

Mr. Rudloff chairing the meeting, informed all present that the meeting is being recorded.

Minutes

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Griffin and voted 4-0: (Mr. Pearce absent)

that the Community Planning Commission vote to accept the minutes dated December 19, 2023 as written.

Roll call vote: Mr. Johnston, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Griffin and Mr. Rudloff in favor, none opposed.

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Griffin and voted 4-0: (Mr. Pearce absent)

that the Community Planning Commission vote to accept the minutes dated January 2, 2024 as written.

Roll call vote: Mr. Johnston, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Griffin and Mr. Rudloff in favor, none opposed.

Accessory Dwelling Units

Mrs. McKnight stated that the Select Board has provided dates that do not work for a joint meeting to discuss ADUs. We are asked to provide dates that do work for the CPC based on that. The CPC's response is that it would be best if the Select Board could provide dates that do work for them first.

RFP – Saint Theresa Street

Mrs. McKnight stated that the draft RFP is complete and she can be present it to the Select Board on February 12, 2024.

249 Haverhill Street & 7 Charles Street – Special Permit – P.H. 8:00PM

Mr. Rudloff stated that the Chairperson, Warren Pearce is unable to make this meeting and therefore the CPC will get a general sense of what the project entails and will field any questions from the people attending, but wants everyone to know that this will not be voted on tonight and will be continued.

Mr. Rudloff read the public hearing notice into the record.

Atty. Jill Mann stated that the developer John Bobrek has submitted a special permit for an open space residential subdivision plan that will show the best utilization and open space for this property (see attached PowerPoint). They're proposing a twenty six unit subdivision. It is comprised of two individual roads, and it will be a total of fourteen lots because they're proposing to develop multi-family duplex and single family homes. The advantage of doing that, is to be able to consolidate development, provide a variety of home choices, and protect open space. The property has 32 acres of land with a tremendous amount of upland and only 376 sq. ft. of wetland. The advantage of this particular development is that they will avoid all wetland impact.

The first plan that they submitted was conventional, but in addition to that they need to show a concept plan. A big bottom portion of the property are all great slopes and beautiful open space. After they went out and looked at the site they decided not to take away this parcel of land and will leave it open and undeveloped, it's beautiful and fits in well with the Harold Parker State park that this land abuts. They altered that plan and that's what was submitted, showing fourteen lots and that's the one showing one multi-family proposal. They have examples of what those homes look like in order to give a more diverse housing stock. DCR owns a right-of-way going in that goes into a "Y" shape. They have two roadways that bisect this property, but over which whoever owns this property (John Bobrek), as the successor, has the right to travel, to use in any and all ways to use a roadway, he can use it to access anything he wants. He chose not to develop those particular streets because of the impacts to the wetlands, but doing it the way Mr. Bobrek did it in the alternative plan with the smaller subdivision roads make much more sense. This is the Yield plan. Under the Open Space subdivision, the rule is this is: They don't want the property over developed just because you can put in a more dense development, that isn't what the bylaw is about. It's about how much you can get in a conventional sense. They want us to show them what that is and then they're going to give a little bonus because they want us to do it the other way and the bonus is about 20%. This particular conventional subdivision shows four individual roads, some of which do use the DCR roadways. In this subdivision there are about twenty two individual single family home lots and four subdivision roadways. Some of it requires wetland crossing, all the things are permissible because they cross wetlands in order to access property, it's that limited project. So that's basically a project that has to be approved. As long as we can demonstrate that we can protect the wetlands by a secure crossing. Nobody can just do it if they can't provide that surety and that's what this particular plan shows. Now they get into the alternative proposal that has these 2 wide roadways that are DCR rights-of-way that they are not developing and/or using them. However, there is a bubble in the middle, on the plan near the wetlands that the current owner when doing some work, actually disturbs that area. So they have an obligation when they would acquire the property to actually restore that wetland. So part of their project and part of their applications will be a Notice of Intent to replicate, restore the wetlands, but that is the only disruption. The subdivision roadways that Mr. Bobrek is proposing to construct is Abigail off of Haverhill Street, and Lucas off of Charles Street. So they are proposing two subdivision roadways and are going to create 14 lots with 26 living units. There will be 9 single family homes. The subdivision roadway at the top really does work better for single family homes than it does for multifamily which is why it was designed like that. Then, in the bottom where they have Lucas Lane they have 4 duplex units. There is 1 single lot that will access 3 multi-family buildings. All these things are permissible under the bylaw. They are going to create a large amount of open space and they're going to create public parking. The PowerPoint shows Amber Road and right below they have created 5 parking spaces there. The purpose of that is because people park on the street and may park in front of the Romeo's house, so they're proposing to move people down, so that they're parking on their property vs. in front of somebody's home.

