

Open House 10/16: 94 sign-ins + 5 Subcmte members + 1 PB member helper + 1 spouse helper = 101 ppl

Open House 11/16: 73 sign-ins + 7 Subcmte members + 1 PB member helper + 1 spouse helper = 82 ppl

Feedback compiled from Subcommittee meetings, emails/letters, Open House sticky notes, notes, posters, Qs

Notes from Julie for Subcommittee

JULIE’S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NARROWING (see my revised maps w/notes):

- Eliminate parcels that are less than 2 acres
- Eliminate historic properties (work with Historical Commission to understand which historic properties still have historic structures on them / if certain historic properties make sense for this zoning, then work closely with Historical Commission to add language to zoning that will protect the historic structures)
- Eliminate 4-acre flag lots b/c not feasible to subdivide unless back parcel w/zero frontage put into open space restriction
- Avoid estimated and priority habitats for endangered species pursuant to the Natural Heritage Endangered Species Program (NHESP)
- Avoid common driveways and private roads
- Research if any developments/subdivisions are subject to further restrictions or HOA docs – eliminate ones that are (Chris Johnson-Battista is working on this research for me ☺)
- Remove the following areas from consideration (or reconfigure them):
 - East Riding / Page Brook / Brook – the entire area is constrained by wetlands, floodplain and priority habitat areas, some lots are less than 2 acres – what’s left is limited
 - Bedford Road / Shady Brook Lane / Brook Street – almost every lot in this area is either historic, a flag lot, or has a significant environmental constraint (i.e., CR, NHESP, wetlands, etc.)
 - Patch Meadow Lane / Rutland Street / North Road – almost every lot in this area is either a flag lot or historic – and the 8 parcels left are mostly not adjacent or contiguous – extend along Rutland Street?
 - Concord / Russell / South / Audubon / Spencer Brook – there are many historic properties and flag lots along Concord Street and South Street – many of the lots that are left are constrained by resource areas to the Spencer Brook

STRATEGY (I will finesse this into a document for delivery to the Planning Board)

- Nitrogen Loading Regs 15.214, 15.215 – we believe we are getting this right
- Consider or reconsider (and hone messaging for why or why not):
 - Town-owned land (i.e., Banta Davis, Conant Land) or swap with conservation land
 - Feeling that it puts power back in hands of people instead of single owners/developers
 - Too many competing interests for Banta Davis
 - Banta Davis & Conant land have each had multiple failed housing proposals
 - Conant land has ledge, wetlands, trails, monument to resident, etc.
 - Town-owned buildings (i.e., Highland)
 - Too many competing interests for Highland, but should at minimum look at re-zoning for Bog House and whether units there could count towards this
 - Town Center (Residence A District) – [one resident papered the posters with stickies stating “put MBTA community in center of Town and access Town sewer – best solution for traffic congestion, pedestrians, cyclists – and access for newcomers to MBTA”] – Carlisle doesn’t have Town sewer in the center (or anywhere); Town Center is 1-acre lots & entirely historic district.

- Vacant land for development like Kay’s Walk / Existing developable land – **strong survey response to not use vacant land**
- Large building(s) on edge(s) of Town near water/sewer connections / connecting to adjacent towns water & sewer systems – **strong survey response against large buildings**
- Low-value properties – **we have a list from the Assessor, some overlap is ok, but this can’t be an all-in strategy b/c it would diminish our stock of “a” achievable housing units**
- Property owners who want this – “if this is such a positive for those affected, let’s do it by volunteer” - **scattered through town; some may end up included**
- Allow people with 4+ acres to have 1-acre zoning
- Churches w/large buildings and large lots (i.e., St. Irene’s)– **Julie has confirmed that re-zoning church properties is allowed under MBTA Communities**
- Commercial areas – **Commercial areas outside of Town Center are small and not contiguous. Route 225 corridor under consideration**
- Entirety of Residence B
 - Multi-family is perceived to be better if spread out so everyone can benefit / Spread out to different areas rather than focusing on 1-3 areas
 - People think the State rejected a plan to rezone the whole Town – **State’s compliance model didn’t allow us to model all of Residence B, but it can be broken into parts and modeled that way. State has NOT rejected any plan for Carlisle at this time.**
- Look for areas not near existing higher-density developments OR look to include existing higher-density developments in areas for re-zoning
 - How are existing units accounted for? **I reached out to Reading staff. Existing units do NOT net out of future zoned by-right capacity. State looks at land as if it’s vacant and evaluates what is allowed by-right without netting out what is there today whether allowed by-right or not. Interesting to note that compliance model only considers lots as they are now and rejects any lot that doesn’t meet lot size requirements.**
- Mixed-use provisions in Guidelines can reduce unit capacity requirement
 - **State-defined ‘mixed-use’ in Carlisle Town Center feels impractical or improbable in most cases for the following reasons:**
 - **Town Center is a historic district**
 - **No municipal water and a lot of ledge**
 - **Town Center lots are small – no room for commercial and 3 residential units, not to mention septic – and how would septic capacity even work for this?**
 - **We need parking for the commercial uses**
 - **IMO: would not meet criteria outlined and would be rejected by State**
- Reuse of existing structures – **We need to think through requirements for single-family conversion to multi-family**
- Historic properties – how to handle? – **remove most or all historic properties with historic structures from consideration; work with Historical Commission on zoning protections for historic structures as they work separately on a Demolition Delay Bylaw.**
- How will non-conforming lots be treated?
- Private roads – how to handle? – **Evaluate further after we refine areas, may depend on how private way was created and who has rights in it**
- **Multiple strategies at once – On 11/12, Subcommittee discussed - but did not vote on – presenting multiple strategies to PB. On 11/14, Subcommittee discussed – but did not vote on – presenting 1**

