he is joined by one of the principles of the development team, Chris Koeplin as well as, project engineer Bob Griffin, and principle project architect Dan Skolski. Scott Thornton of Vanessa and Associates is also present to answer questions related to traffic and parking. Mr. Grover presents a powerpoint and explains that the property that is the subject of the petitions consists of three parcels that are located in the North River Canal Corridor (“NRCC”) zoning district. 75 North Street is a small office building and shop space facing the extension of north street, 2 Commercial Street is occupied by Bill’s Towing Company, and 3 South Mason Street is the largest of the three parcels, and is overgrown. Mr. Grover indicates the applicant is seeking to combine the three parcels as they are underutilized, to develop a four-story, transit-oriented, mixed-use development that will consist of 60 residential units and a small commercial office space on the North Street corridor. A map of the area is shown. Mr. Grover states the plans include a significant amount of park space and public access to the site from the train station downtown. Given the walkability and proximity to the train, Mr. Grover explains the proposal is for one parking space per residential unit, and nine new spaces will be created along Commercial Street.

Mr. Grover indicates the petitioner worked with Councilor Stott to conduct well attended neighborhood meetings at the Salvation Army facility near the site, and a number of changes were made to the plans before being submitted to the Board based on neighborhood feedback. Mr. Grover states the initial petition included a request for a special permit to allow multi-family residential use in the NRCC, but the planning staff clarified that the permit is approved by the Planning Board, rather than the Board of Appeals. The petitioner will refile for that special permit with the Planning Board when they file for site plan review and the flood hazard overlay district permit which are also required for the project. Therefore, Mr. Grover explains, the application before the Board is just for four variances. One is for lot area per dwelling unit, and Mr. Grover notes that by right the project would only be allowed to construct 12 units. He contends that similar relief has been granted for other projects in the area. Mr. Grover informs the Board that 10 percent of the units will be affordable at 60 percent of the area median income (“AMI”), which as proposed would be six units. Mr. Grover also notes that in many ways this project complies with dimensional requirements, including with respect to height, and floor area ratio. Mr. Grover explains that another variance being sought is for parking, noting that one space rather than the 1.5 spaces required per ordinance are proposed. Based on similar projects and data, Mr. Grover suggests the parking is adequate for the needs of this project and consistent with other projects approved under the PUD provision, including the Brix condominiums. The third variance relates to the buffer zone that is required in the transitional overlay provisions of the NRCC. Due to the location of the project within close proximity to residential uses, Mr. Grover explains that zoning requires a buffer of 50 feet from any residential use, and within that 50 feet any construction or disruption of land is prohibited. There are no structures in the buffer, however, Mr. Grover indicates the applicant proposes a small landscaped area and four parking spaces within that area, requiring relief. The majority of the parking will be beneath the building and out of view. The last variance is a requirement before the Planning Board can issue the special permit for multi-family use, and is relief from the requirement that any units located within 100 feet of a residential use parcel in an abutting zoning district have separate entrances. The building must be significantly elevated above grade due to flooding concerns, which would make it impossible to have first floor entrances, so a variance is required.

Chair Copelas notes that the posted agenda only shows a request for three variances, rather than four, and asks for clarification. Mr. Copelas and Mr. Grover discuss, noting one was included in the public notice but not the agenda. Mr. Grover suggests that because it was published, that should be enough notice to proceed. The Board discusses whether they should proceed, and Mr. Laroe checks to see. Mr. Grover suggests that the missing variance from the agenda is the least significant in his opinion, and asks that the Board hear the other three if they cannot proceed on all. The Board continues on the petition while Mr. Laroe reaches out to the City Solicitor

Mr. Grover discusses the grounds for relief, noting there are several conditions that uniquely affect this property, limitations and requirements imposed by the state chapter 91 licensing requirements, challenges created by existing flood conditions, the significant environmental remediation needed based on past industrial uses, and the need to stabilize poor soil conditions to support new construction. Mr. Grover contends that with respect to literal enforcement of zoning causing hardship, the changing neighborhood makes it such that the only use that makes sense for this parcel is residential, and if zoning were literally enforced there could only be 12 units built, and given the special conditions and the City's affordable housing requirements, the parcels could not be redeveloped if the density was limited to the amount of units allowed by right. Mr. Grover suggests this is a hardship for the present and any future owners of the property. Mr. Grover states the relief can be granted without detriment to the public good or derogating from the intent of the zoning ordinance because there are many public benefits such as the creation of housing including affordable units, revitalizing several blighted properties, creating a park space, and overall economic stimulation. Mr. Grover adds that the project will be thoroughly reviewed and vetted but he Planning Board, along with a site plan review by the Conservation Commission, and other procedures that will make sure public good is preserved.

