

Open House Feedback 6-25-25		
Scattered Sites	Cluster Development	One Site
<p>A lot of concern related to concentrated aquifer drain in the 50% anchor cluster area. Thanks.</p> <p>Will you provide demographics on the abutters and owners effected? Seniors? Lower income? Less expensive homes?</p> <p>Why isn't the PB proposing to eliminate the pre-1962 exception for 2 houses on a lot? It's being used to target the older lots in town. My whole neighborhood is targeted. - Steve Tobin, 164 Partridge Lane</p> <p>The Scattered "Approach" is my least favorite for several reasons. Environmental issues, management issues, development planning, etc. 80 Carelton Road. "I am very against this one."</p> <p>Scattered approach. I am concerned that changing the zoning on an existing neighborhood will dramatically change he feel of the neighborhood. This is not good!- Carol Peters</p> <p>How much do the 1,2, &amp; 3 bedrooms go for?</p>	<p>In favor because there is existing infrastructure from Assurance Tech on South Street.</p>	<p>Single site could be &gt;6.22 acres, to allow larger buffer, more septic area. Limit development area to minimum</p>
	<p><b>A</b></p> <p>Site B is good because it is scattered- please avoid concentration of wells as an Option D or A.</p> <p>Can you show an overlay of the top One Site &amp; Refined parcels.</p>	<p>South Street- Please consider the dangerous traffic!- Angel</p> <p>If we pick the right site, it is possible that all 95 units won't be built, and more of Carlisle will remain green on the map and not turn white like our surrounding towns</p>
	<p><b>B</b></p> <p>Concord-&gt; reference 2005 Coventry Woods 40B.</p>	<p>I think we should choose the option that has the minimum number of units and the least chance of being developed</p>
	<p><b>C</b></p> <p>Survey the Septic and water. Higher ranking since it is required by law.</p> <p>one cluster at 29 acre Kimballs- New town center?</p> <p>Kimballs Site? Large 22</p>	<p>For Carlisle this option is unworkable in terms of water access and waste water treatment. Environmentally very poor option</p> <p>I want the least amount of acreage with the least amount of housing. 6.33 with little actually built</p> <p>Can we also consider town owned land? I feel this would be important in minimizing the amount of units that get developed- Amelia</p>
<p><b>D</b></p> <p>Be more clear that some sites are unlikely to be built (benfield and Kay's walk</p> <p>Using Benfield and Kay's walk is a good idea!</p> <p>I access part of Concord- Peter Connolly</p>	<p>I propose if people like the "one and done" option, that this option be built next to their homes. No harm done (I do not want to offend)- Angel</p> <p>Water should be #1 not traffic.</p> <p>Will abutters be compensated for risk of loss of water?</p> <p>I have a suggestion for another one site location if it's not too late- Steve Tobin</p> <p>How can we guarantee that septic systems will work in the future, given the failures at Woodward Village and Benfield?</p> <p>291 River Road is part of a major wildlife cooridor</p> <p>Good idea locating on edge of town for traffic flow- West Street looks like a good site</p> <p>291 River Road- Skelton Road is a "scenic" road. Skelton is too narrow. Preservation on the river. Conservation &amp; wetlands.</p> <p>Skelton Road: too narrow. Preservation land on Concord River. "scenic" road. Wetlands</p>	