strategy to Planning Board. On 11/14, Subcommittee voted to have Julie work on zoning for the 3-4 units on 2-acres multi-family conservation cluster strategy (inclusive of the subdivision concept).

ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS / HELPFUL INFORMATION

- Zoning information about home sizes, etc.
- Impacts on affordable housing
 - Since the units are not going to be Affordable, then the increase in # of homes from this MBTA zoning will lead to more of a burden to provide more Affordable housing. 10% of a bigger # is more housing that must be affordable.
 - Kay's Walk homes are very expensive – what's to say these won't be too?
 - Want at least 10% affordable, Town should require affordable housing
- Analysis of cost of converting existing home into 3 or 4 units, current home prices, and expected per unit sale prices – **maybe Eric Adams can help with this?**
- BioMap and/or NHESP data layers – to avoid parcels with endangered species
 - Invite Steve Tobin to Subcommittee meeting – **Julie met with him and Christina re: BioMap**
- Wetlands – identify unmarked wetlands – **not possible to create local wetlands layer while most Conservation Commission files remain in file cabinets**
- Water quality & quantity- impacts
 - Are there concerns re: our groundwater capacity as we increase overall population density?
 - Has there been a water impact study done? How does increased density align with climate change preparations?
 - 8 bedrooms on 2 acres in multi-family has higher probability that there will be more people than in single-family house – what happens when well stops producing sufficient water?
 - We need an accurate water table analysis before any decisions are made. Also, choices were made without hard data re: water, ledge, septic viability
 - Do comprehensive water & septic impact analysis in all considered zones – Carlisle is one of few communities 100% reliant on septic and well
 - Impacts to well water quality and PFAS levels
 - Comments that Town needs more time to consider issues and decide based on water/wetland data
 - What about the current drought and the ability of the aquifer to handle the added population?
 - Regulation stipulating a public water supply must be provided – more info on this
- Chapter 61 land - **Julie has list from Assessor and is creating a map**
- Property value impacts - **See feedback from Assessor**
 - Q: Why would zoning not increase assessed value of property? When do they pay added taxes?
 - Estimate of impact on house price
- Historic properties / protections – **Julie met with Hist Comm on 11/20. Hist Comm supportive of strategy, I'm sure in part b/c I told them that the Subcommittee plans to remove historic properties – so to the extent that the Subcommittee wants to keep some historic properties in consideration, we need to follow up with the Historical Commission and make sure to work with them on zoning language to protect the structures / they plan to establish a Demolition Delay Bylaw next year if possible as well.**
 - Invite Historical Commission to Subcommittee meeting
 - >50 years = HC review / Consider Demo Delay bylaw or incentive for reuse
- Criteria for parcel/neighborhood consideration – **We have outlined the criteria and could build a matrix showing how each area meets the criteria**
- Gross math re: units, acreage, etc. – **Julie will do this once Subcommittee refines areas a bit more**