Chris Koeplin introduces himself and discusses development goals, noting the proximity of the proposal to parks, downtown, and the MBTA commuter rail station. Mr. Koeplin describes the project as an underutilized/urban infill redevelopment that will help reduce commercial traffic while addressing critical housing needs. With respect to sustainability, the project will be 100 percent electric and solar and have flood resistance and resiliency, and Mr. Koeplin notes there will be incremental tax revenue as well. He presents photos of existing conditions and describes the properties more, noting the need for improvement. He also presents examples of other nearby projects. Mr. Koeplin presents maps of the area and discusses the NRCC Vision Statement from 2003, which focuses on expanding the urban character of the city, reconnecting diverse neighborhoods, utilizing vacant parcels, and providing a range of housing types and affordability. Mr. Koeplin suggests the proposal is consistent with goals of the NRCC, and describes some of the design elements. He also contends the proposal is consistent with the 2022 Salem Housing Road Map. Mr. Koeplin presents a project cross-section as well as a proposed site layout, and discusses traffic impacts in the area, suggesting that the one space per unit proposal is adequate. He notes that the intersection just after the bridge will need to undergo study during the planning process. Mr. Koeplin summarizes some of the site special conditions, including the ground contamination from a prior tannery, the FEMA flood zone and flood hazard overlay, and Chapter 91 requirements.

Bob Griffin introduces himself and presents an overhead photo of the area. Mr. Griffin explains that there will be an improved pedestrian use with improved sidewalks compared to what exists, and presents additional photos of the area. Mr. Griffin presents a map of the proposal showing the Chapter 91 jurisdiction and public accommodation zone requirements, and discusses the site

challenges some more. He notes the benefit of preserving and improving public access to waterfront, in this case the North River Canal, as well as creating a safe pedestrian path from the residences and nearby neighborhood to the train station. Mr. Griffin discusses the flood zone requirements and elevations as well. Mr. Griffin notes the building will store water underneath during floods, and also presents a map of the proposed parking layout and landscaping. Mr. Koeplin also notes the nine public parking spaces being proposed along the landscaped area.

Dan Skolski introduces himself and states he lives in Salem and understands the importance of designing this site well. Mr. Skolski presents additional aerial views of the site and nearby area to show building heights and the relation of the proposal to downtown and other infrastructure. He next presents an aerial rendering of the initial proposed development, along with renderings showing changes based on neighborhood responses to the initial proposal. Mr. Skolski discusses the double and triple hung windows, along with building materials, and shows additional renderings from various angles and views. Mr. Skolski states the units will have lots of natural light, and also presents exterior elevations.

Chair Copelas asks Mr. Grover if anyone would like to speak to the traffic data and information included in the petition. Mr. Grover states they did not intend to present on it because of the length of the presentation already, but that Scott Thornton is present for any questions.

Mr. Viccica states most of what has been presented has been Planning Board information, and that the issues of traffic and parking should be discussed with the Board since they are germane to the variance requests. He also notes there needs to be more information regarding the entrance and egress, not just for the building but onto North Street. Mr. Viccica asks for information on recently approved buildings with only one parking per residence that have been fully realized and any results or ramifications. He states it would be helpful to hear about other projects receiving similar variances and any lessons learned, as well as data, perhaps even anecdotal, about how it has worked. Mr. Grover states the only completed project with the one-to-one parking ratio is the Brix project located fairly close to this proposal, but that others are still pending Planning Board review. He also reiterates that Mr. Thornton is present for any specific questions the Board of public may have, but notes he can also speak on the matter for a few moments. Mr. Viccica also notes there are several large projects being proposed and underway in the area, and that the larger picture must be considered with respect to this proposal, not just the proposal itself. Mr. Grover indicates there will be a full site plan review, which will include a comprehensive traffic study as part of the approval process.

Mr. Laroe provides an update from the City Solicitor, noting the Board can hear and rule on the three variances in the agenda, or has the option of continuing and ruling on all four variances at a future meeting once properly noticed.

