

Lexington SPRD – Committee Progress Status - 2/23/22

Confirmation of Previous Discussions and Votes taken at the January 12th meeting

1. Number of paths – Retain two options SSD and ARD – Decided by a vote of 7-1
2. Both paths to require inclusionary units – Decided Unanimously
3. Payments in lieu of construction for inclusionary units should be allowed with SSD, with the caveat that payments are designated for either LexHAB, an Affordable Housing Trust or other vehicle to produce affordable units - Decided by a vote of 7-1
4. SSD Path no longer to require Single Family units only - Decided Unanimously
5. Both Paths to be By Right Development with Site Plan Review, NOT Special Permit- Decided Unanimously
6. No requirements for open space to be deeded to individual units - Decided Unanimously

DECISIONS MADE 2/9/22 VOTED 2/23/22:

7. No additional minimum size should be imposed beyond what may exist in health or building code
8. We will continue to use GFA terminology
9. Number of units allowed must be greater than that allowed by the Conventional Sub-Division. There should be additional allowances for creation of additional below market rate units beyond the minimum requirement. ('density bonus' for producing extra below market rate units)
10. The square footage of a preserved historic structure will be exempted from total GFA calculations for purposes of calculating total allowable GFA.
11. Setback and other dimensional requirements will be the same as for conventional development.

Remaining Issues for Discussion and Resolution

12. Design guidelines and/or pattern book of styles (examples of housing or features that we regard as "Lexington friendly". This is not excluding other designs, but highlighting some). (*Preliminary discussion held 2/9; 2/23*)
13. Should the bylaw have a maximum average size or individual unit maximums? (*discussed, not resolved 2/9; 2/23*)

Our Prior discussion: We have discussed 2,000 sf livable space max. but need more info. how to achieve.

Our Zoning Administrator offered this idea to deal with GFA vs. Living Area:

For example:

- Townhouse/condo with its own **indoor** garage or carport parking – 80%, counting the covered parking space as part of GFA
- Townhouse/condo with **outdoor** parking – 90%

Here’s how this would work – as an example, I used targeted “livable space” at 1,200 sq. ft.:

| Indoor Parking | Desired Livable Space | % GFA | Sq Ft Required |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Yes | 1200 | 80% | 1500 sq ft condo |
| No | 1200 | 90% | 1333 sq ft condo |

14. Do we want to require a minimum number of units—to ensure smaller than Lexington usually gets, and make it by percentage?

15. What guidelines or requirements for the level of affordability should be specified? Do we want different incentives for different levels? (i.e., require X number of units if below 80%AMI, but X Plus if greater than 80%AMI)

Question - Does the Comp Plan or other Town document have targets for affordable housing development and or AMI guidelines or “housing for teachers, police, etc.” and if so, is there a way to tie this in?

16. What is the target for the work force/missing middle segment of below market? (up to 150%, 200% of AMI?)

17. Do we want to add additional density incentives related to energy performance standards (per unit and per development)? It is important to consider if this will defeat the goal of attracting builders to use this path rather than conventional subdivisions.

18. What maximum density do we want to impose, if a project were to build all available density bonuses?

19. How do we ensure we get a product that leads to smaller, more affordable, inclusive, accessible, and potentially greener units?

20. Would the establishment of a publicized target number of new affordable/diverse units that meet the criteria of smaller, affordable, greener, universal design be helpful?