- Financial impacts on Town – Julie following up on info provided by Simon Cataldo's office
 - School enrollment data, per student costs, potential impacts on long-term town expenses
 - Municipal services – consider additional expenses for Police and Fire
 - How can we “comply” and preserve land, water resources, and not increase taxes for current residents?
 - Financial impact of fighting mandate versus cost of complying
 - Show what funds we get & would lose, and how much a lawsuit would cost
 - Show which funds are one-time versus recurring
 - Loss of federal funds vs cost of town infrastructure to support increase in population and environmental impact over next 10 years
 - Be realistic about which funds State might withhold – we will know more in 2025
 - Estimate tax impact of non-compliance – Julie will work with Ryan on this
 - Someone told Julie that Milton paid their lawyers \$900k all-in
 - Julie also heard from a Milton resident lawyer who said it cost \$250k
- How does this decision represent the people/voters?
- How is Town preparing for the following:
 - Possible legal challenge of the mandate
 - Joining other towns (Winthrop, Wrentham) to challenge the mandate / at least 10-15 other towns have rejected this plan, most are adjacent like Carlisle – Carlisle will have the benefit of knowing how things play out with Milton and with the commuter rail communities that need to comply by Dec 2024 – and will take it from there.
 - If the State rejects this proposal and/or does not agree with our interpretation of nitrogen sensitive areas – we believe they won't based on preliminary feedback, but we will submit for pre-compliance review prior to Town Meeting.
- Another Survey, with the following:
 - Question about using existing lots or undeveloped land
 - Question about fighting the mandate: opposition or no opposition
- We need to understand other options better and have choices when we vote
- Consider current buildings and septic fields, and how that will impact the # of trees that need to be cut down on each individual property
- MBTA Questions: how many Carlisle residents use the MBTA now? Will parking capacity be increased at T stations? My understanding is that the MBTA had no involvement in this and has not committed to anything regarding services or infrastructure that is directly related to the Act.

QUESTIONS / CONCERNS

- Why is Carlisle included in this?
 - MBTA Community is defined by reference to MBTA Enabling Legislation - MGL Ch. 161A Section 1 (more info: [MBTA Legislative History](#)):
 - Original MTA District, 1947: “Fourteen cities and towns”, the cities and towns of Arlington, Belmont, Boston, Brookline, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Malden, Medford, Milton, Newton, Revere, Somerville and Watertown.
 - Original MBTA District, 1964: "51 cities and towns", the cities and towns of Bedford, Beverly, Braintree, Burlington, Canton, Cohasset, Concord, Danvers, Dedham, Dover, Framingham, Hamilton, Hingham, Holbrook, Hull, Lexington, Lincoln, Lynn, Lynnfield, Manchester-by-the-Sea, Marblehead, Medfield, Melrose, Middleton, Nahant, Natick, Needham, Norfolk, Norwood, Peabody, Quincy, Randolph, Reading, Salem, Saugus, Sharon, Stoneham, Swampscott,

Topsfield, Wakefield, Walpole, Waltham, Wellesley, Wenham, Weston, Westwood, Weymouth, Wilmington, Winchester, Winthrop and Woburn.

