

City of Salem Zoning Board of Appeals
Meeting Minutes
July 15, 2026

A meeting of the Salem Zoning Board of Appeals (“Salem ZBA”) was held on Wednesday, July 15, 2026 at 6:30 pm via remote participation in accordance with Section 30A of Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, as amended by Section 40 of Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2023, and further amended by Section 1 of Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2025, the City is authorized to conduct remote meetings of its public bodies through June 30, 2027.

Chair Vyedin calls the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

Chair Vyedin 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. Ms. Vyedin also explains the rules regarding public comment.

ROLL CALL

Those present were: Chair Nina Vyedin, Vice Chair Christa McGaha, Ellen Simpson, Peter Habib, Elena Eimert, and Stephen Larrick. Also in attendance were Brennan Postich — Staff Planner, and Voula Orfanos — Building Commissioner. Those absent were: None

CONTINUANCES

Location: **61 Memorial Drive (Map 42, Lot 0014) (R1 Zoning District)**

Applicant: **Amy Pelletier**

Project: A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of AMY PELLETIER at 61 MEMORIAL DRIVE (Map 42, Lot 0014) (R1 Zoning District; Coastal Resiliency Overlay District) for a Variance per Section 3.2.4 Accessory Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to construct a two-story, eight-foot by sixteen-foot shed with a gross floor area of approximately 256 square feet.

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application date-stamped May 20, 2026, and supporting documentation

Vice Chair McGaha introduces the petition and notes that the applicant has requested to withdraw without prejudice.

Vice Chair McGaha opens the floor to public comment, but there is none.

Motion and Vote: Ms. Simpson motions to withdraw without prejudice the petition of AMY PELLETIER at 61 MEMORIAL DRIVE (Map 42, Lot 0014) (R1 Zoning District; Coastal Resiliency Overlay District) for a Variance per Section 3.2.4 Accessory Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to construct a two-story, eight-foot by sixteen-foot shed with a gross floor area of approximately 256 square feet.

Mr. Habib seconds the motion. **The vote is five (5) in favor (Christa McGaha, Nina Vyedin, Ellen Simpson, Peter Habib, and Elena Eimert) and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.**

REGULAR AGENDA

Location:	10 Blaney Street (Map 41, Lot 0278) (I Zoning District; Coastal Resiliency Overlay District)
Applicant:	The Salem Harbor Port Authority
Project:	A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of the SALEM HARBOR PORT AUTHORITY at 10 BLANEY STREET (Map 41, Lot 0278; Map 41, Lot 0342) (I Zoning District; Coastal Resiliency Overlay District) for a Variance per Section 4.1.1 Dimensional Requirements of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to construct a two-story ferry terminal building on the property line of 10 Blaney Street and 71 Derby Street, where a thirty-foot setback is required. The building would be located near an existing ferry terminal. Additionally, the Applicant requests a six-month extension to exercise rights granted by the Variance decision.

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application date-stamped June 22, 2026, and supporting documentation

Chair Vyedin introduces the petition.

Bill McHugh introduces himself as the director of the Salem Harbor Port Authority and introduces his team. Mr. McHugh explains that the proposal is to replace what was supposed to be a temporary structure. The plumbing and HVAC systems of the existing terminal building are failing, according to Mr. McHugh, and the structure needs replacing due to growth as well. Mr. McHugh indicates the shape of the lot is odd and difficult to accommodate large structures, and that the plans have been scaled down, but that the proposal is based on functionality needs. Proximity to ferry landings, proximity to point access area, accessibility, and lot configurations and dimensions are discussed. Mr. McHugh discusses the setbacks and presents a certified plot plan and dimensional table showing existing conditions.

Deborah Fennick of Fennick McCredie Architects introduces herself as project architect and provides additional details of the proposed new Salem Ferry terminal, which she states would serve as a permanent, resilient, and modern gateway hub for waterborne transportation. The terminal will provide passenger services and operations such as ticketing, waiting areas, restrooms, and concession support, with operational capacity for current and future tourism needs. There is leasable space on the second level of the building, hopefully for a maritime-related entity. Ms. Fennick also discusses port operations and resiliency and sustainability-related design elements, such as an elevated first floor, durable materials, and provision for a future solar array. Ms. Fennick explains the proposed massing and building design, highlighting efficiency and compactness.