Mr. John Bobrek stated that the single family houses will have their own individual septic system on their property and on the lower street there will be a combined system that will utilize the area out back.

Attorney Mann stated that because they'll do this as a condominium, it is basically called a common system which is allowable under Title V without any additional relief. It simply requires the presentation and acceptance by the Board of Health and the H.O.A. will be kept on file by the Board of Health. The beauty of it being a condominium is that you don't have to seek recourse in the courts, but because it's a condominium it's statutory, so the town has the right of lien which is powerful. Abigail Way that is shown at the top of the plan is 450' long, it's 9 single family homes and she wanted to point out that there are 2 homes that are right at the top. The 2 homes will access their property over a driveway that they use over Priscilla.

Mr. Rudloff stated that the fire department is referring to a bridge in their memo.

Attorney Mann stated that's because in the original plan that they submitted showed more single family homes with no multi-family did have a bridge. All lots require a waiver from dimensional requirements that's OSRD, she listed because she thinks it's better to just be upfront and that's what one of the requirements was to try to minimize the amount of consumption. All lots have access to the open space and also provides access to the public. Lucas Lane is the one with 4-duplexes, and one lot with 3 multi-families. They purposely designed the multi-family lot to have one common driveway because they are anticipated comments from the fire department they have ensured that there's fire access 360° around the entire property. Once you get involved in multi-family it starts to trigger different requirements for fire safety sprinkler and they have acknowledged and accepted that. If the fire department wants them to give a better, they have the ability to flex and create.

Mr. Rudloff asked if the road would be paved, or gravel.

Attorney Mann stated that because it's an OSRD they would prefer that it be compacted stone.

Mr. Bobrek stated that it will be an engineered graveled road with some sort of geotech fabric, or geogrid.

Waiver requests:

- 1) §200-50(B)(3)[j] to allow slopes with a grade of 25% within the Open Space

Attorney Mann stated that the entire North Reading bylaws focused on the fact that open space is going to provide usable area. That none of this area is going to provide space the

people can't use. They say, Look, if you have slopes that are greater than 25% within the open space then you need a waiver. Where they have the slopes that are greater than 25% is right in this area here and they intentionally withdrew all of their development work from that.

In order not to have it be a development area they had to make it all open space. There is a substantial portion of that that does have substantial slope. But again, based on how they're

supposed to provide upland vs. sloped area, they do provide that minimum amount of slope that minimum amount that CPC is looking for.

- 2) §200-50(C)(7) allow a reduction of all dimensional requirements (subject to 50' perimeter buffer and no waiver for lots bordering on existing home sites) as follows:
 - 20,000 SF minimum Lot Area
 - 80' Lot Frontage Lots 1-4 and 7-14
 - 20' Lot Frontage for Lots 5 and 6 (allows reduce disturbance)
 - 20' Front Setback
 - 12.5' Side Setback
 - 25' Rear Setback
 - 10% Maximum Building Area
 - 30% Minimum Open Space