- **Forward Funding District, 1999:** "Other served communities", the cities and towns of Abington, Acton, Amesbury, Andover, Ashburnham, Ashby, Ashland, Attleboro, Auburn, Ayer, Bellingham, Berkley, Billerica, Boxborough, Boxford, Bridgewater, Brockton, **Carlisle**, Carver, Chelmsford, Dracut, Duxbury, East Bridgewater, Easton, Essex, Fitchburg, Foxborough, Franklin, Freetown, Georgetown, Gloucester, Grafton, Groton, Grove land, Halifax, Hanover, Hanson, Haverhill, Harvard, Holden, Holliston, Hopkinton, Ipswich, Kingston, Lakeville, Lancaster, Lawrence, Leicester, Leominster, Littleton, Lowell, Lunenburg, Mansfield, Marlborough, Marshfield, Maynard, Medway, Merrimac, Methuen, Middleborough. Millbury, Millis, Newbury, Newburyport, North Andover, North Attleborough, Northborough, Northbridge, Norton, North Reading, Norwell, Paxton, Pembroke, Plymouth, Plympton, Princeton, Raynham, Rehoboth, Rochester, Rockland. Rockport, Rowley, Salisbury, Scituate, Seekonk, Sherborn, Shirley, Shrewsbury, Southborough, Sterling, Stoughton, Stow, Sudbury, Sutton, Taunton, Tewksbury, Townsend, Tyngsborough, Upton, Wareham, Way land, West Boylston, West Bridgewater, Westborough, West Newbury, Westford, Westminster, Whitman, Worcester, Wrentham, and such other municipalities as may be added in accordance with section 6 or in accordance with any special act to the area constituting the authority.
- Deed restriction as method to ensure property not developed, can this be done for by-right use?
 - Question for Town Counsel
- Specialized code: will it apply or will restrictions be loosened as they are for ADUs?
 - Julie can clarify with Jon Metivier
- People are more afraid of 3 units than 2 units (SF + ADU) – **what’s behind this?**
- Concern that developers will buy-out owners and build higher-density housing.
- Will Carlisle create new zoning for multi-family homes? **YES**
- Many people did not see the survey, # of respondents is low percentage of Town.
- Do any Subcommittee members own property in the proposed rezoning areas? **As far as I know, Justin Harrison is the only Subcommittee member who lives in an area under consideration. I believe there are Planning Board members who live within or very proximate to areas under consideration. When the Subcommittee started their work, the entire Town was under consideration, and some neighborhoods were ruled out b/c of ledge, bad soils, wetlands, etc.**
- Who in Town has the capacity to monitor/inspect the quality of dwellings and septic requirements? What will this cost the Town to ramp up the department staff? Past experience with this informs this suggestion. Avoiding problems requires expert supervision.
 - How will Carlisle handle the increased management – building/electrical/septic inspections and do a good job going forward with this plan?
- Eminent domain – **this zoning does not lead to eminent domain**
- This seems personal, neighborhoods being attacked. The main reason people move to Carlisle is for the rural atmosphere / community. How will that be protected?
- Can you request that the State update Title 5 so that the state can use land better?
- Can you work with the State to modify the MBTA Communities Guidelines, since they have already been modified? Also, work with State to allow ADU Law to fit with MBTA Communities Act.
- We will lose the uniqueness of Carlisle with this zoning change
- Plan for dealing with added traffic flow – our roads are already narrow and unsafe
- Article 89 allows us to govern our Town. If we agree to this zoning we turn that right over to the State and they can ignore any zoning requirements we might want.

- What happens if Carlisle passes zoning and then the mandate is deemed unconstitutional, can we put a clause that releases the zoning? **We cannot stay the effectiveness of the zoning beyond the date by which we need to comply, but we could go back and undo it at a future Town Meeting.**
- Why did the former Governor agree to this re-zoning without our vote?

COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF STRATEGY AND/OR PROCESS

- Single-family home properties with adequate developable area should be allowed to profit.
- These proposals are more in keeping with Carlisle’s character than the mega mansions currently being built by developers.
- I congratulate the committee for their diligent work on this matter. You have been very professional and the display is clear.
- We don’t want to be known as a NIMBY town.
- Appreciate your work on this. Thanks for taking input.
- Very helpful. Keep doing these forums. Neighborhood impact is very real and hard.

OUTREACH

- Get input from other committees: Cons, LSC, Hist, etc.
- Survey: distribute through Carlisle Parents Facebook group
 - **Resident of Hutchins/Kimball neighborhood to send Julie admin contact info**
- Post all posters on MBTA page, have Mosquito link to it
 - **Julie will do this imminently**
- Many people perceived that the proposal & overlay areas are final; we need to make it clear that’s not the case
 - **Julie could send an email to all attendees**
- Comment on poster that not everyone gets the Mosquito.

ZONING / REGULATION LANGUAGE

- Protection of Open Space – options beyond CRs (Steve Tobin can help)
- Requirement/assessment for developer to do water studies to ensure density can be supported
- Require electrification of multi-family construction
- Clarify what is meant by “impervious coverage”
- Can we phase in building out dwellings to minimize impacts to schools? **The low-density MF cons cluster strategy will do this.**
- Ensure access to trails
- Remove zoning barriers to playground development – **unrelated to this**
- Zoning requirements for pickleball to be quiet (quiet balls & paddles, buffer plants) - **unrelated**
- Pork-chop lots don’t have enough room – **Julie suggests removing them entirely**
- Incentivize developers to not tear down but to reuse what is there
- Zoning to limit the square footage of the houses
- Limit the maximum paved area

POSTER MODIFICATIONS **Julie modified posters for 11/16 Open House based on this feedback**

- FAQs: Put MF Def next to Title 5 limits
- Explain ability to have bedroom/unit mix
- Poster showing developable land in Town

