

MEMORANDUM

To	Isaac B. “Zac” Bears, President, City Council Alicia Hunt, Director, Planning, Development, & Sustainability Department
From	Gina Bukas, Administrative Specialist
Date	February 11, 2025
Project	23146: City of Medford Zoning Update
Subject	Public Meeting for Salem Street
Cc:	Emily Innes, AICP, LEED AP ND, President Paula Ramos Martinez, Senior Urban Designer/Planner

Summary:

This memorandum summarizes the feedback received on February 10, 2025, at Medford’s Public Meeting at Robert’s Elementary School regarding Salem Street’s rezoning. Based on the sign-in sheets eighty-two (82) participants attended the meeting. The scanned copies of the sign-in sheets used at the forum will be sent to the City as separate documents.

Presentation:

The primary goal of this meeting was to receive feedback on the proposed zoning changes for Salem Street. After an introductory presentation of the process, and an overview of the zoning recommendations in the 2023 Comprehensive Plan, the consultant team focused on the City’s main corridors, specifically Salem Street. The consultant team presented the corridor’s current zoning, dimensional standards and permitted uses, and then compared it to the proposed amendments.

Furthermore, the consultant team examined specific examples of non-conforming buildings down Salem Street, and how the proposed amendments would achieve compliance. The consultant team also presented the concept of incentive zoning, as well as neighborhood-specific components, such as neighborhood compatibility dimensional standards, pedestrian sensitive parking, and green score.

Finally, the consultant team presented a detailed timeline of the zoning process, pointing out future opportunities for public input.

Salem Street Neighborhood Corridor District: Existing Zoning Map



- ## Salem Street Neighborhood Corridor District: Proposed Zoning Map



-
- 2

- ## Salem Street Corridor District: Uses

USES					USES				
Sales Street Corridor District					Sales Street Corridor District				
	USE	MAX-1	MAX-2	COMPATIBLE	Parking	Loading		USE	
RESIDENTIAL USES	1. Single-Family Detached						RESIDENTIAL USES	1. Single-Family Detached	
	2. Single-Family Attached							2. Single-Family Attached	
	3. Townhouses or Rowing Units							3. Townhouses or Rowing Units	
	4. Medium-Density Residential							4. Medium-Density Residential	
	5. Single-Family Attached							5. Single-Family Attached	
	6. Single-Family Attached							6. Single-Family Attached	
	7. Single-Family Attached							7. Single-Family Attached	
	8. Single-Family Attached							8. Single-Family Attached	
	9. Single-Family Attached							9. Single-Family Attached	
	10. Single-Family Attached							10. Single-Family Attached	
COMMERCIAL USES	1. Retail						COMMERCIAL USES	1. Retail	
	2. Office							2. Office	
	3. Restaurant							3. Restaurant	
	4. Retail							4. Retail	
	5. Office							5. Office	
	6. Retail							6. Retail	
	7. Office							7. Office	
	8. Retail							8. Retail	
	9. Office							9. Office	
	10. Retail							10. Retail	
PUBLIC UTILITIES AND SERVICE USES	1. Public Utility						PUBLIC UTILITIES AND SERVICE USES	1. Public Utility	
	2. Public Utility							2. Public Utility	
	3. Public Utility							3. Public Utility	
	4. Public Utility							4. Public Utility	
	5. Public Utility							5. Public Utility	
	6. Public Utility							6. Public Utility	
	7. Public Utility							7. Public Utility	
	8. Public Utility							8. Public Utility	
	9. Public Utility							9. Public Utility	
	10. Public Utility							10. Public Utility	
RECREATION AND CULTURAL USES	1. Recreation						RECREATION AND CULTURAL USES	1. Recreation	
	2. Recreation							2. Recreation	
	3. Recreation							3. Recreation	
	4. Recreation							4. Recreation	
	5. Recreation							5. Recreation	
	6. Recreation							6. Recreation	
	7. Recreation							7. Recreation	
	8. Recreation							8. Recreation	
	9. Recreation							9. Recreation	
	10. Recreation							10. Recreation	

Activity: Put an X on the uses you would NOT like to see in each district.

Medford Zoning Update | City of Medford
Prepared by Innes Associates

USES	Salem Street Corridor District			
	MF	MX-1	MX-2	Commercial
Essential services.	XX			
Other institution.	XXX	X	X	X
D. COMMERCIAL USES				
Private entertainment or recreation facility excluding adult	X	X	X	X
Hotel.	X	XX	XX	XX
Mortuary, undertaking or funeral establishment.	X	X	X	X
Adult use.	X	X	X	X
Brewery or taproom.	X	X	X	X
D. OFFICE USES				
Neighborhood Medical Office.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Medical Office.	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX
Clinic.	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX
J. WHOLESALE, TRANSP/TION, INDUSTRIAL USES				
Distillery or winery.		XX	XX	
Renting one or two rooms without separate cooking facilities to lodgers within a dwelling unit to one or two total lodgers.	XXX	XX	XX	
Noncommercial greenhouse, tool shed, or similar accessory structure.	X			

Comments:

1. Hope no hotels. If allowed, please prohibit them being turned into shelters via MA state contracts.
2. Fellsway/Salem St. intersection is already a death trap.
3. Need for 55+ owner strip communities. Check out Lynfield's process.
4. No medical facilities at all. Nothing above 4 stories.
5. NO methadone. NO short term housing. No hotels. No boarding hs.
6. Feb 10, 2025. No resident should lose any sunlight in their home or yard due to the increased height of this project. Paul Margan 871-395-3706
7. Too tall! Too dense! We live here!
8. I support 6-stories and new development.

