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"Lincoln," IT HAS BEEN WRITTEN, "is a rich town and is becoming more and more a favorite."¹ A newspaper article highlighting the notable characteristics of this affluent Massachusetts community included the following observations:

'The geographic centre of Lincoln, in which are two churches, the public library and town hall, is about 15 miles from the state house. The station on the…Railroad is about one mile and a half from the centre of town and 16 miles from Boston…The villages at the centre of the town and about the station are small…

Few towns within the same radius from Boston have land of as good quality. This…gives a pleasing impression of productiveness to the visitor…and it also, probably, largely explains the fact that there is a greater variety of trees in the forests than in the larger part of the towns of eastern Massachusetts.

This feature of forest growths…give[s] unique character and beauty to many winding roads…and an autumnal landscape from early September to December, which is equaled in few and surpassed in none of the towns of the region…

The appropriations for schools are liberal…The teachers are competent and faithful, the supervision is careful and the results obtained in the course of years, it is believed, are not inferior to the schools of much larger places…An unusual proportion of the youth of the town have taken collegiate or other extended courses of study…

[Lincoln has]…a good deal of "the best society" in the sense that the old and new residents of the town are intelligent, upright, kind hearted and given to neighborly offices…

The public library has several thousand carefully selected volumes…The people of the town are proud of treasures which it contains, whose value seems enhanced by their setting. Nearly all the families of the town draw books from the library. It is an educational influence of large and increasing value…

There is no particular anxiety on the part of the residents of the town to have an influx of people. There are advantages in the sparseness of the population, in the attendant quiet and the fine open spaces."²

Excerpt taken from A Rich Harvest, MacLean, John C.1949

¹ “A Look at Lincoln!..." The Concord Freeman (18 March 1880), p. 4.
“Shall the Zoning By-Law of the Town of Lincoln, as amended, be further amended by the establishment of an Industrial District along Airport Road?”

This question developed in May 1952 when the following petition, initiated by the Selectmen, was put forward in a series of open, Planning Board meetings.

“From the beginning there seems to have been uncertainty in some townspeople’s minds as to why Lincoln, strictly zoned for residential and small business use, apparently getting along in a satisfactory and even enviable manner, should find it necessary to consider industrialization with the apparent singling out of North Lincoln for industrialization.”

The petition originated out of eighteen months of planning studies done to understand the town’s current and future needs. A course was desired to accommodate for future growth as part of a larger metropolitan matrix while retaining Lincoln’s most desirable assets:

- High standards of schooling and other services,
- Tolerable rate of taxation and property valuation to maintain and improve services,
- Preservation of the character of a rural residential village.

During this time, pressures for development were placed on North Lincoln by the expansion of Hanscom Air Force Base. Transonic Corporation also applied for a zoning variance to construct and operate an industrial plant near the airport in North Lincoln. No direct action was taken, but it became necessary to front the problem of how Lincoln wanted to grow.

To help answer this question, the League of Women Voters assembled information bearing on both sides of the subject. Their findings were presented in this report as topic neutral questions and answers.

1. **Why should a town, without industry, deliberately choose to industrialize a portion of itself?**
   
   **Yes:** Generally speaking, towns without industry encourage industries to come to their town for the sizable revenues they bring to the town in the way of taxes levied on their land and buildings and inventories. Industrial plants require minimal services from the town.
No: Lincoln has been able to maintain both excellent town services and a low tax rate because it has attracted a great deal of expensive houses and estates, which more than pay for their cost to the town.

2. **Would any contribution be made to the town, other than taxes, by industrializing this area?**
   - Yes: Industrialization would contribute to the town by helping to contain the airport within its present limits. The cost of acquiring land occupied by industries might make the government hesitate about expanding the airport in this direction.
   - No: This area of industrialization would only serve to widen the damage already done to Lincoln by the airport and Project Lincoln.

3. **Would not such as drastic alteration of our zoning laws constitute a precedent for further assaults upon them?**
   - Yes: Lincoln zoning laws are no weaker and no stronger than the will of her citizens. Any change of emendation requires the support of 2/3 of the citizens assembled at Town Meeting.
   - No: Lincoln’s zoning laws are not sufficiently established to be able to afford any such weakening precedent as this.

4. **In the event that the town needs more income is it not possible to raise this income by raising the valuation of all property in the town to this point where taxes on this property equals the expenses of the town?**
   A town can increase its total valuation by voting to raise the valuation of all the properties within the town and ordering the assessors to carry out this vote. However, valuation of real estate beyond 2/3 of the actual value indicates a rather unfavorable state of finance within a town and is not recommended. In Lincoln the policy has been to meet whatever expenses the budget calls for over and above the current income by raising the tax rate rather than the valuation of the property.

5. **The property in Lincoln has not been valued by professionals; should not such a valuation by professionals result in a much higher total valuation for the town, which in turn would provide considerable in the income that we may need in the future?**
   Assessors, whether professionals or amateurs, have the duty to see that properties of equal value are assessed equally. Our own assessors have been working for three or more years trying to bring equity of evaluation amongst comparable properties. By October of this year with the job nearly finished, there had been almost no changes in the total valuation of the town.

6. **Much of the apprehension about Lincoln’s ability to finance herself in the future seems to depend upon the rapidity with which she is growing. Can we slow her down in her rate of growth by a tax policy which puts a very low valuation on our open land and woodland and so encourage owners to keep it rather than sell it for house lots?**
Lincoln does assess un-built open land very low. Woodland and swamps are valued at a lower rate than pasture and productive farmland. Farmland is valued much lower than the land on which a house stands. Land in the center of town is valued higher than land toward the edges of town. Since the valuations are already low not much can be done about this.

7. **If it is decided that Lincoln should permit the industrialization of this area could she contain it within this area? Could she prevent industrialization of other areas?**
   - **Yes:** So far as containing the proposed area within the 90 acres, it is perfectly possible to do it under the existing zoning laws so long as the majority of the towns people wish it to be contained there. A buffer zone such as a town forest could possibly be established between it and the town.
   - **No:** The idea of relaxing the zoning laws would let the bars down and a gradual encroachment of surrounding areas would be impossible to prevent.