Aaron Udy of Fennick McCredie Architects introduces himself and presents a plot plan showing the proposed building, and identifies the velocity zone, low water mark, and building egress. He presents additional, more detailed plans and discusses vehicle and pedestrian access. The plans show both the existing and proposed building, emergency vehicle access, and the designated velocity

zone. Mr. Udy notes blue bike and regular bike racks, as well as the harbor walk and wastewater facilities.

Daniel Collins of the Salem Harbor Port Authority introduces himself and discusses the constraints of the building area, zoning setbacks, and property conditions. Mr. Collins presents a map highlighting the long, narrow shape of the lot and existing nonconformities. Mr. Collins also discusses compliance with the Coastal Resiliency Overlay District requirements and how it impacted design elements of the proposal, including setbacks and proximity to the property at 71 Derby Street. Mr. Collins explains the variance request and the hardships related to the uniqueness of the site. He also speaks to the public benefits of the proposed project.

Mr. Udy discusses the proposed site circulation further and also presents a diagram showing the proposed building height and flood elevations. A rendering of the proposed structure is also shown, and Mr. Udy notes accessibility as well as design elements. Mr. Udy presents exterior elevations and concludes.

Chair Vyedin acknowledges the uniqueness of the lot as a hardship, and asks for further clarification regarding the setbacks shown on the plot plans. Chair Vyedin suggests the vote should be on a zero setback rather than a 2.3-foot setback after clarification. She also asks about easements relative to the potential for the building to encroach upon the abutting plot, despite it also being city-owned. Ms. Simpson asks for clarification regarding the velocity zone. Mr. Collins explains the velocity zone further as the area where the worst waves would hit during a flood, and best practices of not building within the velocity zone. Mr. Udy also provides additional comment regarding the velocity zone and potential flooding. The Board discusses the lot lines and abutting properties further. Ms. McGaha suggests a letter in support of the neighboring property after clarification that one is city property and one is port authority property. Mr. Larrick agrees it would be good as a special condition.

Chair Vyedin opens the floor to public comment.

John Tierney of 3 White Street introduces himself as an abutter to the parking lot. Mr. Tierney asks if the variance would allow for building at any height, noting concerns about abutters' views being obstructed. He questions the need for offices on the second floor, a function room, and suggests a one-level building not larger than the existing building should suffice.

Chair Vyedin and Mr. Collins confirm that there is not a variance being requested for height. Mr. McHugh speaks to the space requirements and needs. Ms. Eimert further clarifies height requirements related to the CROD.

Chair Vyedin notes the requested special condition for a six-month extension to exercise rights granted by the variance decision to allow for adequate time for construction. She also notes the previously discussed special condition regarding the side setback and dimensional table, as well as the special condition for a letter from the port authority, which owns the neighboring parcel, to confirm the development is allowed to encroach on the property line.

The petitioners discuss timing, funding, Chapter 91, and construction requirements related to the request for an extension to exercise the variance rights, noting an optimistic timeline for a completed project is three years.

Motion and Vote: Ms. Eimert motions to approve the petition of SALEM HARBOR PORT AUTHORITY at 10 BLANEY STREET (Map 41, Lot 0278; Map 41, Lot 0342) (I Zoning District; Coastal Resiliency Overlay District) for a Variance per Section 4.1.1 Dimensional Requirements of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to construct a two-story ferry terminal building on the property line of 10 Blaney Street and 71 Derby Street, where a thirty-foot setback is required. The building would be located near an existing ferry terminal. The approval is 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. A Certificate of Occupancy is to be obtained.
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 dimensions 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 conditions:

1. The petitioner shall submit a revised dimensional table for the plot plan dated July 7, 2026, by Nitsch Engineering, showing a revised zero-foot side setback, to the Inspectional Services department prior to receiving a building permit.
2. The petitioner shall submit a letter of permission from the property owner verifying that the construction of the ferry terminal building can be located on 67/71 Derby Street, to the Planning Department prior to receiving a building permit.
3. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary, the Board will consider rights authorized by the Variance exercised so long as the City timely records the Board's decision and diligently pursues all necessary Planning Board approvals and a Chapter 91 license.