9. NO pot dispensaries.
10. Use cases need more scrutiny. Should be a 4-floor max. No temp use (Dormitory). No medical. % setback.
11. No increasing the sidewalks into private property.
12. Ban all medical offices on Salem Street.
13. No dorm. No hotel. No boarding. No homeless shelter. No medical of any kind.
14. Traffic study. No pot stores.
15. No medical buildings.
16. NO public drug use enforced.
17. No medical use. Adult use – NO. Boarding house NO. Adult Entertainment NO.
18. No medical office or dental centers – opposed to methadone clinic on Salem St. Corridor. Hts of buildings greater than 3 stories + 1 mechanical NO 5-6 stories or higher. re: building hgt. Thank you, Menzan Wing, 36 Dudley St.
19. No medical offices, no halfway houses, no rehab houses.
20. No medical of any kind. Medford Square is close for medical.
21. Can we increase min lot size? 3000K is too small should be 4500/5000K.
22. Maximum height 3-4 (no 6).
23. Six stories is too dense. Walkability is NOT the answer.
24. No dorms, shelter, hotel, doggy daycare, research & testing labs.
25. Exempt labs. No Wuhan labs.
26. No dorm, no hotel, no boarding house, no church w/ homeless shelter.
27. Complete: shadow study, traffic study, parking study.
28. How will schools handle more students? McGlyna + Roberts full.
29. No medical of any kind.
30. No incentive for higher buildings. Block sun from houses.
31. No dorm.

32. NO medical. NO hotel. NO AirBnB. NO transit housing.
33. No Med-office. No drug dealers.
34. No 6-story buildings.
35. Concerned about height of buildings on Salem St.
36. The taxpayers own the City – we know and like some progress + growth.
How can the taxpayers/residents limit the bldg. construction to maximum of 6 units?
37. No dorm no shelter.
38. No medical of any kind.
39. No medical offices. Max 4 floors. Incentives to keep current businesses.
40. NO overnight camping, lines etc. on Salem St. Written confirmation that MPD will enforce.
41. NO “MEDICAL” of any kind!

SURVEY

The consultant team distributed a survey to all meeting participants to get feedback on community engagement. The general sentiment expressed by the people who took the survey was fear of change and distrust towards the City and the consultant team. Many people expressed disappointment due to the lack of community engagement earlier in the process. Some people felt that their voices weren't heard regarding future changes and that the information presented was either misleading or too much to take in during one session. People expressed their strong opposition to medical uses, temporary housing, hotels, and higher density being allowed in the corridor. However, a smaller portion of people seemed to be excited about the proposed zoning changes. Overall, the majority agree that they want to be more involved and learn more about the zoning process.

NOTES FROM PUBLIC INPUT

Summarized notes from the public participants of Salem St Neighborhood Corridor District Public Meeting on February 10, 2025:

- Concerns from residents about the proposed zoning allowing methadone clinics to open and operate along Salem St.
 - Many residents voiced their concerns about allowing the use of methadone clinics to operate on Salem St.

- Innes Associates and Medford City Staff advised about the implications and that the city cannot prohibit this specific use under federal law, if allowing other types of medical uses to operate in the corridor.
 - Some residents advised they will rather prohibit all medical uses in the corridor if it means that methadone clinics would be prohibited from opening and operating in the corridor.
- Some residents voiced concerns about the lack of studies completed in the corridor before the proposed zoning was presented to them.
 - Some residents agree that they would like to see various development studies done before the official zoning is voted on and put in place.
 - Residents are concerned about traffic and lack of parking that will come with development/density from the proposed zoning.
 - One resident asks if there is an analysis addressing if development/density becomes detrimental for the community.
- Development and increased density in the corridor are a concern for some residents.
 - One resident points out that their property would be boxed in by mixed use buildings and wants to prevent it from happening.
 - Other residents are concerned about the proposed building heights and what it would do for their properties to be in the shadows of taller buildings on Salem St.
- Issues with developers/companies Medford chooses to do business with and desire to close loopholes in proposed zoning.
 - One resident points out that the city has a bad track record of shady developers it chooses to do business with on projects.
 - This resident would like the proposed zoning be comprehensive in that it prevents developers from using any loopholes that would be detrimental to the community when they choose to do business in the corridor.
 - The City noted that they have no control over private developers who choose to submit applications.
- Concerns about tax implications of the proposed zoning changes.
 - One resident brings up that they believe rezoning of properties will increase land value of the re-zones and adjacent lots. They would like

to see protections put in place for homeowners from increased property tax rates because of the proposed zoning changes.

- Innes Associates will investigate precedent cases/examples if there is something they can place into the language of the zoning to protect property owners from this.