8. **What disadvantage is it to the town to allow this land to remain zoned for residential purposes?**
   - **Yes:** The nearness of the airport to this land which is directly across the road from Project Lincoln makes it unattractive to people who build homes in the country for reasons of beauty, quiet, etc; but the same factor makes it very attractive to those who wish to build houses for the workmen who work at the airport.
   - **No:** There are only advantages for the town in allowing this land to remain zoned as it is. In doing so we have not weakened the zoning laws, we ourselves made; we do not damage any surrounding areas. Much of this land is very pleasant and could well be used for the sort of building we desire in Lincoln.

9. **Would veterans be able to secure mortgages for houses in this area under present V.A. rulings?**
   - The V.A. will not approve a mortgage of housing in an area 1000 feet wide and ½ mile long from the end of any airport runway.

10. **If industrialized what is a reasonable assumption of taxes it would bear within 10 years?**
    - **Yes:** It is assumed that well within ten years a sufficient number of industries would be built in this area to total in terms of valuation some $500,000.
    - **No:** It is very unrealistic to assume that under the severe restrictions of the proposed petition there would be anywhere near $500,000 assessed value in light industrial plants. Such light industry as would be permitted on this area is housed in small buildings and at a cost that runs around $50-60,000.

11. **Will our zoning laws and restrictions contained in this petition guarantee that this development will not be ugly and unsightly?**
    - No answers…
May 1955 – Land Use Survey
February 1956 – Interim Report of the Public Land Study Committee

“The Land Use Survey of the Planning Board of May 1955, and statistics made available by the League of Women Voters in February 1954, indicate an accelerating growth of the town…the Planning Board, supported by the voters, has taken constructive measures to prevent an excessively dense development of the existing land and to regulate land use through zoning regulations. However, these measures do not set aside land that will be needed in the future for common use and enjoyment by the citizens.”

A. Objectives to guide the future use and protection of public land
   1. Protect existing qualities of the town and the enhancement of property values.
   2. Safeguard the purity of the town’s drinking water supply.
   3. Provide recreational areas for playgrounds, nature walks, and horseback riding.
   4. Set aside existing marginal land for the benefit of the town.
   5. Expand the road network to reduce dangers from increasing traffic and hazards, and to prevent damage to property and the loss of shade trees on the existing major roads.
   6. Provide sites for public buildings and town services.
   7. Conserve the beauty of the landscape and protect the shores of Sandy Pond and Beaver Pond against unsightly encroachments.

In late 1955 The Public Land Study Committee was established to further study and recommend potential Public Reservation Areas. The Public Land Study Committee carefully considered two areas: Reservation A, The Sandy Pond Watershed, and Reservation B, The Belt of Lowland extending from South to North Lincoln and passing through Beaver Pond. Additional areas were identified in the 1955 Land Use Survey but were not considered high priority areas for various reasons described in the Interim Report.
Special emphasis was placed on protecting the Sandy Pond Watershed for the purposes of preserving the rural amenities and scenic beauty of the area and for public safety by preventing contamination of the water supply. The Committee felt the minimum requirement for water supply protection would be a strip of land which would roughly follow the 240-foot contour established on the USGS maps.

The second area proposed for public reservation encompassed an almost continuous strip of swamps and connecting low lands running north and south parallel to Lincoln and Bedford roads and about ½ mile to the east (currently known as the Hobbs Brook, Iron Mine Brook, and Beaver Brook). Values for preserving this land included recreational opportunities such as hiking and horseback riding, conservation of natural areas for wildlife and plant diversity, and possibilities for locating town services such as a playground or school. Today we know this area also plays a critical role in storing and filtering stormwater runoff.
December 1958 – Planning for Lincoln
Charles Eliot and Planning and Renewal Associates

“At the Town Meeting of March 18, 1957, the Town voted to raise and appropriate $2000 to be used by the Planning Board for professional services toward a comprehensive study and presentation of factual data on the current conditions and trends in the Town, including the impact of light industrial, commercial, or other zoning changes on the town. The Town received matching funds under Title VII of the National Housing Act of 1954 with a memorandum to stress 1) the problem of losing certain amenities in the community consequent to the Town’s growth, and 2) the problem of increasing tax burden.”

Charles Eliot and Morton Braun of Planning and Renewal Associates were retained to complete the study. Their report, produced in December 1958, highlights the ‘character and distinctive qualities’ that dominated Lincoln for the past 250 years. It points to forces of change that may affect the town and recommends measures to balance this change with the existing character of the town.

A. Goals of the study
   1. Maintain amenities in Lincoln - identify measures for preservation and enhancement, cost.
   2. Understand impacts of industrial activity on future development of Lincoln.

B. Apply goals to specific land use challenges
   1. Open Space Protection.
   3. Road Problems – Rte. 2 relocation.
   4. Rezoning.

Planning for Lincoln presents a series of graphs and tables that illustrate current conditions and trends in town. It includes an associated map entitled Town of Lincoln – Preliminary General Plan that offers a framework for orderly growth and development of the town and an introduction, prepared by the Lincoln Planning Board, giving its position with regard to the consultants’ recommendations.
LINCOLN’S CHARACTER AND DISTINCTIVE QUALITIES

Planning for Lincoln effectively details Lincoln’s geologic, topographic, hydrologic, and ecological features. “Lincoln was founded as a hill town in contrast to the valley town of Concord, from which it split in 1754. The hills of glacial till are interspersed with deep pockets where ponds, swamps and marshes have formed over time.” Such natural features combined with “the works of man in ‘conquering the wilderness’ – cutting and clearing the forest, digging the rocks out of the fields, building stone walls, laying out roads and the railroad, and constructing all the varied structures” are what define Lincoln’s character. As stated in a previously cited memorandum of the Planning Board: “The amenities that are enjoyed by the citizens rest in the:

- pleasing character of the unspoiled open landscape,
- tree-lined country roads with fieldstone walls,
- harmonious and attractive older buildings in the center of the Town and,
- the predominance of unobtrusive residences blended into the landscape by irregular setbacks and generous foliage barriers.”
FORCES OF CHANGE

For 250 years after its first settlement (as part of Concord) Lincoln was a rural community of farmers. By 1904 commuters began to take over farms as ‘estates’ and by 1958 this pattern dominated the town. Between 1800 and 1900 the town grew from 700 to 1127 (427 people in 100 years) and between 1900 and 1950 the town grew to 2427 (1300 people in 50 years). Forces of change not only included population growth, but also the demands of the technological age and increased dependence on cars, all of which placed rising demands and costs on Town services. These costs were reflected in the community tax burden and became a great concern. However, interest in maintaining open spaces and historic sites remained a strong, counter-veiling force.