Mr. Habib seconds the motion. **The vote is five (5) in favor (Ellen Simpson, Peter Habib, Elena Eimert, Nina Vyedin, and Christa McGaha) and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.**

Location:	7 Burnside Street and 5 Skerry Street Court (Map 36, Lot 0157; Map 36, Lot 0149) (R2 Zoning District)
Applicant:	Graham Wing (formerly Graham Hines)
Project:	A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of GRAHAM WING (formerly Graham Hines) at 7 BURNSIDE STREET and 5 SKERRY STREET COURT (Map 36, Lot 0157; Map 36, Lot 0149) (R2 Zoning District) for a Variance per Section 4.1.1 Dimensional Requirements of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to divide an existing merged parcel and construct a two-family house at 5 Skerry Street Court. The proposal would create a 4,393-square-foot lot at 7 Burnside Street with a 2,196-square-foot lot area per dwelling unit, and a 3,820-square-foot lot at 5 Skerry Street Court with a 1,910-square-foot lot area per dwelling unit, thirty-seven-foot frontage, and insufficient front, side, and rear setbacks.

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application date-stamped May 28, 2026, and supporting documentation

Chair Vyedin introduces the petition.

Attorney Bill Quinn introduces himself on behalf of the petitioner and explains that this is a unique petition that would allow two plots that have merged to be legally separated and modified to create two lots. Mr. Quinn explains that the front lot has an existing two-family dwelling and there will be no changes to the dwelling under the proposal. The rear lot is proposed to be a building site for three-bedroom townhouse condominiums. Mr. Quinn presents plot plans showing existing and proposed conditions and discusses lot frontage and setbacks. He discusses the relief being requested and proposed 12-foot easement that will exist at the front on Burnside Street to the property line of the rear parcel. Mr. Quinn notes the three parking spaces for the townhomes on the site plan. Mr. Quinn acknowledges comments and concerns raised by neighbors, but suggests many concerns can be assuaged by special conditions to the proposed variance. He suggests a condition prohibiting short-term rentals, and speaks to concerns about the number of inhabitants and subdivisions. He also notes concerns regarding drainage, and contends more work will be done to ensure that there are no surface water or drainage issues. Mr. Quinn also notes that no trees are planned to be removed and that any trimming would be consistent with any city tree ordinances. Mr. Quinn indicates many of the well-written objections appear to be written by individuals that are quite knowledgeable about zoning law, but also notes that zoning law on variances in towns and cities in Massachusetts all changed on July 1, 2026, as part of the state budget act. Mr. Quinn contends the changes are intended to make it easier to build housing and to modify the hardship criteria requirements. Chair Vyedin provides clarifications regarding the updated criteria.

Chair Vyedin asks clarifying questions regarding the lot lines and the subdivision. Mr. Quinn discusses the division on the plot plan. Mr. Quinn also presents an overhead street view of the area and plot. Elevations of the proposal are presented, and Timeus Mulinge introduces himself as one of the project designers and architects. Mr. Mulinge presents floor plans for the proposed townhouses and discusses design concepts, made for single-family living. He also discusses elevation details and building height, which is below the limit. Renderings of the proposed townhomes are shown. Mr. Quinn discusses the requested relief and presents a dimensional table

for both lots resulting from the subdivision and proposed construction. The Board discusses the frontage and where it should be calculated for each lot. Mr. Habib asks about the timing of purchase and merging of the two lots, and the petitioner clarifies that the second parcel that merged was purchased after 7 Burnside Street. Mr. Habib suggests that the timing of the purchase might make the hardship self-imposed. Ms. Simpson indicates she is usually in favor of additional housing but has some concerns about this project, particularly with respect to drainage, snow removal, and density. She notes that the renderings of the two townhouses did not show them in the context of the surrounding area and dwellings, but that it would be helpful, especially with the Skerry Street homes. Mr. Habib expresses concerns regarding setbacks and echoes Ms. Simpson's concerns. Mr. Eimert asks why frontage cannot be taken from Skerry Street Court and accessing the property from there is not viable. Mr. Wing indicates that in previous proposals to build on this lot, there were issues concerning parking and traffic on Skerry Street Court. Mr. Wing contends that having access and trash for both lots be on Burnside Street was meant to prevent any issues and address prior concerns raised. Ms. McGaha agrees with concerns raised by other Board members, and also asks that the question of frontage and the legal definition be further addressed if the petition is continued. Mr. Larrick asks about the initial intent when purchasing the rear lot. Mr. Wing states the purpose was to perhaps build in the future, but in the meantime to have a larger backyard. Mr. Wing also notes that at the time he was not aware of the legal doctrine of merger and that the lots would need to be subdivided. He also notes that his family is growing and that they will soon outgrow their existing space, and that the intent would be to move into one of the two new townhomes.

Chair Vyedin opens the floor to public comment.