Attorney Mann stated that they need a reduction in all dimensionals. Obviously, though, one dimensional waiver is never allowed is the 50' perimeter buffer for lots that border existing homes and they honored that and it's in the updated plan. What they're seeking is to actually have lots that are only 20,000 square feet in area. They're looking to have 80% lot frontages for lots 1 thru 4 and 7 thru 14. However, those two lots that they show with those driveways actually only have 20' of frontage, because they're simply matching the amount of driveway that they have going over the DCR property. They don't own the property, they would have to start off big and go small, which makes no sense to do it because of the way they have access over DCR property. They're asking for 20' setbacks and only to the extent within the interior of the OSRD. A 12.5 side setback only within the OSRD to the extent lots abut each other and a 25' rear setback. They're looking for reductions in how much the maximum amount of building area they can actually occupy, because they have no OSRD and same thing with minimum open space. They're going to buy huge amount of open space, but the lots also still need some element of open space, so they're providing 30%.

- 3) §200-51(A)(7)(b)[2] allow 35% Multifamily Structures 3 Unit Buildings

Attorney Mann stated that the reason for the waiver is because currently the CPC is saying that you only have 25% of the buildings to be multifamily structures, and we're asking to make it 35%, which would allow them to do those 3, 3 and 3, to do the 9. She asked the engineer, Brendan Pyburn who works for John Bobrek to just show the areas of the property that are going to be disturbed, and the total amount of disturbance is 482,532 square feet, that's it.

That includes everything all lots, all streets the septic system, any storm water bases and the trails. She made sure that they looked at every single number, and that amounts to 35% of the entire property.

They're leaving 65% totally untouched and she did list those areas. Now open space is 918,000 square feet. The CPC can see where all the open spaces are and can see where it's all adding to the actual benefit of the development. In addition, it's providing access to that Harold Parker

State Forest. So they really are expanding the usability of Harold Parker and they do provide a buffer on all sides of this multi-family project. Just to break it down the open space undisturbed has almost 900,000 square feet. Of that almost 622,000 square feet are actually upland and only 20,000 of the total upland are either being disturbed. Its 276,000 square feet of wetlands, and all of that is going to be perpetually protected.

The open space is more than 50%, its 918 which is 65%. The open space contains absolutely no structures, or exclusive use areas. What the North Reading bylaw does allow are trails. They are proposing to put the septic system in that common space behind the multifamily lot which is also permitted, and they do have a couple of stormwater management features that will be in the open space. However, we are only allowed to do certain types of rain guard bio-retention. They cannot put in detention basins and the purpose of that is so it's not ugly, but attractive. All of the open spaces are undisturbed and contains all the wetlands and a substantial portion of buffer. The most important thing for open space, and it's clear, because it's written everywhere in the bylaw is that there's connectivity and preservation of wildlife. When you go back to this particular slide, you can see how they actually provide connections throughout. There can be wildlife corridors all up and down their particular property. In addition, the bylaw's definition of connectivity does not mean if a street runs in between it doesn't connect because everybody recognizes there are going to be streets and access and the entire purpose of the DCR properties to provide access. Now the DCR properties do bisect their open space, but it provides the public with general access to all of their open space. In addition to that, the open space has multiple points of access. Anytime there are areas behind the homes they have provided a trail to go behind it for the people to use the roadways and access. You can see where the cul-de-sac on Lucas actually is able to be accessed to the open space, and the same exact for the cul-de-sac on Abigail, which was intentionally done. They didn't put in parking for those areas because after their conversation they thought that it was going to be better to concentrate the parking in the open space as part of the OSRD, but off of Amber. Again, they've provided 5 parking spaces and the open space. This is what it was that Mr. Rudloff actually alluded to. The open space is going to be owned and maintained by a condominium association. However, what they do, and are required to do under the OSRD is to grant the town under the custody of the Conservation Commission a Perpetual Conservation Restriction. When they do that they will get approval of the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, which means the only way that it can be changed, modified, terminated is by a legislative act; it is perpetual. Many times that's only a 30 year restriction. Well, special permits when they have a condition can put in place things that go beyond the 30 years. But, this particular provision and statute extends forever.

As shown on the PowerPoint these large homes. They are going to do front load and side load because the way those properties are situated, but they wanted to give the CPC an idea. These are typical townhouse duplex properties. They have nice living space behind and in front and every single solitary home in this subdivision will have indoor parking with a two car garage.

