

From: Lorraine lovanni

Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2024 3:49 PM

To: Ann Harrison <harrisona@manchester.ma.us>; Christopher Olney <olneyc@manchester.ma.us>

Cc: Gail Hunter <HunterG@manchester.ma.us>; Greg Federspiel <federspielg@manchester.ma.us>;

Marc Resnick <ResnickM@manchester.ma.us>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Comments for this evening's Meeting: Draft MBTA Zoning/May 23 Forum

Attn: PB and MBTA TF

(Ms. Hunter, please send to PB and MBTA TF. Thank you.)

Good afternoon, Planning Board and MBTA TF,

Thank you for your effort in drafting the new zoning bylaws for the EOHLC to approve ref Ch40 A, sec 3A.

My concern is this clause:

LINE 502:

11. Waivers. Upon the request of the Applicant and subject to compliance with the

Compliance Guidelines, the Site Plan Review Authority may waive the requirements of this Section 9.4 7. General Development Standards, in the interests of design flexibility and overall project quality, and upon a finding of consistency of such variation with the overall purpose and objectives of the CHOD.

Simply put: this language is **overly broad and "guts" any semblance of any development standards** ...whether it be site plan review, design review, environmental review etc. What is troublesome is the movement away from "special permitting," where it must be retained under the overlay zoning. (I may be unclear on this point and would welcome a clarification). "By Right" Housing is not a "free for all". Because By Right development eliminates special permitting, and with it all the due processes that permit abutters/residents into which they may input and legally appeal to the State, any further waivers of development standards weaken protection for the Town and Abutters. By the language above, you are in effect watering down protections for the Town and its residents. The PB authority should enforce standards, not decide standards should be disregarded. If we are to have By Right development, we need clear, concise and enforceable standards.

I note the specificity with regard to the "Beaver Dam Zone" in terms of units (100) and 2 vehicles apart from current vehicle requirement under the other proposed MBTA zoning overlays, and mention of a By Right Pool, etc. I question whether our PB is ahead of the game here for CST desires. Impact studies I understand have been promised and need to be completed in the Summer, which will include traffic management and environmental concerns.

Please consider these remarks for the Jt PB and MBTA TF Meeting tonight.

Respectfully,

Lorraine Iovanni
20 A Pine St