Abigail Clark of 3 Skerry Street Court introduces herself as an immediate abutter. Ms. Clark expresses objection to the proposal, noting the proximity to the property line and density. Ms. Clark expresses concerns related to drainage and snow removal as well.

Gretchen Buckley of 3 Skerry Street Court introduces herself as an immediate abutter. Ms. Buckley suggests the request seems excessive, noting the proposal is for two three-story townhouses in a dense neighborhood with a dead-end street. She also expresses concerns about fire safety and asks that the Board deny the requested relief.

A resident of 4 Skerry Street Court introduces herself and expresses concerns regarding the petition and extent of the variances being requested. She speaks against the petition and asks if there is a valid hardship to consider. Concerns about privacy and density are also expressed.

Ian Clark of 3 Skerry Street Court introduces himself as a direct abutter. Mr. Clark speaks against the petition and suggests it would be a detriment to direct abutters and the neighborhood overall. Mr. Clark raises concerns regarding density and safety, and notes that a smaller single-family home was previously denied for this property based on density concerns. He echoes concerns raised by others regarding drainage as well.

Chair Vyedin notes a number of written public comments as well, and reads one of the letters from the owners of 4 Skerry Street Court. The letter discusses the history of the lot as being considered unbuildable at the time of sale. The letter lists conditions under which they would be comfortable with the petitioner going forward with construction, namely changes to height, size, and location.

Ms. Orfanos notes that there appears to be a third story, which would require additional relief if plans remain as is. The Board continues to discuss the petition and concerns raised. The petitioners acknowledge that they will need to continue and come back with revisions and to address concerns raised by commenters and Board members.

Ms. Simpson is curious about how the trees might be able to remain, and also would like to see the back side of the proposed townhouses from Skerry Street Court. She also reiterates concerns regarding drainage. The petitioner notes that one tree will need to be removed, but that others will be trimmed and preserved. Mr. Habib suggests a site plan showing abutting properties. Melinda Hager of 6 Skerry Street introduces herself and questions the petitioner's need for a two-family structure. She suggests something more appropriately sized for the lot would be better and asks that the Board ask questions about alternatives.

Pat Frederickson of 1 Skerry Street Court introduces herself and speaks against the petition, noting that the proposal is too large and infringes upon abutters' privacy. Ms. Frederickson also contends that the petitioner currently utilizes the first floor as a short-term rental, and claims the need for additional space is unfounded. She echoes concerns raised by other commenters and asks that the Board come down to look at the neighborhood.

Heather Roman of 8 Skerry Street introduces herself and raises concerns regarding the amount of relief being requested. Ms. Roman acknowledges the need for housing and suggests an ADU might be more appropriate. She expresses concerns regarding density and drainage.

The Board continues to discuss the petition, comments, and updates to the variance requirements, and asks the petitioner if they would like to continue. The petitioner agrees.

Motion and Vote: Ms. McGaha motions to continue the petition of GRAHAM WING (formerly Graham Hines) at 7 BURNSIDE STREET and 5 SKERRY STREET COURT (Map 36, Lot 0157; Map 36, Lot 0149) (R2 Zoning District) for a Variance per Section 4.1.1 Dimensional Requirements of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to divide an existing merged parcel and construct a two-family house at 5 Skerry Street Court. The proposal would create a 4,393-square-foot lot at 7 Burnside Street with a 2,196-square-foot lot area per dwelling unit, and a 3,820-square-foot lot at 5 Skerry Street Court with a 1,910-square-foot lot area per dwelling unit, thirty-seven-foot frontage, and insufficient front, side, and rear setbacks. The petition will continue to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals on August 19, 2026.

Ms. Simpson seconds the motion. **The vote is five (5) in favor (Elena Eimert, Ellen Simpson, Christa McGaha, Peter Habib, and Nina Vyedin) and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.**

Location: **23 Jackson Street (Map 25, Lot 0661) (R2 Zoning District)**

Applicant: **Brian G. Sims and Robert G. Hahn**

Project: A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of BRIAN L. SIMS and ROBERT G. HAHN at 23 JACKSON STREET (Map 25, Lot 0661) (R2 Zoning District) for a Variance per Section 4.1.1 Dimensional Requirements and a Special Permit per Section 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single- and Two-Family Residences of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to construct a sunroom, attached two-car garage, and a modified entry deck to a nonconforming single-family house, increasing the lot's coverage from 25.4% to 36% where 35% is required.

