



Ruthanne Fuller  
Mayor

**City of Newton, Massachusetts**  
Department of Planning and Development  
1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

Telephone  
(617) 796-1120  
Telefax  
(617) 796-1142  
TDD/TTY  
(617) 796-1089  
www.newtonma.gov

Barney S. Heath  
Director

---

**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** December 7, 2018

**TO:** Councilor Susan Albright, Chair, Zoning and Planning Committee  
Members of the Zoning and Planning Committee

**FROM:** Barney Heath, Director, Department of Planning and Development  
James Freas, Deputy Director of Planning  
Rachel Nadkarni, Long Range Planner  
Lily Canan Reynolds, Community Engagement Manager

**RE:** **#518-18 Discussion and review relative to the draft Zoning Ordinance**  
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING requesting review, discussion, and direction relative to the draft Zoning Ordinance.

**MEETING:** December 10, 2018

**CC:** Planning and Development Board  
John Lojek, Commissioner of Inspectional Services  
Marie Lawlor and Jonah Temple, Law Department

---

Attached is a meeting summary of the discussion on residential districts from the November 26<sup>th</sup> meeting. Staff will be creating a meeting summary like this for each topic regarding the First Draft Zoning Ordinance to track work flow, next steps, and to digitize the notes taken during the discussion.

At the December 10<sup>th</sup> meeting, staff will briefly present the meeting summary, and take note of any additional thoughts that the Committee has reflecting back on the previous discussion.

## Zoning Redesign Meeting Summary

Topic: Residential Districts      Date: November 26, 2018

### Part 1: Staff Summary (Points of General Agreement)

During the discussion of residential districts, staff introduced several topics related to the development of, and modifications to, properties in the residential districts. Staff have attempted to summarize additional points of general agreement with the understanding that details on these topics still need further discussion. These notes will be used to direct work flow over the next months and do not represent any decision of the Committee members.

#### Lot Standards

- The definition of lot coverage – there seemed to be general agreement that the clear division of what could be built upon and what had to be left as landscaped area was a positive change.
- Setbacks – there seemed to be general agreement that setbacks are an important mechanism in the zoning ordinance. Staff would like more feedback on the proposed list of setback encroachments in Sec. 2.3.5. and the Committee asked for more research with regard to encroachments and freestanding structures in the front setback.
- Contextual Front Setback – there seemed to be general agreement that the contextual front setback is a tool to keep in the zoning ordinance.
- Effective Minimum Lot Size – As analyses proceed, staff will explore what the effective minimum lot size is in each district based on the setbacks and lot coverage.

#### Building Types

- Footprint – there seemed to be general agreement that footprints may need adjustment after the buildout analysis is discussed.
- Proximity Rule – there seemed to be general agreement that the proximity rules for building types, particularly in the R3 district, merit further thinking on the part of both staff and the Committee.

#### Topics needing more discussion

- Height – How to measure? Standards? Reducing incentives for flat roofs and “podium” grade changes around buildings? There are many questions on height, and staff will review the schedule for an appropriate deep dive into all things height-related.

- Multi-unit housing – The discussion of Village Districts on January 14th will include topics related to multi-unit housing and mixed-use projects that may be applicable in the Neighborhood General and Residence 3 districts as well.
- Rear Lots – Staff has slides on a rear lot case study that we will include in a future presentation. A rear lot has a different relationship with the private backyards of its neighbors than a typical home fronting on a street. Some of the standards for rear lots are made stricter to address impacts to neighboring properties, most significantly a rear lot is limited to the House C building type. The House C type is smaller in footprint and lower in profile at 1.5 stories than other house types, limiting views into neighboring backyards. Landscaped screening and building orientation standards are also used to clearly separate the semi-public space of the driveway and front entry of the house on the rear lot from its neighbors' private backyard spaces. Staff would like feedback on the clarity and strength of the proposed limits on rear lots.

**Part 2: Meeting Facilitation Notes Documented**

Below is the Zoning Redesign Notes Matrix from the Residential Districts Discussion at the Zoning and Planning Committee Meeting on November 26<sup>th</sup>.

**Recorded Zoning Redesign Facilitated Discussion Matrix**

<p><b>Points of Agreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Presentation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Proposed Modifications</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider differences in R3 District – potential need for a new district (as buildout analysis moves forward, consider if two patterns emerge)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Points to Discuss Next Time</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differences in current and first draft proposed zoning map</li> <li>• Mixed Use and Villages – come back to the Neighborhood General and how the transitions are handled at village edges</li> <li>• R3 – come back to more discussion on the proximity rule for certain building types</li> <li>• Tear-down vulnerability is important analysis</li> <li>• Rear lots – easier or harder to do under the proposed? (show the case study at future meeting)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Points that need Staff Research</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Front setbacks and components in the front setback – things like pergolas – make sure there’s incentives to allow full use of front yard for home/community connection</li> <li>• House D – footprints may need to be reduced – will benefit from buildout analysis</li> </ul>
<p><b>Ideas to Come Back to</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What lots are currently unbuildable that become buildable (A question for the build out analysis)</li> <li>• Review items that were moved from Phase 1 to Phase 2 discussions back in 2015, see how they are handled in the First Draft</li> <li>• More discussion on height, retaining walls, basements, and attics</li> <li>• Exploring prevention of groundwater flow between properties</li> </ul>	