“These forces or similar forces are operating around all of the great cities of America. Our fragmented local governments in and close to metropolitan areas cannot cope with these forces as separate units. Plans must be made in a larger context. Different parts of an urban region should be expected to serve different purposes – peculiar to the physical conditions, history, and potentialities of the particular area. Since all the differing areas are parts of a single whole, the financial organizations of the inter-dependent community should reflect the common interests.”

(During the past 25 years, Lincoln has become a part of the metropolitan community, but despite this change, we have managed to preserve the essentially rural character of the town. Much of the land is still being farmed. Owing to large individual holdings, much of it is still in fields and woods. We have not yet lost the spaciousness, the beauty of the landscape, the opportunities for outdoor recreation and nature study...This is not inconsistent with Lincoln’s position in the larger community. The unique character of our town is dependent on one factor above all others: Open Space – defined as land under cultivation or left in its natural state, as distinguished from land which is developed for residential or other purposes. This is what the citizens of Lincoln, in advance of most other communities, have sought to preserve. – Lincoln Planning Board)

Outlined below, is a summary of Planning for Lincoln with Planning Board comments in parenthesis and italics under each associated heading.
SUMMARY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Natural Characteristics

1. Elect follow-up Committees for Natural History Inventories.

2. Adopt Preliminary General Plan for open spaces as a guide for public and private actions:
   a. support of State action for the Bay Circuit and Walden Pond Reservation,
   b. support of Metropolitan action for the Cat Rock and Cambridge Reservoir,
   c. land acquisition by the Town or Private Land Trust including:
      • Sandy Pond and water courses feeding it and the reservoirs of Hobbs Basin and Stony Brook Basin for protection of water supply and recreation,
      • swamp Belt outlined by the Public Land Study Committee with adjustments,
      • lands along brooks for natural drainage or building,
      • a town forest, and
      • connecting strips for riding and hiking trails.
   d. create Zoning and Voluntary Restrictions for:
      • preservation of swamp lands to prevent fill, drainage or building,
      • control over views from selected hill tops, and
      • direct zoning for open space or agricultural zones.

3. Consider advance acquisition of open spaces to avoid rising costs.

4. “Costs” of proposed actions for preservation of Natural Characters are for:
   a. capital acquisition and development and operation and maintenance,
   b. in loss of rateables due to transfer of property to a non-paying status.

The projects for the Bay Circuit, Walden State Reservation and Cat Rock-Cambridge Reservoir are proposed as State or Metropolitan Projects. The Town projects are proposed as a program for solicitation of gifts and with zoning controls and voluntary restrictions, with the exception that capital outlays will be needed only in emergency situations or to clean up at the end of a project - the less ‘development’ undertaken the better.
Loss of taxes would be insignificant - $100,000 in assessed value – even if all the land were taken out of taxation.
That value and more would normally be reflected in increased values or adjoining properties. Furthermore, a program of voluntary restrictions and ‘rights in land’ should avoid taking considerable areas out of private ownership and, at the same time, provide assurance of continued open spaces and natural characters.

5. Preparation by Planning Board of street tree plan and campaign to secure plantings.
(Emphasis should be placed on projects that are the responsibility of the Town...The Board strongly endorses the consultants’ plan for advance acquisition and a coordinated effort (by the Planning Board, Conservation Commission and Lincoln Land Conservation Trust) toward preserving the connected land as shown on the Preliminary General Plan as open space, by means of citizen gifts, voluntary restriction, easements, covenants, direct town acquisition, and/or zoning. – Lincoln Planning Board)

B. Works of Man

1. Town Center
   a. prepare and adopt a plan to by-pass traffic,
   b. consider restrictions or zoning controls for architectural review of exterior appearance of buildings and structures to maintain harmonious village character,
   c. negotiate for agreements to preserve open land.

2. Spaciousness
   a. support two-acre zoning by negotiation of voluntary restrictions and covenants,
   b. interpret ‘lot’ as buildable land – excluding swamps and very rough areas,
   c. designate setbacks from streams to preserve natural drainage,
   d. establish conservation zones to protect wetlands,
   e. apply floodplain zoning,
   f. encourage voluntary restrictions and easements including:
      • agreements and covenants among property owners, and
      • gifts of rights in land to public and semi-public agencies.
   g. consider assessment policies of restrictions and the possibility of postponing some part of the taxes on planned open space so long as the land remains open.

3. Narrow Roads
   a. prepare and adopt a long range road plan for through routes including:
      • ‘Double-tracking’ existing narrow roads by constructing a parallel traveled way on the other side of the stone wall,
      • new parallel routes – particularly to by-pass the center,
      • concentration of through traffic on route 2, 117 and 126.
   b. establish building lines to permit ‘double-tracking’ or widening.
   c. require dedication of full right of way for planned routes in new subdivisions.
(Primary roads should be brought up to the standards necessary to carry this traffic...Provide extension for road linkage between subdivisions...Replace trees and stone walls whenever widening is the only answer...Conduct traffic study to determine if Old County Road would draw off through traffic from local roads, and if so, relocate Old County Road from North Avenue in Weston to Winter Street and improve Old County Road as far as Trapelo Road – Lincoln Planning Board)

4. Route 2
   a. adopt the Plan for Relocation along the southern boundary of the proposed Minuteman National Historical Park with appropriate interchanges.
   b. give vigorous advocacy for the proposed route and plan.

(Of primary concern is a DPW proposal to place a new limited-access highway south of the present Highway 2, along the northern shore of Sandy Pond...Adoption and vigorous advocacy of the relocation of Highway 2 along the southern boundary of the proposed park. – Lincoln Planning Board)

5. Historic Features
   a. support proposed Minute Man National Historical Park - subject to provisions to minimize disruption of business and residential uses and hardships and to secure to the Town taxes or payments in lieu of taxes on properties included in the park for as long as they are used for a private purpose or require services from the Town.
   b. establish an historic zone covering the area proposed to be included in the park,
   c. organization an Historical Society,
   d. follow-up investigation of historic buildings and sites,
   e. solicit gifts of titles or restrictions on historic sites to the Town, Historical Society or Trustee,
   f. study names with historical associations for features, roads, subdivisions, etc.