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application date-stamped June 4, 2026, and supporting documentation

Chair Vyedin introduces the petition.

Attorney Bill Quinn introduces himself on behalf of the petitioner and describes the property and intention to keep the property as a single-family dwelling. Mr. Quinn indicates that the petitioners' needs have changed over time, and that they no longer utilize an above-ground pool located on the property. This will be replaced with the garage, sunroom, and entry deck proposed, which would replace the pool. Mr. Quinn presents a plot plan showing existing and proposed conditions, as well as a dimensional table. He also describes the relief being requested.

Chair Vyedin asks clarifying questions regarding the setbacks shown on the plot plan and whether the garage is attached or not, as that matters with respect to which variance(s) are required. Chair Vyedin suggests looking at the proposal holistically and then examining the two variances required (for lot coverage and setback or distance from dwelling, depending on whether the garage is attached or not).

Project architect David Harmon introduces himself and presents additional details regarding the proposal. Mr. Harmon shares elevations and additional plans showing existing and proposed conditions. Chair Vyedin asks about the curb cut, which Mr. Harmon indicates will likely be 10 to 12 feet, certainly below the city limit.

Chair Vyedin asks about the easement shown on the plans. Mr. Quinn indicates it is with the property at 25 Jackson Street and was established many years ago when some of the land was divided. The permanent legal easement has no effect on any of the setbacks. The Board asks additional clarifying questions.

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

The Board continues to discuss the petition and relief, and Chair Vyedin suggests a special condition where the existing driveway be changed to a permeable material, but Ms. Eimert notes that is already in the project plans. The Board discusses a special condition to update the dimensional table to correct the side setback.

Motion and Vote: Mr. Habib motions to approve the petition of BRIAN L. SIMS and ROBERT G. HAHN at 23 JACKSON STREET (Map 25, Lot 0661) (R2 Zoning District) for a Variance per Section 4.1.1 Dimensional Requirements and a Special Permit per Section 3.3.5 Nonconforming

Single- and Two-Family Residences of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to construct a sunroom, attached two-car garage, and a modified entry deck to a nonconforming single-family house, increasing the lot's coverage from 25.4% to 36% where 35% is required. The approval is 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. The exterior finishes of 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.

And the following special condition:

1. The petitioner shall submit a revised dimensional table for the stamped plot plan dated May 11, 2026 by the oath Shore Survey Corporation, stating the primary structure's existing side setback, prior to receiving a building permit from the Inspectional Services Department.

Ms. Simpson seconds the motion. **The vote is five (5) in favor (Nina Vyedin, Elena Eimert, Christa McGaha, Ellen Simpson, and Peter Habib) and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.**

Location: **2 Rockdale Avenue (Map 09, Lot 0157) (R1 Zoning District)**

Applicant: **Israel Berl**

Project: A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of ISRAEL BERL at 2 ROCKDALE AVENUE (Map 09, Lot 0157) (R1 Zoning District) for Variances per Section 5.1.5 Parking Design and Section 5.1.6(2) Setbacks of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to create an additional curb cut for a five-car parking area. The proposal would create a forty-five-foot curb cut with a parking space approximately one foot from the side property line where two feet are required.

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application date-stamped June 8, 2026, and supporting documentation

Chair Vyedin introduces the petition.

Israel Berl introduces himself on behalf of the petitioner and describes the proposal to create an additional curb cut for a driveway that was previously increased in size. Mr. Berl presents plans showing existing and proposed conditions, and notes the driveway expansion previously approved. He notes the owners are struggling with parking and have received several parking violations for parking on the street, and explains the need for additional spaces driving the proposal. The requested curb cut is roughly 45 feet wide. Mr. Berl also discusses drainage and other details.

Chair Vyedin asks why the petitioner requires so much parking. Mr. Berl explains the garage is not currently used as a garage and the current difficulties with parking in the existing concrete driveway. Mr. Berl also notes there are four individuals in the home with cars that require space to park.

Chair Vyedin expresses safety concerns regarding the large curb cut. Mr. Berl explains the location and specific proposal more, noting ledge in other parts of the property that limit the options of where additional parking can go, as well as required turning angles. Ms. Orfanos offers that the parking violations referenced by the petitioner were due to parking business vehicles and operating a business in an R1 zone. Ms. Orfanos also notes one of the proposed spaces backs into a crosswalk. Board members discuss concerns regarding the size of the request. Mr. Habib suggests he would be more comfortable with two spaces rather than the proposal. Mr. Larrick notes the proximity to a local school and the importance of sidewalks in the area.

