

# ARTICLE 22, INCLUSIONARY ZONING

## REVISED MOTION

### SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

On April 22, the Planning Board voted, 5-0, with 2 members absent, to move the following revised motion for Article 22:

I move in terms of the article, except for the following:

**A. Under Section 15.32, replace the existing proposed language with the term “RESERVED.”**

15.32 ~~In the R-G District, the default Additional Lot Area/Family requirement of 2,500 sq. ft. per unit in Article 6, Table 3, Dimensional Regulations, shall apply to the total number of units in the project, as counted prior to the addition of any market rate offset units (see Section 15.4). Footnote m. shall not apply to residential uses or developments subject to this Article.~~  
RESERVED.

**B. In Sections 15.44 and 15.45, delete the ~~lined-out~~ language and add the language in *bold italics*, as follows:**

15.44 Maximum Height. ~~In any district~~ *the B-G, B-VC, B-L, and COM Districts only*, the maximum height allowed by right under Table 3 of Article 6 shall be increased by 10 feet.

15.45 Maximum Floors. ~~Except in the B-G and B-N~~ *In the B-VC, B-L, and COM Districts only*, the maximum number of floors allowed by right under Table 3 of Article 6 shall be increased by one (1) floor.

The two parts of this revised motion have the following effects:

➤ **Part A. removes a proposed change to the dimensional regulations for the General Residence (R-G) District, reducing potential increases in density.**

As proposed, Article 22 includes a provision changing the additional lot area/unit requirement in the R-G District from 4,000 sq. ft./unit (footnote m.) to the existing default requirement of 2,500 sq. ft./unit. This change would have reduced the lot area on which a multi-family project (10 units or more) was possible from 1.1 acre down to 0.76 acre. Analysis of examples, however, indicated that the change could also produce a rough doubling of potential density on some properties in the R-G District. That increase would

have been disproportionately greater than any impacts on other residential districts. The Planning Board determined that more study was needed.

The revised motion under Part A. removes the proposed change, so that the currently existing additional lot area/unit requirements of the R-G District will apply to affordable projects, as will be the case in all other residential districts. The Planning Board intends to meet with R-G District residents to review this issue, and to develop a different proposal to bring back to a future Town Meeting.

➤ **Part B. removes proposed increases in maximum height and floors from all residential districts, and limits those changes to selected center business districts.**

Under Article 22, the intent of changing maximum height and floors in residential districts was to ensure that there would be enough room on any given property for the additional cost offset units that allow affordable housing projects to be financially feasible. There was also an intent to keep the rules simple and applied to all districts. However, the Planning Board determined that in residential districts, other proposed increases in building and lot coverage would be sufficient to accommodate offset units, and allowing taller buildings by-right would not be necessary. However, increases in height and floors may well be needed in center business districts, where existing dimensional regulations do not leave a lot of room to expand.

Under Part B. of the revised motion, the 10 foot increase in maximum building height for affordable projects is removed from residential districts, and limited to the B-G, B-VC, B-L, and COM Districts only. No such increase would be allowed in the B-N District, which assumes buildings of a smaller scale.

Similarly, the one floor increase in maximum floors for buildings in affordable projects would be removed from residential districts and limited to the B-VC, B-L, and COM Districts only. No such increase would be allowed in the B-G or B-N Districts. For the B-G District, the Planning Board had already been determined that 6 floor buildings would not be appropriate in the downtown, and, as noted, buildings in the B-N District are intended to remain at a smaller scale.

The change under Part B. also reinforces the goals and objectives of the *Amherst Master Plan*, as well as the recommendations of the *Housing Production Plan* and *Amherst Housing Market Study*, all of which identify Amherst's centers as appropriate locations for increased residential density and an increased representation of affordable housing.