(By far the most important is the proposed National Park, which would become an integral part of the General Plan for the orderly growth and development of Lincoln...It would provide a stabilization zone between Bedford Air Base and the Town of Lincoln, it would offer further justification for relocating Highway 2 on the edge of town, and it would provide a buffer zone between the town and any future light
C. Implications of Growth

1. Land Use Considerations
   a. land-use proposals will leave 2,137 acres for residential development with a resulting population capacity of about 6,000 persons, on the basis of two-acre zoning.

2. Non-Residential Considerations
   a. Lincoln’s 1957 valuation was approximately 92% residential, 7% public utilities, and 1% commercial.
   b. two areas are available for non-residential use:
      • about 65 acres west of Mill Street and south of Route 2A for either commercial or limited-industrial use.

      (This area would most logically lend itself to development as a limited commercial adjunct to the proposed park…it would have special attraction for commercial uses serving the park...No change of zoning is suggested without the prior application of a particular enterprise. – Lincoln Planning Board)

      • about 85 acres at Bedford Levels adjacent to Hanscom Field for limited industrial.

      (This area is already isolated and unsuitable for residences because of the flight easement appurtenant to the southwest runway of the Air Base. – LPB)

   c. selected industrial development should be strictly controlled through performance standards so as to avoid any effect upon the amenities and character of the Town.
   d. while non-residential revenues can contribute greatly to and temporarily stabilize a town’s tax base, this may not prevent tax increases in the long run.

3. Fiscal Considerations
   a. If Town expenditures rise by about $30,000 a year, a tax rate of $75 can be maintained if assessments increase by $400,000 a year.
(The reduced amount of new residential construction in 1957 and 1958 makes it extremely doubtful that the Town can count upon the assessed valuation increasing at this rate. – Lincoln Planning Board)

b. The average tax bill per home in 1957 was $530, of which $345 was required for schools and $185 for other Town expenditures.

c. Conclusions:
   • Lincoln is faced with the need for increased capital outlays, and
   • these outlays can be met by one or a combination of the following factors: higher tax rate, increased assessments, a larger percentage of non-residential revenues, increased state contribution.

(Without the benefit of revenue from non-residential sources or increased state contribution, the consultants foresee a continual rise in the Town’s tax rate in the predictable future. This rise is an inevitable result of growth and the consequent need primarily for new capital facilities for education and secondarily for other town services. But it should also be noted that a reduced level of new building may reduce expenses for school and other services.

D. Planning Board Conclusions

1. The two areas recommended are the only suitable ones for light industrial or commercial development

2. The matter of timing in rezoning, as the consultants suggest, is most important. The Planning Board is fearful that a premature establishment of non-residential zones in the locations proposed might endanger the accomplishment of the Preliminary General Plan presented by the consultants. The Planning Board has unanimously agreed to a policy that no action should be taken by the town to rezone areas that might in any way jeopardize the establishment of the National Historic Park and the relocation of Highway 2 beside the park.

3. The Town should not be asked to act upon a proposal for rezoning these areas until it can be assured that the zoning controls and performance standards will be adequate and that the prospective developer unqualifiedly can meet the standards of those controls and standards.
“The Economic Study Committee was created by the joint action of the Board of Selectmen and the Planning Board in June of 1960. It was given the task of assembling the economic data required for the Town to make a reasonable judgment on the advisability of rezoning certain portions of the Town for light industrial use.”

A. Findings

1. Light industrial land use, properly located and controlled, would provide a substantial net tax revenue to the Town, without detracting from its present residential character.
2. The revenue to cost ratio for single family residence is 2.37:1.
3. The revenue cost for light industrial development is 60.6:1.
4. The tax rate may only be stabilized through the admission of selected light industry.
5. Other sites are suitable for light industrial and should be studied before any proposed industrial use is agreed upon.

B. Analysis

1. Statistics and Revenue
   a. Contrasts Mill Street for light industrial vs. residential development.
   b. Study area contains 150 acres – 116 acres would be available for 2-acre house lots.
2. Annual Operating Costs.
   a. Applied to either proposed development, whether residential or industrial.
   b. Trash removal would be responsibility of end user.
   c. Based on current expenses, it would cost $26,843 to educate children in the area.
   a. Streets for residential development would be built and paid for by the developer.
   b. Extension of water mains would be on the developer under residential development.
   c. Installation of 8-inch main for industrial would cost town $31,500.
   d. Total cost of residential would be $70,650 and industrial would be $31,845.
“Information from nine Boston area towns was gathered and compiled into a descriptive summary of each town covering history, population, education, conservation, recreation, planning, zoning, taxes, assessing and industry. Pre World War II conditions and the changing post war picture are also included and where appropriate, an effort was made to state some conclusions about the effects of the introduction of light industry.”

A. Winchester
   1. History, Population, Special Characteristics
      a. Settled in 1640 and Incorporated in 1850.
      b. Formed from parts of South Woburn, Medford, and West Cambridge.
      c. Presently, town is 93% built upon with residential housing and some commercial.
      d. Population in 1960: 19,376 Density: 2,981
   2. Education
      a. After WWII schools were considered to be one of the best in the metro area.
      b. 86% of students attend public schools with 75% going on to higher education.
   3. Recreation and Conservation
      a. Rates high in public recreation with winter and summer facilities, adult education, two swimming beaches and a golf course.
      b. Middlesex Fells and 25 acres town forest are primary conservation areas.
   4. Planning and Zoning
      a. 1924 zoning ordinance had six kinds of zoning.
      b. Largest residential area comprises 20,000 sq.ft. with 120' frontage.
      c. planning Board since 1915.
   5. Taxes and Assessing
      a. Tax rate in 1960: $64.80 – 40%.
   6. Industry
      a. 93% of town is residential with little room for new industry.
      b. 8 firms of small light industry with 5 more properties available.
B. Needham

1. History, Population, Special Characteristics
   a. Established in 1711, an agricultural community with some manufacturing and industry.

2. Education
   a. Forward looking but not experimental.
   b. 78% go on to further education.

3. Recreation and Conservation
   a. 160 acre town forest and 320 acres of MDC conservation land.
   b. Has playground, park land, athletic fields, public swimming beach and golf course.

4. Planning and Zoning
   a. Six types of zoning including general residence, single residence, commercial, industrial, manufacturing and flood plain (1000 acres).