Multifamily - The North Reading bylaw actually points out the concern about having the fronts of the properties to align, so it's one big strip. The multi-families in this particular subdivision have pushes and pulls, they go behind and forward and they will try to side load some garages to

the extent possible. But, they are just trying to give the CPC this point, a concept that the CPC wants. This is not what they're proposing, these are simply concepts to get people understanding what they're proposing when they say multifamily townhouses, because, while the Board may get it, she doesn't know if the public readily says, "Oh, a townhouse means there have to be structure side by side."

- 4) §200-50.B.3.i allow a greater percentage of wetland in the Open space than the percentage on the Property (*Required if the Primary Open and the Secondary Open Space are combined.*)

Attorney Mann stated that every single solitary time she presents an OSRD project it has the same exact provision, and what it actually shouldn't say is that we need to have certain amount of wetland. It should say, you need to have a minimum amount of upland. They are going to give 200,000 square feet more of wetland area to protect, and they are meeting the minimum. So the reason why they specifically cut into primary and secondary is to show how that provision really should be flipped. They can give primary land that's more than 50% of the total area. It ends up being substantially all upland, and only 56,000 square feet of wetland. But because they have a secondary area, which is 221,000 square feet of wetland, they skew the number, but when they separate them they don't. That's why they did it just to kind of demonstrate to the board. However the CPC would like them to present it they can remove the primary or secondary, but they did that to facilitate an understanding of why the bylaw in every town is written like that. CPC should be focused on upland, not wetland.

Mr. Rudloff asked Attorney Mann what her response is in regard to the email from Mr. Romeo stating that these are two separate lots.

Attorney Mann stated that the property is all owned by a common owner. The fact that they're separated by DCR properties is not a separation according to the bylaw, they can be separated by streets all the time. These streets for the DCR are only ever going to be access for the Harold Parker State Forest. There is a provision in the Subdivision bylaw that states "Connectivity is not impeded, interfered with, or denied by virtue of a right-of-way or street." Connectivity is provided when you have the ability to walk and access. The fact that the DCR rights-of-way are there is actually kind of better, so they don't have a home going there, but a beautiful right-of-way to get to the park. There almost is more continuity with an OSRD.

Attorney James DiGiulio stated that he is representing Mr. Thomas Romeo owner of 253 Haverhill Street. With respect to that specific question, he thinks the connectivity issue in the bylaw relates to the open space issue and not with respect to the lots. The bylaw specifically provides for a special permit for a cluster development. When six or more buildings or structures are proposed on a tract of land, or if there are contiguous lots that were in common ownership at the time of the bylaw, and neither of that seems to be proposed. In the aerial plan that was shown to us earlier, it seems to appear that these are two separate subdivisions, and what that would do if they are two separate subdivisions, and they appear to be two separate subdivisions, as it would kept that change the calculations with regard to the open space.

Mr. Rudloff stated that he thinks these are two different roads going into a single subdivision. The reason he opened with the question about the two lots was this was something that Mr. Romeo had raised in the email he submitted that he was looking at it as two separate lots, or the way it was separated by the DCR roads. Mr. Rudloff is unaware if there are any restrictions that wouldn't allow two different ways to get into this open space development.

Mrs. McKnight will check to see if there are any restrictions regarding two roads going into a subdivision in this way.

Mr. Rudloff stated that Mr. Romeo's email also mentioned a previous lawsuit with the current owner of the property (Dale Halchak).

Attorney Mann stated that as far as what they're supposed to remediate, it's anything within the wetland area and if there's some issues. They're going to let everything grow back. DCR, likes some of the cleared area because then they have access, and they're going to want to continue to keep the fire lane. Attorney DiGiulio and she can discuss some of the elements of the order that was issued by the court. When the proposed roadway was going to still access over Amber Road and that is clearly how Mr. Romeo accesses his home, he was very concerned that they were going to impact his access rights, but the decision says they cannot block the right to use the road which they're no longer going to do, and if, and when, whomever is going to be the successor created an issue and impeded the ability for Mr. Romeo to access his property, they need to restore that. So at this point, she has not had discussions with Mr. Bobrek and would rather not talk about a legal document here, but she will absolutely have a conversation with Attorney DiGiulio and any obligations by the predecessor and interest will become theirs and they will absolutely address this.

