

From: Orlando Pacheco <OPacheco@lanasterma.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 15, 2021 4:29 PM
To: vpetraccapublic@gmail.com; Philip Eugene
Subject: Mike A 40R review-feel free to share

(see below)

Orlando,

I read through the proposed 40R bylaw. From a planning perspective I see nothing wrong. The bylaw mostly follows what the state model bylaw puts forth. Regarding consistency with local policy the bylaw attempts to accomplish everything the town has laid out in its Economic Development Plan, its Affordable Housing Plan, and its Master Plan. So I think from that perspective it is a great thing.

Additionally, I'm happy to see the town pursue this as, since you know, I initially was researching 40R as it pertained to the "village area" around AUC. The proposal is also consistent with recommendations made from Barrett Consulting Group. The most important piece of information you'll receive about this bylaw is the review study when it comes in from RKG. Without knowing the scope of review, ideally that will help to identify the feasibility of the bylaw regarding local market demands. Also, the legal review you are awaiting from counsel will be helpful as always.

If both the ICOD and the SGOD pass, then North Lancaster will have 4 overlay districts. The districts include the Water Resource Protection Overlay, IPOD, ICOD and NLSGOD. I don't think there will be any conflict between any of the overlay districts should they all be approved, given that applicants will have the option to apply for either IPOD, ICOD or NLSGOD. However, has Capital Group, the major stakeholder in North Lancaster, been approached for input regarding the SGOD? Presumably, they are the ones who would likely use the Overlay.

I do like the idea of the 5-member Plan Approval Authority. I think that will provide a well rounded perspective from all the different Land Use Boards. I assume there are volunteers ready to staff that board. I don't think the town has any current problems with getting volunteers on boards, but if that were the case, obviously the creation of a new board would be troublesome.

A question I have to DHCD would be: if a development is approved on the land designated for the SGOD, but is instead approved under a different bylaw (ICOD) can the town still get the rewards of 40R? I would think no, since I believe there is an approval process through DHCD regarding 40R projects. Just something to be aware of.

Regarding the design standards, they seem a bit vague and open to interpretation. Are there specific aesthetics the trust would like to see for new residential structures? Or maybe more importantly, new commercial structures? Even if it's simple things like "structures must have pitched, shingled roofs", or "prevent building massing of over 100 linear feet without architectural or aesthetic changes". Again, I would suggest discussing this specifically with the stakeholders.

Those are my thoughts on this. Feel free to share with the trust. I didn't see any specific request from the trust for my input, but they are certainly welcome to it. I wanted to get something out to you as soon as possible on this, so if I think of anything in the meantime I will send along as an addenda.

The contents of this email and any attachments are the property of the Town of Lancaster Massachusetts and subject to the Public Records Law, M.G.L. c. 66, section 10. When writing or responding, please remember that the Massachusetts Secretary of State's Office has determined that email is a public record and not confidential.