5. Taxes and Assessing
   a. 1960 tax rate: $58.00, 45%.

6. Industry
   a. Large industrial park between 128 and Charles River to Newton.
   b. Fortunate geography, planning, and the scale of development have made it possible for Needham to make a considerable net economic gain from new industry without any apparent loss of other values.
   c. The income from industry makes possible a high (but not luxurious) standard of town living without oppressive residential taxes.

C. Natick

1. History, Population, Special Characteristics
   a. Founded in 1651.
   b. Ushered in the shoe industry, which at one time ranked third in the U.S.
   c. Availability of land, easy access to major arteries, good commuting service and lack of adequate zoning allowed small house developers to enter the town with the result that population burgeoned.
2. Education
   a. Under pressure for improved quality Teacher's salaries are low.
   b. 60% of students go on to higher education.

3. Recreation and Conservation
   a. Outlining a plan for a green belt. Has a town forest and Cochituate State Park.
   b. Recreation is excellent with a full time superintendent.

4. Planning and Zoning
   a. Planning became active in 1953, after building got out of hand.
   b. Zoning includes 5 residential zones, one multiple zone, business, commercial and manufacturing.

5. Taxes and Assessing
   a. 1960 tax rate: $63.00, 45%.

6. Industry
   a. 450 plants including a Ford assembly plant and Carlings Brewery Co.
   b. Three Industrial Parks with a total of 155 acres.
   c. Industry seems to be helping taxes and lack of foresighted planning seems to have made the map of Natick what it is today.

D. Lexington

1. History, Population, Special Characteristics
   b. Limited natural advantages for industry, but extensive commercial enterprises.

2. Education
   a. Major reason why families choose to settle here.
   b. 70% go on to higher education.

3. Recreation and Conservation
   a. 241 acres of open land and good recreation programs.

4. Planning and Zoning
   a. Eight zoning categories from single-family through garden apartments to commercial and light industry.
   b. Planning Board started in 1918.

5. Taxes and Assessing
   a. 1960 tax rate: $68.00, 45%.
6. Industry
   a. $7-8 million worth of Raytheon and Itek executive offices are only industry.
   b. Character seems too well established to be significantly affected by the amount of industry possible on remaining land.

E. Burlington
1. History, Population, Special Characteristics
   a. History dates back to 1640 when it was part of Woburn.
   b. Building of Rte 128 changed use from agriculture to industry.
   c. Considered the fastest growing town in the Boston area.
   d. Population 1960: 13,000, Density: 1,098
2. Education
   a. Fluctuations with jobs and development.
   b. 40% go on to higher education.
3. Recreation and Conservation
   a. No land in conservation.
   b. Recreation includes a summer playground, tennis courts, a baseball diamond and a private country club which is inadequate for a fast expanding population.
4. Planning and Zoning
   a. Had a Planning Board since 1940, but industry dominated with no zoning.
   b. Zoning includes two residential, one business, and one industrial area.
5. Taxes and Assessing
   a. 1960 tax rate: $66, 40%.
6. Industry
   a. Light Industry began in 1950 and by 1960 there were roughly 50 industries.
   b. Clearly made an economic gain from industry, but has not chosen to spend at a comparable rate on schools, conservation, recreation, etc.

F. Wayland
1. History, Population, Special Characteristics
   a. Settled in 1636 as part of Sudbury.
   b. At the end of WWII, Wayland was considered a small country town and industry was negligible. Population explosion, Rte. 128 with jobs in industry, good access roads and the rural character of the town brought people in.
2. Education  
   a. Growing education system.  
   b. 73% go on to further education.  
3. Recreation and Conservation  
   a. Conservation land includes more than 500 acres.  
   b. Have two private golf clubs, a tennis and swimming club and public facilities.  
4. Planning and Zoning  
   a. Wayland has maintained a rural character.  
   b. Four types of zoning including flood plain, industrial, four grades of business and four grades of residential.  
5. Taxes and Assessing  
   a. 1960 tax rate: $78, 35%.  
6. Industry  
   a. Raytheon and a Dow Chemical Plant are only industry.  
   b. Wayland has felt little adverse effect and sufficient economic benefit to justify continued introduction of light industry.  

G. Weston  
1. History, Population, Special Characteristics  
   a. Established in 1713 from Watertown as an agricultural town.  
   b. One industry, a rock quarry near Route 128.  
   c. Homogeneous rural residential suburb.  
   d. Population in 1960; 8,261, Density: 492  
2. Education  
   a. Excellent schools and have developed with growth.  
   b. 16% of children go to private school and 84% go on to higher education.  
3. Recreation and Conservation  
   a. Public conservation lands of 500 acres or more.  
   b. Recreation is excellent including tennis, pool, ski tow, playgrounds, a summer youth program.  
4. Planning and Zoning  
   a. Four residential zones, 2 business zones and a limited industrial zone.  
   b. One of the first master plans and far sighted Planning Board.
5. Taxes and Assessing  
   a. 1960 tax rate: $60.80, 40-45%.

6. Industry  
   a. Has no light industry and hopes to avoid it.

H. Sudbury  
1. History, Population, Special Characteristics  
   a. Incorporated in 1636.  
   b. Since WWII, population has tripled, schools and services have expanded and town has rapidly gone from farming town to residential suburb.  

2. Education  
   a. Growing in quality and attendance.  
   b. In 1960, 56% of students continued to higher education.

3. Recreation and Conservation  
   a. Woman's Club Memorial Forest is part of 1289 acres in private reservation.  
   b. Recreation includes town courts, little league baseball program, basketball, Red Cross, swimming and summer recreation.

4. Planning and Zoning  
   a. Planning Board was formed in 1929, but zoning has been piecemeal.  
   b. Land was zoned for specific industry as it came along.  
   c. Three types of residential zoning, two types of business and two types of industrial and research zoning.

5. Taxes and Assessing  
   a. 1960 tax rate: $90.

6. Industry  
   a. First came in 1949 and includes 7 or 8 examples of light industry.  
   b. The tax contribution of industry is great enough to suggest that Sudbury will continue to industrialize where feasible.

I. Lincoln  
1. History, Population, Special Characteristics  
   a. Incorporated in 1754 as farming community.  

2. Education
a. In 1956 Lincoln and Sudbury joined in a regional agreement and built high school.

b. Good school system with 78% going on to higher education.

3. Recreation and Conservation
   a. Very active conservation and recreation program.

4. Planning and Zoning
   a. First zoning law passed in 1929 and 2-acre zoning in 1955.
   b. Lincoln has never been zoned for industry, but in 1960 there was a by-law change which provided standards for industrial development in the event it did occur.

