

On 01/29/2024 4:11 PM EST Christopher Olney <olneyc@manchester.ma.us> wrote:

Hi Lorraine

Below is some rough data for you. I can't really call it a best estimate. It is at best a blurry snapshot. This was compiled from the assessors' records, but the data is sketchy. For example, it does not include mixed use properties. Condos are sometimes listed as single properties, sometimes as units within a single property. Commercial and retail uses are also "units" so these have been subtracted. But it gives you an idea.

There are about 450 residential units in the G district. Of these, around 150 are multifamily. The biggest complexes include 10-12 Summer, Powder House Lane apartments, 3-5 School, 48 Union, and 33 Union. Data on each of these properties is in the Density Walk presentation posted in the town MBTA Zoning website.

In the D districts, there are around 330 residential units. Desmond Ave and Newport Park are the only multifamily properties that I know of. That is about 60 units altogether. There are some condos at 41 Pleasant around Wilmontton, but I am not sure if they are multifamily.

There is a Housing Production Plan that was completed 3-4 years ago. I have attached it for you as it contains a lot of population and housing data for the town.

When we talked about being almost compliant with the mandate, it was based on the idea that under current zoning, any structure in the G District can be converted to a 3-family building by right. Since the minimum lot size is 6,000 SF, which would be large enough to support a 3-unit building, one could argue that we were almost there. That is a density of 18 units per acre, more than the 15 units required. But of course, reality is more complicated. The downtown is not a grid of equal lots or buildings, so when we test the current situation using the state's compliance model, we fall short. Still, most people don't realize that the downtown area is pretty dense with units already and that we can hopefully comply with the mandate without ruining the scale and character of the town if we are careful. We are fortunate that most of the downtown area is comprised of small irregular lots, not conducive for the construction of big apartment complexes.

As for Gordon College, the proposal may indeed be premature. But it might also offer a great opportunity for the town to protect the watershed and create a fair number of affordable units beyond the town's residential areas. It would be too bad to miss at least the chance of discussing it and presenting a plan to the voters if a deal can be put together. It is true that creating new districts in existing neighborhoods will mean fewer new units allowed by right. But the development of new

housing near Gordon would have a much smaller impact on the town. It's a tradeoff worth consideration at least. It would hopefully be very different from the 40B as it would neither be hostile nor a poorly designed project, and not proposed for the top of a steep hill. I do understand and appreciate your concern- and it may well be that the TF will decide not to pursue it for many reasons. However, if this concept becomes remotely possible, I am quite sure there will be ample opportunity for public discussion and many site walks.

I hope this helps.

Chris