Mr. Romeo stated that he would ask that his attorney finish his remarks before he makes any comments.

Attorney DiGiulio stated that he would like to be heard on everything that's being proposed tonight.

Mr. Rudloff stated that they spoke about the two issues listed in his email: concerns about having a contiguous parcel and access on Amber Road.

Mr. Romeo called for point of order and asked if this was coming from the CPC Chair or the applicant.

Mr. Rudloff stated that he did open the meeting by saying that this was going to be a review, but the meeting would be continued. Out of respect for Mr. Romeo and Attorney DiGiulio he called on them first to discuss the issues listed in the email that was sent to Mrs. McKnight, but those issues have been discussed.

Attorney DiGiulio stated that the concerns that they have is that they don't think that the proposal appears to meet the requirements for consideration of a special permit for a cluster development in

many ways. But particularly, the bylaw provides for a tract of land for 6 or more structures, but these are not contiguous parcels. These three parcels that are being proposed are parcels are separate parcels and to his knowledge, they have never been in held in common ownership. He's referring to the basic requirements of a cluster of development. At least one of the tracts that is being proposed, is tract C, and it's not proposed as having six or more units.

Mr. Rudloff stated that is a valid point, but should be put in a memo to Mrs. McKnight and she can send it to Town Counsel for their opinion. Out of respect for Chairperson Pearce who is unable to be here this evening, the CPC would prefer not to get to involved with these issues until he is in attendance.

Mr. Carroll stated that having access to Harold Parker is a valuable resource, but when it's not clearly delineated, it becomes a point of contention.

Attorney Mann stated that they are willing to add more trails as they proceed with this plan. They have talked about putting a small kiosk showing the trails, access points and parking. They can also put split rail fencing.

Mr. Carroll stated that a break away chain should be put at the end of Lucas Way, where the fire lane is located to keep it clear. Also, adding a landscape buffer to the back side the townhouses will keep it separate from the homes behind it.

Attorney DiGiulio stated that Amber Road is being shown as a right-of-way on the plan, and it's not a right-of-way. It's a public way and it's owned by DCR. It has access and sight distance issues.

Attorney Mann stated that they are rights-of-way, but they're all in deed and they are not public ways. She has made it abundantly clear that they (the applicant) do not own them.

Mr. Carroll stated that he is concerned with the sight lines coming off of Lucas Way.

Attorney Mann stated that they did have some issues with Lucas Way, so they moved it. They will submit the traffic support when they submit the subdivision plan.

Mr. Griffin stated that he does not have any comments at this time except that the issues that were discussed at the last meeting have been addressed.

Mr. Johnston stated that in comparison to the original proposal that they saw he thinks this is evolving in a positive direction and was pleased to see these changes.

Mr. Carroll stated that he was wondering what the intent is in regard to the driveway going back to those townhouses are they trying to go for 20'.

Attorney Mann stated that they have to go the 20' with a common drive, and even the common drives that go over DCR will be over 20'.

Mr. Rudloff asked if a sidewalk was going to be added.

Attorney Mann stated that it would be added to the subdivision plan. The sidewalk for the common drive will need to be a little different because it will be on private property, so she will need to speak to the architect to see how it should be done.

Attorney DiGiulio asked to speak on behalf of Mr. Romeo.

Mr. Rudloff stated that he would like to give some of the other people that are in attendance an opportunity to speak. He stated to Attorney DiGiulio that if he wants to put further issues in an email and send it to Mrs. McKnight the board will have chance to review it and speak about it at the next meeting.

Jean Harty of 247 Haverhill Street stated that she would like to get a little more detail on 249 Haverhill Street.