5. Taxes and Assessing
   a. 1960 tax rate: $94.

6. Industry
   a. One small industry at the end of WWII.
   b. There have been no new services provided over the post-war period.
1964 – Report of the Recreation Study Committee

“While charged with a study of the whole recreation program, the committee felt that its appointment arose largely out of questions raised as to the value of the summer playground program and consequently decided to devote a majority of its attention to that subject.”

A. Summary

1. Committee concluded that the program does play a socio-educational role and that public funds are rightfully allocated to it.
2. Program includes instruction in arts and crafts, games and sports, dramatics, music, dance, nature, gymnastics, tennis, swimming and camp-craft.
3. Program had an average weekly attendance of 240 kids out of 680.
4. To ask each family to underwrite the full cost of their participation could deny some the opportunity to benefit from the program, put a strain on the budgets of others, and place an unwelcome emphasis upon relative wealth.
5. Community would like to see winter ice skating and expansion of the overall program.
6. Lincoln currently pays $1.43 net per capita, Weston: $3.00, Newton: $3.21, Wellesley: $3.17, Brookline: $4.59 and a recommended national norm is $5.00.
“We enclose the long-awaited Comprehensive Development Plan for Lincoln. It is a bold plan, carefully conceived for a community blessed with a moment in time to save itself. It was drawn by our consultants with considerable help from more than 50 Lincoln citizens who, through their collective wisdom, marked the plan with the stamp of the Town.”

Planning Board’s Foreword:
It is happy coincidence when a source of a man’s pleasure is beneficial to his health, a comfort to his pocketbook, and nourishment to his soul. Open space in Lincoln is such a compound. Few of Lincoln’s citizens are unmoved by the Town’s rural beauty. Preceding generations left a visible inheritance eloquent of the dignity of simple living, work, and public spirit. Today the ecological importance of green areas in keeping air and water pure is seldom recognized, but as urbanization progresses, this function may become crucial. The economic incentives for perpetuating Lincoln’s fields and forests are real: the market value of property is enhanced by open space and the cost of a program to secure it from adverse development is low. The open space program set forth in Part 1 of this report is a major achievement. Even now, Town Boards are actively working to put specific land acquisition proposals before Town Meeting. Favorable action on these will be a major landmark in Lincoln’s history.

Another major achievement is the Land Use and Economic Study of Part 2. Not only does it provide the economic analysis essential to the understanding of the open space program, but it also contains a mathematical model with which to analyze future changes in land use. The Planning Board and the Board of Selectmen hope it will serve as a useful tool for every voter in making the decisions that shape Lincoln’s future. The high degree of citizen interest in the Town’s business has been expressed in the conduct of the studies on which this report is based. A breadth of citizen participation has been realized through a structure of citizen committees working with the Consultants. These committees, Residential, Commercial-Industrial, and Conservation-Recreation, studied possible patterns of land use, developed the specific land use ranges that were used by the consultants, and set forth criteria for appropriate land uses.”
– Lincoln Planning Board, Lincoln Board of Selectmen
PART I – THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

A. Policy Goals of the Future Land Use Plan

1. Preservation of open space.
2. Continuity of high quality education.
3. Provision for adequate services and facilities.

B. Open Space Program

1. A program of land acquisition is imperative now.
2. The town cannot continue to depend on private landowners to keep their land open.
3. Preservation techniques include: cluster development, conservation zoning, options, easements, gifts, direct purchases supplemented by state and federal aid including:
   a. State's self-help program,
   b. Federal funds under Title VII of the 1961 housing act,
4. The cost of such a program relative to the total budget is small.

C. Policy Goals of the Future Land Use Plan

1. Protecting watershed land, ground water table and unspoiled natural areas will protect the balance of nature, for wildlife habitat, study and simple enjoyment.
2. Preservation of scenic beauty for its own sake; in particular, certain fields and views of water add to the character of Town and its respective neighborhoods.
3. Setting aside 'reserve lands' for general Town uses, such as possible future buildings, playgrounds and organized recreation, or schools.
4. Protection of historic sites. (Studies of this matter are still incomplete)
   Sandy Pond Shores – 1. 2.
   Mt. Misery Wilderness – 1. 2.
   Flint's Great Meadows – 2. 4.
   Baker Bridge fields at Concord Road – 2.
   Codman Field south of Rice's Corner – 2. 3.
   Wheeler estate – the great stone walls, brook valley and pasture – 2. 4.
   Elm Brook Headwaters – 1. 3.
   Valley Brook east of Conant Road – 1.
   VanLeer Maple Swamp – 1.
   Farrar Pond southwest shore – 1. 2.
   Browning field on Weston Road – 2.
   Winchell field at Farrar Road – 2.
   Pleasant meadow – 2.
   Stony Brook valley in Harrington's and Preston's – 1. 2.
   Flint's esker – 1.
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Rando swamp area – 1.
Shaw hilltop – 1. 2.
Adler pond and meadows – 1. 2.
Osborne pond area – 1.
Sudbury River shores – 1. 2.
Coburn pond – 1. 3.
Hobbs brook swamp – 1.
Brook at pierce hill and Lincoln Roads – 1.
Umbrello pond and hillside – 3.

Conservation Corridor Opportunities:
Sandy Pond shore to Elm Brook tract
Sandy Pond to Adams Estate
Mt. Misery to Codman field to Drumlin Farm
Old Town Hall to Hartwell School
Access to Sudbury River
VanLeer the Stonehedge to Coburn
Coburn to Harrington to Valley Pond
Portions of the gas transmission line
Baker Brook

D. Residential Land Use

1. Lincoln’s population will probably continue to grow at the rate of 3.5% per year, with a resulting 1980 population of 6700.
2. This growth will not greatly increase the individual homeowner’s tax burden.
3. Cluster development should be emphasized in future subdivisions to preserve open space.
4. Some social and economic benefits could be expected from a change in residential development policies. Serious consideration should be given to higher-density development.
5. Some demand exists in Lincoln for housing at moderate rentals, but moderate rentals are unlikely without FHA or other public assistance to developers.
6. Any apartment housing likely to be built privately in Lincoln would produce an excess of tax revenue over costs to the Town.
7. Properly designed high-density development could maintain the natural landscape more successfully than conventional subdivisions of 2-acre lots. Consideration should be given to an expanded concept of cluster development to achieve this objective.