Mr. Thornton introduces himself and explains some initial traffic analysis was conducted with the intent of providing some real world data to go along with standard industry guidelines and methods, knowing full well that there will be a more thorough analysis of traffic and parking as part of the site plan review process. Mr. Thornton indicates traffic counts and parking utilization information was studied for nearby sites. Nearby similar sites such as Halstead Station apartments and South Mason condominiums generate somewhere between 17 and 37 percent less traffic than what would be expected under ITE guidelines and standards. He suggests this is most likely because of proximity to the train station and downtown, along with more people working from home and moving away

from motor vehicles generally. Mr. Thornton also states that with respect to parking counts, parking demand ratios ranged from 0.9 to 1.3 spaces per unit. He suggests the proposal here is most similar to those with ratios closer to 0.9 spaces per unit, and that therefore the proposed parking is appropriate. He also notes an overall trend toward less parking. Mr. Thornton emphasizes the proposals proximity to the train station and bike infrastructure, and again notes there will be comprehensive traffic review at some point.

Mr. Viccica states that because the development must be not more detrimental to the neighborhood, he would like more information about the intersection leading onto North Street, with an understanding that a full traffic study will be completed at a future date.

Chair Copelas asks if someone can provide an overview of the general traffic flows in and out of the property and area, including into the parking lot and other areas nearby. Mr. Koeplin presents a slide showing pedestrian and traffic flow and discusses expected movements. Mr. Copelas asks if there is any surface parking outside besides the nine public spaces on the street. Mr. Koeplin notes there will be four surface spaces, which will be resident parking, and also notes that the nine public spaces are currently occupied by commercial vehicles, which will not be the case going forward.

Ms. Vyedin asks if studies will be done on the intersection onto North Street, and Mr. Thornton confirms it will be studied, along with other nearby intersections. Mr. Viccica raises concerns about the intersections and the impact of 60 additional cars and units, and suggests further discussion would be helpful. Ms. Vyedin agrees. Mr. Viccica states for next meeting he would like more information and insight on where the traffic proposal is heading. Mr. Thornton contends that the number of peak hour trips would not be a large impact based on current assumptions and other nearby properties, although it will be an increase compared to what is there now. He also compares the proposed use to the commercial uses currently which involve towing trucks and flatbeds.

Chair Copelas opens the floor to public comment.

Polly Wilbert of 7 Cedar Street introduces herself and suggests the Board check with the City Solicitor as she does not believe commenters are legally required to provide their address. Ms. Wilbert contests the assumption that a residential project is the only viable use for the parcels, stating that the discussions on urban needs and what should good there has been shortsighted. Ms. Wilbert suggests there is a benefit to the towing company being located where it is, as it is better than having a tow company in the middle of the City. She expresses concerns that the entrance to the building will still be in the flood plain, and additional concerns about emergency vehicles accessing the area in the event of a major storm. Ms. Wilbert also states there is age discrimination built into the discussions of the proposal being transit, pedestrian, and bike oriented. Ms. Wilbert states that some people just want to get into their car to go to the grocery store or get medications, and that in that respect this proposal is narrow-minded.

Kaitlyn Karedis of 14 Commercial Street introduces herself and expresses concerns about the impact of construction in the area, particularly since it is a flood-prone area. Ms. Karedis also notes the area has been designated for businesses and not for residential use, and argues that introducing the residential use will put a strain on the parking situation and traffic. She asks about traffic mitigation measures.

Jack Priest of 6 Water Street introduces himself on behalf of the Trustees for Salem Maritime, direct abutters to the new project. He states they are in favor of the project as it focuses on a blighted and underdeveloped area and addresses some of the problems. Mr. Priest states they share concerns with other neighborhoods about traffic impacts and look forward to hearing more about mitigation efforts. He also discusses current difficulties regarding the nearby intersections and traffic flow.