Mr. Bobrek stated that in the plan detail, there are four duplexes as you enter the road that will end with a cul-de-sac. A landscaped buffer will be provided against the southern side of the road and there will be a common driveway for three multi-family buildings out back which will be isolated by the wetlands and open space upland.

Nick Hardy of 247 Haverhill Street stated that the property line being shown on the plan is not what their property line looks like. Each corner of his property houses a telephone line and they've both been taken out three times in the years that they've lived there. That's a huge corner for accidents and to put more housing in there is going to cause a lot more traffic and that's a concern.

Attorney Mann stated that she believes this was surveyed, but they will go back and revisit and address it. When they go through subdivision approval they have to go through certain traffic regulations and they have to ensure that they have sufficient sight distance.

Mr. Bobrek stated that they have reviewed this with department heads, along with the police department who also had similar concerns, so they will be looking at some traffic calming in that area.

Mr. Carroll asked if the existing single family home was going to be demolished.

Mr. Rudloff stated that there is quite a bit of ledge removal. Will any ledge be removed that is located close to Haverhill Street?

Mr. Bobrek stated that it would be demolished and ledge would be removed, but they do not own the property where the ledge is located on Haverhill Street.

Mr. Rudloff asked if the two duplex units could be made into a single.

Attorney Mann stated that is not the definite location of where they're going to be. They would like there to be a duplex there, but they are not married to the location of anything except for the general layout. Essentially to where the two roadways come in and how they have chopped that road down with the multis, but they're going to look at everything. So right now, at most, that lot would be a two unit or it could be one.

Bob Johnson of 4 Charles Street that his home is located directly across from where Abigail Road will be. They're very concerned about a couple of things. They have been experiencing a lot of run-off from the Charles Street Ext subdivision. He would like to know how this upper development off of Amber will impact Charles Street, especially during the construction phase and how is that going to be managed? He is also concerned about the stormwater management for the upper development. Is it going to have its own drainage system, or is it going to tie into the storm drains on Charles St.?

Mr. Bobrek stated that two-thirds of this impervious area is going to discharge to wetlands. There will be an initial portion of the sloped road, as you enter the site, which is going discharge to a surface water treatment area. The intention is to maintain almost all of the run-off on the property.

Bob Johnson asked if he was speaking about a retention pond.

Mr. Bobrek stated yes, but it would not be a very large retention pond.

Bob Johnson asked what the grade is going to be on Abigail.

Mr. Bobrek stated that there is a good amount of cut that needs to occur to meet the town's standards for a roadway.

Mr. Carroll stated that in general the site slopes away from Charles towards the wetlands.

Mr. Bobrek stated that it does have a sharp increase and then gradually goes off, out back.

Mr. Rudloff stated that as part of the application will be the stormwater analysis calculations and the CPC is really sensitive to that, and ensuring that the system is designed appropriately.

Bob Johnson asked if all of the homes are going to be constructed at the same time.

Mr. Bobrek stated that it is intended that they will be constructed at the same time. That's the general concept to the two entrance roads is to have the multi-families on the lower side and the single families on the other side. This will not be a seven-year project, and ultimately he's looking to live there and wants to have as much green space around, as possible.

Michael Eastman of 2 Charles Street asked if the land area has been studied, and do they know how much rock ledge there is and will there be blasting?

Mr. Bobrek stated that he does not have that exact number, at this time. They do have extensive soil testing that's been completed in the area. They are trying to minimize the footprint as much as humanly possible which is why they revised the plan to minimize rock removal. He doesn't know what type of rock is there, so he doesn't know if there will be blasting.

Mr. Thomas Romeo of 253 Haverhill Street stated that he just wanted to put on the record his displeasure that the Chair did not let his attorney speak. He feels as though he had the comments to make on the presentation that were germane, but he wasn't given an opportunity to speak. The conversation went all the way to basements and slab on grade, but they didn't talk about the rudimentary aspects of this plan related to safe and adequate access, impact on abutters and roadway construction and whatnot. So he wants that on the record that he feels as though the Chair did not give his attorney ample time under the public meeting law to speak and they will move forward with his attorney speaking to their attorney and hopefully, town counsel as well.

