



CITY OF SALEM PLANNING BOARD

Report to City Council

June 20, 2017

At its meeting on June 15, 2017 the Planning Board met to discuss the proposed amendments to Section 9.5.2 Applicability, Section 9.5.3, Application and Section 9.5.6 Review Criteria of the Salem Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Board members in attendance (Chair Ben Anderson, Vice Chair Matt Veno, Carole Hamilton, Bill Grisct, Noah Koretz and Kirt Rieder) made a recommendation by vote on each individual item, as delineated herein.

9.5.2 Applicability:

- 9.5.2(2) Residential structure containing one (1) or more residential dwelling units.
The Planning Board voted unanimously (6-0) to recommend the proposed change be denied.
 - There was consensus among the Board that reducing the threshold to one (1) residential unit would be overreach. The Board discussed whether less than 6 made sense but could not find a compelling reason to vary from the existing threshold.
- 9.5.2(3) Salem Redevelopment Authority Development Project Reviews.
The Planning Board voted unanimously (6-0) to recommend the proposed change be denied.
 - "Salem Redevelopment Authority Development Project Reviews" is not defined. In addition, projects within the urban renewal area that meet the threshold for a Site Plan Review are already subject to site plan review. The Salem Redevelopment Authority is capable of reviewing smaller projects that do not meet the threshold for a Site Plan Review.
- 9.5.2(4) Planned Unit Developments.
The Planning Board voted unanimously (6-0) to recommend the proposed change be denied.
 - Planned Unit Developments are already subject to site plan review.

9.5.3 Application

- 9.5.3(2) (Location and dimensions of all parking areas...).
The Planning Board voted unanimously (6-0) to recommend the proposed change be approved.
 - The Board noted that it makes sense to include this in the ordinance since it is information they typically ask the applicant to provide.
- 9.5.3(4) (Location, function, photometric intensity...).
The Planning Board voted unanimously (6-0) to recommend the proposed change be approved.
 - The Board noted that it makes sense to include this in the ordinance since it is information they typically ask the applicant to provide.
- 9.5.3(5) (Location, type, dimensions and quantities of landscaping...).

The Planning Board voted unanimously (6-0) to recommend the proposed change be approved as amended herein:

- Location, type, dimensions and quantities of landscaping and screening including retaining walls and fences;
- 9.5.3(6) (Current and proposed locations and dimensions of utilities...).
The Planning Board voted unanimously (6-0) to recommend the proposed change be approved as amended herein:
 - Current and proposed locations, dimensions, and screening of utilities including: water, storm water, sewer, drainage, drain inlets, drainage tanks, back flow preventors, manholes, hydrants, gas, electrical, telephone, wireless communication facilities, HVAC-related mechanicals, transformers, switchgears, generators, intake and exhaust features including: ventilation, stacks, fans, louvers, steam, and recycling and other waste disposal locations;
- 9.5.3(7) (Location and dimensions of snow...).
The Planning Board voted unanimously (6-0) to recommend the proposed change be approved.
 - The Board noted that it makes sense to include this in the ordinance since it is information they typically ask the applicant to provide.
- 9.5.3(8) (Location of all existing natural features...).
The Planning Board voted unanimously (6-0) to recommend the proposed change be approved as amended herein:
 - Location of all existing natural features, including ponds, brooks, streams, wetlands, street trees, and existing vegetation up to the curb line;
- 9.5.3(9) (Topography of the site...).
The Planning Board voted (5-1) to recommend the proposed change be approved.
 - The majority of the Board concurred that many plans are already submitted with one (1) foot contour lines, and that there is not an additional cost to create plans with one (1) foot contours. This was not unanimous. The Chair recommended that this change be denied, for the reason that requiring that level of detail is not necessary for every site plan review, and noted that the board should ask for this further detail on a case by case basis.

9.5.6 Review Criteria

- 9.5.3(3) (Adequacy of traffic circulation for all modes of transit, consistent with Salem's Complete Streets policy).
The Planning Board voted unanimously (6-0) to recommend the "Consistent with Salem's Complete Streets policy", be stricken and approve the change as amended herein:
 - **Adequacy of traffic circulation system for all modes of transit.**
- 9.5.3(8) (Adequacy of the methods and storage dimensions for disposal of sewage, refuse, recycling, and other waste).
The Planning Board voted unanimously (6-0) to recommend the proposed change be approved.
- 9.5.3(11) (Adequacy of pedestrian circulation...).
The Planning Board voted unanimously (6-0) to recommend the proposed change be denied.

- 9.5.3(14) (Subsections 2 and 4...).

The Planning Board voted unanimously (6-0) to recommend the proposed change be denied.

The Planning Board fully supports the Complete Streets Policy. In making the recommendation to deny the language relating to the Complete Streets Policy (Sec. 9.5.3 (3, 11, and 14), the Board considered what makes sense to include in the zoning ordinance regarding the Complete Streets Policy under Section 9.5 for Site Plan Review. As was stated at the joint public hearing, the Traffic and Parking Commission does not have approval authority. The board recognized that the Traffic and Parking Commission is charged with implementing the City's Complete Streets Policy, which applies to the public rights of way. The purpose of the Complete Streets Policy "is to accommodate all road users by creating a roadway network that meets the needs of individuals utilizing a variety of transportation modes." The Policy "directs decision-makers to consistently plan, design, construct, and maintain streets to accommodate all anticipated users including, but not limited to pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, emergency vehicles, and freight and commercial vehicles."

Unless the private development proposal is impacting a public right of way, the Complete Streets Policy does not apply.

In addition, other specific policies are not called out in the ordinance. Specifying the Complete Streets Policy would create an internal inconsistency.

Thus, rather than having the Complete Streets Policy referenced in 9.5, the Board plans to modify the Site Plan Review application to note that impacts to the public right of way would be reviewed by the Director of Traffic and Parking for consistency with the Complete Streets Policy. The Director of Traffic and Parking would be required to provide comment with 35 days and may choose to solicit input from the Traffic and Parking Commission. (Note: The Director of Traffic and Parking was involved in developing this recommendation and concurs with it.)

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact Tom Daniel, AICP, Director of Planning & Community Development, at 978-619-5685.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ben Anderson", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Ben Anderson, Chair

CC: Cheryl LaPointe, City Clerk