E. Industrial Development

1. The relocation of Route 2 to the north may be suitable for industrial development.
2. Lincoln lies within the region predicted to experience the greatest increase in industrial capacity through 1980.
3. Industrial development would have a favorable impact on revenue-expenditure patterns.
4. Land should not be rezoned for industrial use without specific proposals from industrial concerns to locate in Lincoln.

F. Commercial Development
1. Land available for commercial development in South Lincoln is adequate at present.
   "Although the lack of commercialization helps preserve the rural nature of the Town, a sound planning program dictates that the extent of provision for commercial development should be evaluated in terms of Lincoln's present and future needs." The South Lincoln Planning Committee prepared evaluations in 1962 that resulted in Town approved provisions for commercial development in Lincoln.

G. Community Facilities
1. The present school site is adequate unless radical changes occur in the growth rate or there is a change in the current policy of maintaining a centrally located campus-type school complex. The proposed open space program provides a land reserve to accommodate any future needs.
2. Several sites in the open space program could provide neighborhood recreational areas.
3. The present Library site is adequate for present and future needs.
4. The DeCordova Museum has adequate land for its planned expansion.
5. The Town Hall and town garage can be expanded to provide for anticipated needs.
6. The proposed fire station in North Lincoln will provide a better distribution of equipment.
7. The location of a new site for the Town dump depends on the new location of Route 2.

H. Circulation
1. A circulation system should be provided for:
   a. separation of local and through traffic,
   b. internal circulation with convenient access to important Town facilities and minimum disruption of residential areas.
   c. road design in keeping with the character of the town, preserving existing trees and stone walls as much as possible, and
   d. provision of pedestrian and bicycle path, protected as far as possible from automobile traffic but located where present use indicates the greatest need.
2. A peripheral circulation system should be based on Route 2 (as relocated) on the north, Route 126 on the west, Route 117 on the south, and Route 128 on the east.
3. Route 2 should be relocated along the southerly edge of Minuteman National Park.
4. If Rte. 2 is relocated it will not be necessary to extend Rte. 2A west of Air Base Access Road.
5. Planning Board should study possibilities of providing a circulation loop for roads, which would be cut off by a northerly location of Route 2 and by the Minuteman Park.
6. Existing traffic volumes do not justify a connector road between Rte. 117 and Winter St.
7. Old County Road and Winter Street should be maintained at local road standards and all possible steps taken to prevent their use by industrial area traffic.
8. Old County Road should be linked to Page Road at the present Route 2 if the latter is abandoned as part of a Route 2 relocation.
9. Old County Road between Winter Street and Conant Road should be abandoned.
10. Relocate and improve Route 126 northerly of Baker Bridge Road.
11. Specific proposals for Route 126 southerly of Baker Bridge Road prior to a northerly relocation would be premature. The Planning Board should follow this matter closely.
12. Roadside paths should be provided for traffic by foot, bicycles, and horse.
13. A study leading to the establishment of a network of paths should be undertaken.
14. Bridle and footpath easements should be accrued in future subdivisions to provide a system connecting residential and other developed areas with the green belt.
15. Implementation of present plans for off-street parking will provide adequate parking facilities for the South Lincoln business area. Zoning by-law requirements ensure adequate parking facilities for any future development.
16. The Boston & Maine Railroad line serving Lincoln is a significant element in Lincoln's circulation system. It's service has improved and use has increased.

EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arterial Roads:</th>
<th>Estimated Daily Volume</th>
<th>Peak Hour Flow in Relation to Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 126</td>
<td>4000-6000</td>
<td>50% - 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 117</td>
<td>4000-5000</td>
<td>50% - 75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Collector Roads:</th>
<th>Estimated Daily Volume</th>
<th>Peak Hour Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedford Road</td>
<td>1500-2500</td>
<td>25% - 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codman Road</td>
<td>2000-3000</td>
<td>25% - 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Road</td>
<td>3500-4500</td>
<td>25% - 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapelo Road</td>
<td>2500-3500</td>
<td>25% - 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Road</td>
<td>1500-2500</td>
<td>25% - 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Roads – Principal:</th>
<th>Estimated Daily Volume</th>
<th>Peak Hour Flow</th>
<th>Capacity estimates are based on...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexington Road</td>
<td>1200-1400</td>
<td></td>
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</table>
Old Country Road   500-800           on data in the BRPP report
Sandy Pond – Baker Bridge  1200-1400
Weston Road   1800-2000
Winter Street   500-800

Areas in Lincoln which are responsible for large traffic volumes include Hanscom Field, Walden Pond and the Waltham Industrial area. Eventually, the Minute Man National Historical Park and any industrial areas in Lincoln will be in this category.

PART II – THE LAND USE AND TOWN FINANCE STUDY

A. Organization and Operation
   1. Evaluates development pressures and change the Town has/will experience over time.
   2. Provides alternative future development patterns based on their economic impact to Town government.
   3. Considers non-economic factors including:
      e. preservation of the general character of the Town,
      f. preservation of existing open, natural landscape, and
      g. provision of facilities and services to Town residents at acceptable levels of both quantity and quality.
   4. Facilitates comparison of alternative development patterns.

B. Land-use alternatives
   1. Residential
   2. Potential commercial areas including:
      a. limited expansion of present South Lincoln business area,
      b. provision for service uses related to demand generated by Minuteman Park,
      c. area bounded by route 2 and 2A.
   3. Criteria for designating potential industrial areas include:
      a. accessibility to major highways,
      b. availability of public water supply and visibility from major highways.
   4. Open space

C. Procedure for analyzing land-use alternatives
   1. Select components of the alternative ranges for residential, conservation-recreation and industrial-commercial development.
   2. Determine all costs associated with the residential alternative, subdivided into capital and operating, and school and non-school, expenditures. Add to the base figures the costs for the conservation-recreation and industrial-commercial alternatives.
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3. Calculate net amount to be raised by property taxes by subtracting the estimated amount for non-property tax revenues from the total cost figure.

4. Determine assessed value associated with development by adding estimated value of new residential construction with industrial and commercial development; the assessed value of the open land taken for these uses and for the open space program is subtracted, yielding an estimated total assessed value for the particular alternative.

5. Calculate derived tax rate raised by property taxes divided by total assessed value, the tax revenue per house, and total governmental cost per capita.