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Griffin and voted 4-0: (Mr. Pearce absent)

that the Community Planning Commission vote to continue the public hearing for 7 Charles Street and 249 Haverhill Street until Tuesday, February 27, 2024 @8:00PM.

Roll call vote: Mr. Johnston, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Griffin and Mr. Rudloff in favor, none opposed.

Adjournment at 9:30PM

Respectfully submitted,
Ryan Carroll, Clerk

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Ryan Carroll', is written over a horizontal line.

HAVERHILL STREET CHARLES STREET OPEN SPACE RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION

SPECIAL PERMIT


Article X

26 Unit Open Space Residential Subdivision


14 Lots with a mix of single family, two family and multifamily homes

PROPERTY: 1,396,533 SF
1,120,131 SF Upland
376,402 SF Wetlands

Lot A 386,377 SF
Lot B 383,734 SF
Lot C 554,083 SF
7 Charles 24,483 SF
249 Haverhill 47,916 SF



22 Conventional Lots



ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL:


Create 2 subdivision roadways

Create 14 lots with a total of 26 living units
9 single family homes
4 duplex townhouses with 2 units
3 multifamily townhouses with 3 units

Create Open Space

Create Public Parking

Replicate and Restore Pre-existing Wetland Disturbance



ABIGAIL WAY is a 450' long subdivision roadway with 9 single family home lots

1. 2 lots have 20' of frontage that cross over a DCR right of way
2. All lots require a waiver from dimensional requirements
3. Access to the Open Space Parcel

LUCAS LANE is a 417' long subdivision roadway with 5 lots

1. 4 duplex townhouses lots
2. 1 lot with three (3) multifamily buildings with three (3) residential dwellings
 - The Multifamily lot is accessed by one common driveway and will be designed with a fire access that provides 360° access to the Buildings
3. All lots require a waiver from dimensional requirements
4. One common septic system for all Units
5. Access to the Open Space Parcel

WAIVERS:

§200-50(B)(3)[j] to allow slopes with a grade of 25% within the Open Space

§200-50(C)(7) allow a reduction of all dimensional requirements (subject to 50' perimeter buffer and no waiver for lots bordering on existing home sites) as follows:

20,000 SF minimum Lot Area

80' Lot Frontage Lots 1-4 and 7-14

20' Lot Frontage for Lots 5 and 6 (allows reduce disturbance)

20' Front Setback

12.5' Side Setback

25' Rear Setback

10% Maximum Building Area

30% Minimum Open Space

§200-51(A)(7)(b)[2] allow 35% Multifamily Structures (3 Unit Buildings)

§200-50.B.3.i allow a greater percentage of wetland in the Open space than the percentage on the Property *(Required if the Primary Open and the Secondary Open Space are combined.)*

- [illegible]

[illegible]

126 9 258 502

[illegible]

OPEN SPACE:

1. More than 50% of the Property is included in the Open Space Parcel.
2. The Open Space contains no structures or exclusive use areas, it includes the common septic system for Lucas Lane and permitted Stormwater Management Systems and access trails.
3. The entire Open Space is contiguous and is separated only by ROW/Streets.
4. Substantially all Open Space is undisturbed and preserves all onsite wetlands and a substantial portion of the wetland buffers as well as the areas of the Property with steep slopes.
5. The Open Space provides connectivity and preserves wildlife corridors to the Harold Parker State Forest.
6. Create multiple points of access to the Open Space
7. Create enhanced access to Harold Parker State Forest
8. Provides 5 public parking spaces
9. The Open Space will be owned and maintained by a Condominium Association.
10. The Open Space will be protected in perpetuity by a Conservation Restriction granted to the North Reading Conservation Commission.



Housing Styles - Duplex Options
Lots 1 – 4, Lucas Lane



Housing Styles Multifamily Options
Lot 14, Lucas Lane