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

Chair Vyedin discusses the options before the petitioner with respect to going to a vote, continuing, or withdrawing without prejudice. Mr. Berl asks to continue the petition to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Board members provide additional feedback.

Motion and Vote: Ms. Eimert motions to continue the petition of ISRAEL BERL at 2 ROCKDALE AVENUE (Map 09, Lot 0157) (R1 Zoning District) for Variances per Section 5.1.5 Parking Design and Section 5.1.6(2) Setbacks of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to create an additional curb cut for a five-car parking area. The proposal would create a forty-five-foot curb cut with a parking space approximately one foot from the side property line where two feet are required. The petition will continue to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals on August 19, 2026.

Mr. Habib seconds the motion. **The vote is five (5) in favor (Nina Vyedin, Elena Eimert, Christa McGaha, Ellen Simpson, and Peter Habib) and none (0) opposed. The motion passes..**

Location: **21 Warren Street (Map 25, Lot 0268) (R2 Zoning District)**

Applicant: **Carrie Ditcher**

Project: A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of CARRIE DITCHER at 21 WARREN STREET (Map 25, Lot 0268) (R2 Zoning District) for a Special Permit per Section 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single- and Two-Family Residences of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to construct a two-story rear addition to a nonconforming single-family house. The addition would be three feet from the eastern side property line, where ten feet is required, and decrease the rear setback from approximately twenty-nine feet to nineteen feet, where thirty feet is required.

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application date-stamped June 16, 2026, and supporting documentation

Chair Vyedin introduces the petition. She asks that the petition be continued to a special meeting on July 29, 2026, due to the late runtime of this meeting.

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

Motion and Vote: Mr. Habib motions to continue the petition of CARRIE DITCHER at 21 WARREN STREET (Map 25, Lot 0268) (R2 Zoning District) for a Special Permit per Section 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single- and Two-Family Residences of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to construct a two-story rear addition to a nonconforming single-family house. The addition would be three feet from the eastern side property line, where ten feet is required, and decrease the rear setback from approximately twenty-nine feet to nineteen feet, where thirty feet is required. The petition will continue to the special meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals on July 29, 2026.

Ms. Eimert seconds the motion. **The vote is five (5) in favor (Elena Eimert, Nina Vyedin, Peter Habib, Christa McGaha, and Ellen Simpson) and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.**

Location: **46 Chestnut Street (Map 25, Lot 0216) (R1 Zoning District)**

Applicant: **Robert Beverly**

Project: A public hearing for all persons interested in the petition of ROBERT BEVERLY at 46 CHESTNUT STREET (Map 25, Lot 0216) (R1 Zoning District) for a Special Permit per Section 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single- and Two-Family Residential Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to reconstruct a nonconforming single-family house's rear porch and staircase, creating a single-story rear addition and staircase five feet from the rear property line.

Documents and Exhibitions

- Application date-stamped June 16, 2026, and supporting documentation

Chair Vyedin introduces the petition. She asks that the petition be continued to a special meeting on July 29, 2026 due to the late runtime of this meeting. The petitioner agrees to continue.

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

Motion and Vote: Ms. McGaha motions to continue the petition of ROBERT BEVERLY at 46 CHESTNUT STREET (Map 25, Lot 0216) (R1 Zoning District) for a Special Permit per Section 3.3.5 Nonconforming Single- and Two-Family Residential Structures of the Salem Zoning Ordinance to reconstruct a nonconforming single-family house's rear porch and staircase, creating a single-story rear addition and staircase five feet from the rear property line. The petition will continue to the special meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals on July 29, 2026.

Ms. Simpson seconds the motion. **The vote is five (5) in favor (Ellen Simpson, Christa McGaha, Peter Habib, Elena Eimert, and Nina Vyedin) and none (0) opposed. The motion passes.**

MEETING MINUTES

June 17, 2026

Motion and Vote: Mr. Habib motions to approve the minutes from the June 17, 2026 meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals as drafted. Ms. Eimert seconds the motion. **The vote is all in favor. The motion passes.**

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

None

Next Meeting

August 19, 2026

ADJOURNMENT

Motion and Vote: Ms. Simpson motions to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Habib seconds the motion.
The vote is all in favor. The motion passes.

The meeting ends at 10:45 PM on July 15, 2026.

*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-2026>

Respectfully submitted,
Brennan Postich, Staff Planner