

Planning Board Meeting Minutes

Date: June 12, 2019

Time: 7:30pm

x	J. Hargraves	x	A. Pease
	J. Lindquist	x	T. Foster
x	T. Cantor		W. Stacy (associate)

Also Attending:

- Laura Harbottle

*Jeanie caught that pesky French flu... feel well!*

**Meeting Opened at 7:30pm.**

**Meeting Minutes:**

- TBD

**ANR:**

- None

**Land Use Agent FY2019 Contract Amendment:**

- Alan moved to approve the contract; Tricia seconded; all approved; none

**Land Use Agent FY2020 contract discussion:**

- Laura has other upcoming opportunities; the Board will need to evaluate priorities and long-term plan for the land-use agent
- The Board will need to evaluate the priorities to determine what could be done in the interim until the land use agent is again available
- here is some overlap between activities defined in the scope of work and the activities in the Open Space Plan
- Items that are underway/started/or could be started:
  - Natural Resource Protection Zoning
  - Trail and Conservation Projects:
    - Community grant acquired with other efforts
    - Buzynski(sp??) property work
    - Open space plan - *there is still work to be done*
    - Trail improvement, construction, and plan - *has not been started*
  - Misc Planning Tasks
    - Housing plan - obtained some monies and assistance from MSRPC
- Possible things that the Board can work on in the absence of a Land Use Agent:
  - Natural Resource Protection Zoning

- Community Development Plan
  - Addressing greater density for the middle of town; housing options
  - Looking at ways to improving infrastructure for water, sewer, etc.. (such as bringing in Fitchburg water)
  - Address the existing [Community Development Plan](#)
- The board will focus on the land use section of the Community Development Plan
- Laura to provide materials to assist in our continued efforts in her absence

**Natural Resource Protection Zoning review of plans from other towns/Community Develop  
Plan update discussion:**

- Instead of creating a whole new bylaw, we could look at tweaking the existing bylaws to support the NRPZ
- Chart providing comparison of different towns and their measures (proposed and approved) was provided
- Things to consider for zoning:
  - The number of plots that a developer wishes versus what the town wants
  - Location and use of open space in the development plan;
    - Would the town want public access, trails, etc
    - Consider what the property owners in that development would also want in addition to what the town is looking for
  - Size of the lot compared to the size of the house (4k house on 15k lot)
  - Define a minimum contiguous open space, limited by sewer requirements
  - Consider impact of road standards, whether it would be lowered to support the land plan; consider drainage requirements; consider keeping the roads private
  - Density bonus could be considered for things like more open space, affordable units, senior housing, increasing units with increased open space
  - Base requirements on buildable lots (upland versus wetland)

COMPARISON OF TOWNS WITH DIFFERENT OPEN SPACE PROTECTION MEASURES

	Ashby	Ayer	Marshfield	Plymouth	Scituate	Westford
		Preliminary Plan approved	Christmas Cove (not approved)	Watercourse Place, Hoban Place	Benjamin Studley Farm (approved)	Lakeside Meadows, Chestnut Hill Estates, Jarvis Estates
Name of development	Open Space Residential Development	Open Space Residential Development	Open Space Residential Development	Rural Residential Zoning Bylaw	Flexible Open Space Development	Open Space Residential Development
Type of Bylaw	Open Space Residential Development	Open Space Residential Development	Open Space Residential Development	Rural Residential Zoning Bylaw	Flexible Open Space Development	Open Space Residential Development
Development option or requirement	Option	Requirement; option for Form A's	Option	Option	Option	Option
Process		Conservation analysis required; Planning Board makes conservation findings	Must meet design standards for protection of nat resources, views, etc	Approval requires strict compliance with Natural Features Conservation Requirements	Special permit; Sensitive resources must be identified as first step	Planning Board must make written findings that development meets purposes of bylaw
Minimum protected open space	35%	40% if private septic if on sewer 50%	50% of upland	50%	30%. One third may be wetland.	33%
Approval	Special permit	By right	Special permit	Special permit	Special permit	Special permit
Density determined by	No more than zoning allows, based on concept plan	Total acreage less 1/2 high slope acreage, floodplain + wetlands/ min lot size	Formula (Upland x .90/ Minimum lot size) + conventional plan	Zoning Bylaw	Conventional plan.	No more than zoning allows. Burden of proof on developer
Minimum Area		None	5 acres	None	4 X Minimum lot size	10 acres or 1,000' of roadway
Minimum Lot Size	40,000 sf	None	1/2 the normal minimum area or 15,000 sf, whichever is less.	20,000 sf or 60,000 sf depending on district	None	20,000 sf
Minimum frontage	50'	None	75' on internal roads	None	None	50'
Density Bonuses?		Additional open space or access to open space-10%; Solar-ready construction up to 25%; Affordable units - two units for each affordable up to 25% of total.	None	Through Transfer of Development Rights	None	None
Affordability Requirement	None	None	None	None	None	None
Setbacks	No special	10' from each property line	1/2 normal setbacks; 30' from outer boundary which must be kept vegetated	No special	15' for all, except setbacks from outer boundary must be those required by zoning	1/2 regularly required setbacks
Design	50% of open space must be contiguous; 25' buffer from boundaries required, but may be waived	Open space must be protected but isn't required to have public access	Open space must be large contiguous areas	Open space as large as possible in a design where it unifies development	None	Open space must be large contiguous areas; 100' buffer from boundaries required

Items not anticipated by the chairman

- None

Meeting adjourned at 9:15pm.

Submitted by:  
Terri Cantor