

David Pollak

From: Kelly Hardebeck <khardebeck@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 2:52 PM
To: David Pollak
Subject: Re: With attachment - RE: MBTACA Ad Hoc AC Subcommittee - First meeting Tuesday 9/26 at Town Hall

David,
Here's the list of questions I have so far. I'm sure more will come up as we delve deeper and discuss.

- 40B Questions
 - How do currently permitted 40B's factor into calculations of the expected additional units within the Overlay District?
 - Will 40B developments within the Overlay District be subject to the Objective Design Standards? (My guess is that they are not subject to any of the Town's ZBLs and, therefore, will not be required to adhere to them, but I wanted to double-check)
 - Would the adoption of the MBTA CA Overlay District have any potential impact on the number of 40B projects? Does this zoning change permit projects that would otherwise have gone through the 40B process because they are not allowed "as of right" today?
- Tree Canopy and Lot Coverage
 - I'm curious about the interaction between the max. lot coverage and tree canopy requirements and would appreciate more background on how the minimums for tree canopy coverage were calculated and whether lot coverage was considered when the recommendations were made. My concern is that we are unintentionally incenting contributions to the Town's Tree Planting Fund and not encouraging the planting of trees.
- Parking
 - What's the rationale behind reducing the parking minimums for Affordable Units only to 0.1? The Design Standards stipulate that Affordable Units be constructed with the same materials as market-rate units and otherwise seek to ensure the units are on-par with market-rate units. In the past, residents have shared concerns about reducing parking minimums and my concern is that this reduction unfairly targets those who may need parking more than residents in market-rate units. Why separate it out?
- Contemporary Design Standards
 - The design standards detailed in the WAs represent our current streetscape which may lock Harvard Street into a 19th or 20th century look and does not allow for evolution. Section m authorizes the SB to modify several previous sections to update the Objective Design Standards. Is the SB the right body to do this? The SB is an elected body that may not have expertise in architectural design or planning and changes to the design standards have the potential to change the looks of a significant part of Town. Will CTOS be making a recommendation on this section?
 - Could a building that does not meet the Objective Design Standards be approved through the Site Plan Review process? Is there a mechanism to allow for a contemporary building?
- Legal
 - The proposed Design Standards are detailed and quite specific. Are they similar to design standards that are in use in other cities and towns in Massachusetts? The petitioners indicate that they feel the standards would not impeded or unreasonably delay a project, but I'd like to know what the basis for their confidence is.

Thanks
Kelly