- Poster explaining state actions/levers if towns don't comply
- Provide aerial photo of a 2-acre lot in each area showing existing and potential
- Criteria: MP goal – add ‘parcels visually buffered from abutters’
- MF Cons Cluster poster font too small to read across table
- This Zoning Does Not – display this poster at beginning of flow to allay fears early on
- MBTA Zoning Can – clarify first bullet
- Next Steps – clarify what is meant by “socialize proposal”
- Subcommittee – clarify what is meant by “sunset by Jan 2026”
- Aerial maps – change red outline, show NHESP/BioMap
- Clarify the following:
 - Order of events for how this all works with State, etc.
 - That the 95 units do not each contain 3+ units
 - What is meant by “by-right” & “single-family home subdivision”
 - What is meant by “impervious coverage”
 - Nitrogen loading-based density calculation
 - 15 unit/acre AND 4 bedrooms/acre
 - How wetlands are factored into the equation

11/16 POSTER QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

- What is Zoning: clarify who waivers are for and that they are communicated to residents and typically discussed at length in hearings
- Subcommittee Intentions: change “limit clear cutting” to “prevent clear cutting”
- Implications of Non-Compliance: which categories of funding did Milton lose? / poster mis-represents potential impacts to Carlisle / which funding buckets are one time versus recurring? / what is meant by \$ for State-owned land? **Time will tell and I will get more data as we see what happens with towns that do not comply by the end of 2024.**
- This Zoning Does NOT: is this dictated by MBTA or by State law? / isn't development likely like in Lexington? / Article 89 says we govern our zoning but if we agree to this then the State can ignore our zoning
- Criteria: would a community center w/senior units at Banta Davis meet the requirements? / water appears to be a major issue – has the committee obtained necessary information to ensure selected areas can handle zoning changes from a water perspective? / is water a concern – we are a well community
- FAQ 1: according to Mosquito, schools are out of space – how would we handle 95 new families all at once and ADUs? / MBTA- could they extend bus lines? Why are we not just making MBTA more accessible to more of the State rather than crowding outside Boston? Is there a way to ensure these new people will use the MBTA versus just adding cars to the road?
- Concern that we do not have a poster showing potential issues with the strategy
- No gains have been articulated
- Show the nearest water/sewer on the maps
- Can we demonstrate how to subdivide larger lots into good thoughtful 2-acre parcels (i.e., East Street)

NEIGHBORHOOD-SPECIFIC**East Meadow / East**

- Emails from Randy Brown, Amelia Fournier
- 776 East Street (Humm's property) is zoned for agriculture. Can this be included? John Nickles Farm 1775 – ancient riverbed studied by Harvard
 - Julie will look into it.
- 94 East Meadow had septic replaced in 2021, required all new fill because ground was full of rocks (size of cars) and soil that would not perc.
- 744 East Street floods, pumps water onto area next to East Street – water goes down East Street to culvert.
- Larger lots w/smaller less expensive homes are more likely to get knocked down and developed
- Concern for surrounding natural habitat and wildlife that crosses through our area
- Specifically bought the property for the open space and not the house
- Personal reasons for investing in property in Carlisle – for the land and natural habitat/surroundings
- Concerned about well water, history of brackish water and well water running dry for multiple homes within the parcel
- East Meadow is a private road. Larger #s of vehicles would tax the road.
- Rural nature of community and preservation of natural resources is a concern of ours. We're concerned about the wetlands on and surrounding multiple lots involved. Many neighbors have this concern – has been an issue already.
- Wetlands and ledge are major issues/concerns for multiple homes being considered on East and East Meadow.
- Want a plan that doesn't feel that it's one area against another (neighborhood vs neighborhood) – interested in a plan that works for everyone.
- Concerns about wastewater impacting waterways that lead to Town Forest; the Town Forest has many wetland areas that are almost exclusively fed via the proposed zoning area. This could have a dramatic influence on the Town Forest.
- Wetlands on both sides of East Meadow Lane mean that the street cannot be widened.
- Really like the idea of overlaying on properties that are mostly non-forested to help preserve the woody feel of the town as it evolves.

East Riding / Page Brook / Brook

- Concerns with traffic flow on Brook Street: too narrow, too winding, speed limit @ 30 mph is too fast for high density
- Intersection of Page Brook and Brook Street is dangerous already. More traffic → more accidents. What can be done to make the intersection safer? Mirror, blind drive sign? It needs to be fixed before you increase density there.
- Roads are already too narrow for cycling and walking – what is the plan to address this?

Bedford / Shady Brook / Brook

- This area includes many historic properties – will they be at risk?
- Parcel 22-74-0 (large lumpy parcel) has a temporary CR on it, “undevelopable”
- Zoning close to Town Center does not give better access to MBTA services
 - Response: there is no parking at the train station anyway
- Zone it on Banta Davis instead

- Properties north along Bedford between Stearns Street and Brook Street seem really good for overlay.