Barbara Warren of 5 Hardy Street introduces herself as the director of Salem Coast Watch, located at 12 Federal Street. Ms. Warren states Salem Coast Watch is aware of Commercial Street working with the City to create the rain gardens, and calls to attention to the fact that they were planted with plants that can tolerate brackish water, but they all died within the first summer and it is now made of all salt marsh plants. She states this is a tidal area and the river wants to reclaim where it was, which is why the area is Chapter 91. Ms. Warren suggests flooding has increased steadily, and that in 2050 the projection by the State shows 1.4 to 3.1 feet of sea level rise. Ms. Warren suggest thinking twice about placing people in harms way, and also expresses concerns related to parking and traffic impacts. Ms. Warren also notes that North Street is at elevation 8 feet, and that parking will be at 12 feet, so if there is nearby flooding cars will not be able to get out and emergency vehicles could not get in. She states she is interested in learning more about the plans to store flood water underneath the building, noting the water will likely need to go through the proposed landscaped area.

James Tegeder (no address provided) introduces himself on behalf of Historic Salem and states a letter was submitted to the Board. Mr. Tegeder hopes the project will be compatible with all of the provisions of the NRCC plan, and include character details such as massing and historic details. He encourages all to look at the submitted letter.

Sally Ferrell (no address given) introduces herself as a member of the Ice Cream Way condominium community, a close abutter, and states she is excited for the project. The area to be developed is overgrown and requires improvement, and Ms. Ferrell suggests the introduction of additional residences will be a good thing.

Peggy Bukowski of 12 Holly Street introduces herself on behalf of Spartan Oil on Commercial Street, and states as a business and Salem resident, the area suffers from increasing congestion and traffic, particularly with the new residential properties added recently. She states that the majority of this property will be located on Commercial Street, and suggests it is called "Commercial Street" for a reason. Ms. Bukowski expresses concerns that businesses will be pushed out of the area by a proposal that will not need to abide by the same rules and restrictions. She does not believe the proposal is in line with neighborhood characteristics, and expresses additional concerns about traffic. She also states she would like to prevent the area from becoming a new Cambridge-type area, and stresses the importance of preserving the City character as it is.

Rosalie Hezekiah introduces herself as a business owner at 20 Commercial Street. Ms. Hezekiah expresses support for the project, noting she has been a business owner on the street for the last eight years. She states she can only imagine how much better the street would look and feel with this kind of upgrade, as the abandoned spaces and tow yard is an eyesore. She agrees with some concerns regarding traffic, but cannot imagine who else would want to develop this space with all the hurdles required.

Chair Copelas notes there will be additional opportunity for public comment at the next ZBA meeting, as this petition will likely be continued.



Ms. Vyedin asks about Chapter 91 requirements, and Mr. Griffin explains that as you get closer to the water, restrictions become more significant, but because the proposal is at least 100 feet away from the water they can build a non-water-dependent building. He discusses the criteria a bit more generally. Ms. Vyedin also emphasizes the concerns raised by Ms. Warren, and asks that they be discussed more at the next meeting.

Mr. Viccica asks that the next meeting also address the as-right amount of residences compared to what is proposed, and why 40 or some number less than 60 was not considered or proposed.

Mr. Copelas asks which parcels of landed are currently owned by the developer making the proposal. Mr. Grover states 75 North Street is owned, and that the other parcels are under agreement pending approvals.

**Motion and Vote:** Ms. Vyedin motions to continue the petition of 75 NORTH STREET, LLC at 75 NORTH STREET (Map 26, Lot 58) (BPD, NRCC Zoning Districts), 3 SOUTH MASON STREET (Map 26, Lot 54) (NRCC Zoning District), 2 COMMERCIAL STREET (Map 26, Lot 57) (NRCC Zoning District) to re-develop a new four-story transit oriented mixed-use development that will consist of 60 units and a small commercial office space on North Street, seeking variances per section 4.1.1 Dimensional Requirements from lot area per dwelling unit where 3,500 sq.ft is required and 742 sq.ft is proposed, a variance from Section 8.4.9 Parking Requirements where one space is proposed and 1.5 spaces are required, and a variance from Section 8.4.9.c as this parcel is within 100 feet of a residentially used parcel, to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals on October 18, 2023.

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

## MEETING MINUTES

### August 16, 2023

Mr. Viccica notes one proposed edit, at the very end there is a discussion about why Mr. Viccica and Ms. Ordaz are not interested in being Chair, and states they are overbooked, rather than having a lack of interest.

**Motion and Vote:** Mr. Viccica motions to approve the minutes from the August 16, 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

None.

### Next Meeting

October 18, 2023

## ADJOURNMENT

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

**The meeting ends at 8:59 PM on September 20, 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