**Common themes:** Concerns of water availability, loss of habitat, & roads being too narrow or heavy with traffic.

**Open House Feedback 7-8-25**

Scattered Sites	Cluster Development	One Site
<p>This would be my choice. Most distributed</p> <p>This option presents a catastrophic risk of aquifer depletion with no alternative to neighboring town water. How could this even be considered?</p> <p>*in reply to last comment* How? Cite your source.</p> <p>I would prefer more scattered sites, like the hybrid approach. 1) May lighten the traffic. 2) May reduce the water issue. 3) Reduced abutter complaints.</p> <p>Can the town mandate that developers are responsible for paving secondary ( or parts of primary roads) as part of building/development?</p>	<p>Curve Street location is primarily wetlands and road in this area floods frequently</p> <p>Road is quite narrow and has trouble with 2-way traffic as is. It is already heavily trafficked for recreational use (e.g cyclist, runners, walkers, kids on scooters) safety concerns are highly possible</p> <p>The poultry farm is for sale and is located on a scenic road that goes to one lane by the bog house. I think it is likely that it would be developed and proposed density too high for this roadway and would adversely impact the wildlife corridor.</p> <p><b>A</b> Assurance Technology: Traffic is already a problem at that site/mailboxes at Fifty Acre Way, and cars are coming in and out of there. Cars Cutting through South Street. Cars end of South Street onto Concord Street—traffic problem. Water/wells/septic. Fire Dept. hydrants. traffic-police. school-crowding. no convenience stores. no buses, etc.</p> <p>Example of a lovely development: Olde Village Square in Medfield. 42 free-standing single-family condos in a 6-acre lot. Not age restricted. A high-density condo neighborhood. Walkable to town center. Built around a town green. A great model for community.</p>	<p>Each of the other approaches includes # affordable units. Single site should too.</p> <p>Can we require pathway extension on Westford Street to allow the town to complete its goal of a 0.5-mile pathway from the town center in all directions?</p> <p>Wild like in West Street/ Sorn land as new. Poor vehicular access on West Street site.</p> <p>Curve Street is a scenic roadway and wildlife corridor. This is not suitable for this density</p> <p>One site approach is inorganic and will create unintended consequences</p>
<p>Too many units concentrated in one area in proposed anchor site. Please reduce # units in any local area, thanks.</p> <p>The site at east and woodbine is unsuitable due to high water use from agriculture and certified vernal pool nearby</p> <p>*in reply to last comment* Cite source for this statement.</p> <p>South Street- Please consider the dangerous traffic.</p> <p>Why is East Street in blue on this map? What does this signify? Non-State Road?</p>	<p>What are the laws/regulations that are proposed in this version that would protect open space from overdevelopment, and has this option received approval from the State?</p> <p>Can you include a requirement to expand our pathway network, like what was required for Munrow Hill and Hanover Hill, to fulfill a 20+ year Master Goal of 0.5-mile pathway from town center? Westford street sidewalk extends 0.2 mile from Town Center.</p> <p>How much does walking distance to school weigh? Fewer buses, less traffic.</p> <p>How do we assure 10% affordable? Can this 10% apply to all 95 units?</p> <p><b>B</b> 6x west seems problematic as a result. Resources and byways will be stretched terribly.</p> <p>14 new large homes were recently built around West Street (Acton Street) and are still being built. Traffic on West Street, especially toward Westford, is already terrible. Plus water/ septic.</p>	<p>291 River Road: This site could be developed outside the MBTA overlay. How will wildlife be affected</p> <p>8-10-B Concord Street: This site may present a catastrophic risk of aquifer depletion with no alternative (such as town water from neighboring towns )</p> <p>This site will sever a huge wildlife corridor, 1700 acres Estabrook, 3600 acres Great Meadow complex.</p> <p>Approach 3 at the bottom of the first 1056 curve is primarily wetlands, which flood in spring.</p> <p>Narrow road far from 225. Lots of bicycle traffic and pedestrians, and children. Safety concerns are high</p> <p>Concord Street- water pressure in concord was inadequate for a house fire of Bartkus Road. The house burned down. Is there a consideration for adjacent town supply- Carl Popolo 978758-8883</p>
<p>Bylaw for new housing to require both recycling of grey water and composting toilets</p> <p>The example score card weighing does not adequately value water, abutter water and ecology. The abutter category does not include water</p>	<p>west street is not a primary road but a scenic road that ius already increasinlly dangerous with cras using it as a pass-through tp Concord. How would this be mitigated</p>	<p>Given the proximity of wetlands, abutters, and narrow road, can this site safely house 95 units from a water septic + traffic standpoint? Please consider feasibility.</p>

**Common themes:** Concerns of water availability, loss of habitat, & roads being too narrow or heavy with traffic.

Anchor Sites/ Scattered Sites

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Anchor Cluster/ Refined Areas/ Clusters of pre-1962</p>	<p>Lost water at 282 east Riding drive on Sunday 7/6/25</p>	<p>can we consider center of town 4/5 roads have sidewalk/pathways that extend out 1/2 mile from roundabout</p>	<p>Why isn't Lowell Street + East Street listed as a primary road on this map? As they are in our Master Plan</p>
	<p>Please make it clear to all that each 2-acre site could also have an ADU, total 4 units/ 2acres</p> <p>How can we assure 10% affordable units with scattered sites?</p> <p>Some more than others, critical habitats are especially critical.</p> <p>This site can be developed outside the MBTA outlay @River/Skelton</p> <p>Off Bedford- critical habitat for endangered species, wetlands, connects page brook area to estabrook. Very bad for ecology</p> <p>I remian very worried about increased develpopment on North Road which I find to be a very dangerous road to walk bike and even drive on!</p>	<p>RCV Rank Choice vote. Many Problems-</p> <p>St. Irenes and the ** may be amenable-</p> <p>641 South-20 units</p> <p>Cong Church- 20+ mixed use</p> <p><b>C</b> Saint Irenes-20+ mixed use</p> <p>Kimballs- 12+ Mixed use</p>	
	<p>Response to bedofrd/Kimball comment. Isn't every site that is undeveloped a habitat for many species?</p> <p>Can development regulations require grey water reuse? Restrict irrigation. Map all pre-1962parcels</p>	<p>Would it be possible to zone over only part of the "non-anchor" sites in order to lower the bar for the size of the anchor site? ( and open up many new combinations)</p> <p>Could you swap Woodward Village for bx West?</p> <p><b>D</b></p> <p>South Street issues almost every house. On South Street between Cross and Benfield Farm is a pre-1962 house, so it could be developed into 3 by right. Neighbors are concerned about water reserves if Assurance Tech is also developed.</p>	