Patch Meadow / Rutland / North

- Emails from Cindy Croft, Justin Harrison, Valerie Thaddeus
- Is it possible that 5 pork chop lots on the end of Patch Meadow could support 80 1-bedroom units in roughly 10 acres? **NO because: (1) bedroom mix required for ‘housing for families’; (2) you’d put upper limit on units per acre in zoning; (3) possible that pork chop lots created via prior subdivision are subject to “no further subdivision” limitation.**
- Aerial photo marked up to show stream, potential vernal pool, 2 ponds w/animals, steep slopes
- Patch Meadow is partly private road, what will impact be?
- How would pork-chop lots fit regulations?
- North Road is Scenic Road, also dangerous (narrow, dark, winding)

Curve / Fiske

- **Some residents of this neighborhood asked me technical questions about how it would/could work.**
- This area seems really good for overlay because it’s so much lawn; lots of possibility for low-impact building.
 - Response: It’s not “lawn” – it’s fields. Some get very wet in the spring. We farm “by-right” in this Town. It’s grazing land.
 - Don’t use “lawns” on poster – seems pejorative – owner deliberately kept horse fields open with no fertilizer.
 - Area seems a bit remote from Rte 27 and Rte 225. BFRT is unlikely alternate mode of transit.
 - Construction here will disrupt all cranberry bog habitat. The farm is a great idea!
 - Having land is an important eco-factor.
 - House off Curve had well run dry last year.

Kimball / Barnes / Hutchins – THIS NEIGHBORHOOD REMOVED FROM CONSIDERATION

- Letter from Ken Mostello; Email from Roman Magarychoff; Neighborhood petition
- Concerns from neighborhood expressed at 10/8 and 10/15 meetings – see minutes
- No water! Limited groundwater. Common groundwater supply affects the entire neighborhood water supply. Wells run dry. BOH needs to share well info.
- Home on Hutchins had 8 wells drilled before water was found, and has fracked twice since then
- Tall Pines neighborhood has endangered species
- Vernal pool at the corner of Kimball Road and Wilkins Lane
- CR 33 is directly downhill from properties on the east side of Hutchins Road. Increased density will increase water run-off directly into CR.

Hanover / Johnson / Sorli / Gormley

- HOA Concerns

Westford / Old Quarry / West

- Email from Steve Tobin (Remove Parcels 17-25-5 and 17-25-4 due to pending CRs)
- Why not include the Still Meadow Farms development?

Concord / Russell / Audubon / Spencer Brook / South

- Remove 45 South Street (oldest house in Carlisle?)
- South Street is in terrible condition, not passable, one lane in many cases

- South Street is already impacted by Benfield and Russell already has condos – why impact those areas again?

River / Fern / Nowell Farme / Skelton / Bedford

- How much land is zoned commercial on 225 and River Road? Is there enough to rezone?
- Unmapped wetlands on Parcel 1-38-14K
- Questions/Suggestions to include:
 - 2 lots along the river off Skelton Road closest to Bedford Road (Parcels 1-2-A1 and 11-8-6)
 - Parcel 1-1-7 (this is Elliott Farms)
- Include data on biological sensitivity such as BioMap data.

FLIP CHART QUESTIONS & RESPONSES

Arrivals

Do you live in an area under consideration?

10/16: YES: 52 / NO: 20 / Don't know: 7 / Total: 79

11/16: YES: 42 / NO: 18 / Don't Know: 15 / Total: 75

Do you oppose this mandate?

10/16: YES: 53 / NO: 16 / Don't know: 13 / Total: 82

11/16: YES: 42 / NO: 11 / Don't Know: 20 / Total: 73

Departures

Do you live in an area under consideration?

10/16: YES: 40 / NO: 28 / Total: 68

11/16: YES: 27 / NO: 26 / Total: 53

10/16: Do you agree with the proposal?

YES: 17 / NO: 55 / Total: 72

11/16: Do you oppose the multi-family conservation cluster strategy?

YES: 30 / NO: 14 / Don't Know: 13 / Total: 57

Based on what you've learned would you vote in favor of this proposal at Spring 2025 Town Meeting?

10/16: YES: 15 / NO: 43 / MAYBE: 8 / Total: 66

11/16: YES: 14 / NO: 43 / MAYBE: 11 / Total: 68