D. Procedure for analyzing operating costs
   1. Establish pattern and adjust for unusual conditions.
   2. See if figures adequately reflect quantitative and qualitative changes desired by town.
   3. Develop variations for specific alternatives.
“The intent of this report is to outline a philosophy for the planning of the Lincoln and to raise certain questions regarding the direction of proposed and yet to be proposed development. The ideas expressed are intended as suggestions for handling proposals already contemplated and approved by Town Meetings, Selectmen, Planning Board, etc… Planning, as it exists today, is aimed at individual buildings. The type of Master Plan defined here gives a means for dealing with buildings in a collective sense.”

A general consensus in Lincoln is that they wish to keep the community as a ‘retreat from the humdrum of city life and a refuge from the spoils of a less desirable cross-section of our society’. Great interest is placed in land conservation, but many feel that areas of higher-density development will impinge on the community. There is a need for certain concentration in particular areas of the town for various reasons:

- To illustrate the need for certain amenities,
- To illustrate the need of a few [areas of concentration] for greater proximity, and
- To illustrate the need for the physical body of the town to achieve an identity.

In December 1964 practicing architects and planners of the town were invited to a Planning Board meeting to suggest methods of controlling a particular development which was considered to be unsuitable, though it apparently conformed to current zoning restrictions. The zoning restrictions, oddly enough, had actually created the unsuitable outcome.

- Current zoning restrictions imposed on the general-residence district made aesthetics important by calling for a medium-density transect. For various reasons, the human eye strongly focuses on the proportional relationships of individual houses in a medium-density, single-family transect; as opposed to low and high-density areas where the eye relates individual houses to their natural surroundings or adjacent buildings respectively. With current zoning for the medium-density transect, the town is dependent on the designer’s sensitivities to scale.
- The Planning Board previously allowed development other than the predominantly low-density, residential development. They attempted this in an area considered undesirable for other buildings,
or at least out of eyesight of the road, but it didn’t work because the regulations were not suitable for the particular needs of the scheme.

- The existing ordinance consists of a series of negations.

In *Lincoln Revisited*, Denis Jesson refers to the work of Clarence Stein who feels the role of today’s planner is primarily to assist in marketing and protecting property. He appeals for a more potent type of authority, which he terms ‘New Town Planning’, the aim of which is to deal with a better way of life rather than the materials at hand. “The present city form is not molded by the planner. It is the random consequence of the separate and unrelated decisions of subdivider, municipal engineer, zoning board…To fill in the form, the body, and the reality of the town, city planning proceeds not by the positive, but by negations. It restricts, regulates and limits use by zoning laws.”

Denis Jesson goes on to suggest positive guides for the future of Lincoln:

- Irregularities in the development pattern, created through intentional development or zoning actions, suggest communal areas. A certain concentration within the form may imply a shopping center; a void suggests a playground; and a higher form suggests a church or school. When these irregularities are dependent on each other, they allow for ‘vibrant relationships of individuals’.

- The establishment of open space (undeveloped land) is collective intervention for the sake of physical values. The establishment of closed space (built environment) is intervention for the sake of social values. Open space is only one tool in the organization of a rural community…not the least important is its counterpart, closed space. Studied together, they enrich the community.
• Rural Character is reinforced when the distinction between ‘town’ and ‘country’ is realized.
  1. Closed areas complement the spaciousness of open areas,
  2. Limited areas of higher density enhance the social experience of the townspeople.
  3. Concentrating higher density functions within confined areas controls the tax base.

One tool that may help the Planning Board and citizenry create better schemes for multiple and single-use development is the creation of a Master Plan. A Master Plan based on the physical and social structure of the town as well as existing massing of open and closed spaces should predetermine the logical expansion of the town and hence preserve the rural character.

A series of rules, applicable to all scales of development, should govern development in a community. These rules will vary depending on the demands of the particular site and social conditions involved.

  • Change in scale produces a sense of entry or departure.
  • The sense of travel exists as the distance between elements is realized.
    “One example of the sense of arrival in Lincoln is Lexington Road from Rte. 2 to Trapelo Road. One is immediately aware of the change of scale of the traffic from high speed Rte. 2 to an imposed lower speed as one enters the winding confines of Lexington Road. The road has several characteristics: it is winding and narrow, trees restrict the line of vision in the horizontal plane. The road is punctuated by Flint’s Farm and its confining buildings; immediately beyond, the eye is released into the large open space to the right. The field and its confines, forest, hill, and stone walls give a sense of arrival, but only possible because of the release from closed space defined by farm buildings, to open space.”
  • Development traditionally follows paths or trade routes, rivers, railroads, seaboards or some source of power. “A Master Plan for Lincoln should tie together the existing fields, ponds, eskers, rivers and drumlins to emphasize the definition of the town”.
  • A church generally informs an approach to the center of some activity.
  • Public spaces should be uniquely different from private spaces.
  • Physical relationships depend on particular social activities and should be accommodated for.
  • Town planning and design must consider the physical limitations of the human body.

Four main encumbrances limit the possibility for meaningful density within Lincoln:
  1. Setbacks suggest virtually the same spatial relationship for all districts in the town.
  2. Height restrictions applied to all parts of the bylaw.
3. The area requirements in areas zoned for multiple dwellings.
4. The limitations of the general residential district.

“As long as these restrictions are in force, any possibility for exciting experiences, such as the Flint’s Farm example, occurring in the future is lost. Should the Flint barns burn down they could not be rebuilt in their present location. They would be required to be 50-feet back from the road and the visual experience would be lost. I suggest a study evaluating the approach roads to the center, or more particularly centers, in order to achieve an architectural totality for the town, defining solids and voids, ponds and forests, fields and buildings.”

‘Characteristic psychological needs’ should also be considered in the Master Plan (Comparative Housing Study, Harvard School of Design, May, 1958, page 8.)

- The sense of freedom and joy secured through participation in activities.
- The element of sociability through meeting new people and making friends.
- Pleasant associations gained through past experiences.
- The chance to escape from one’s self and from the realities of the moment.
- The opportunity to find adventure.
- The control of hands through arts and crafts.
- A sense of power through control of the whole body.
- The opportunity to find security.

“In a survey of the suburbanite’s reasons for moving to the outskirts, the largest percentage of reasons in favor of this move, 61% was to ‘live in a cleaner, healthier neighborhood,’ 48% of the answers were for better schools or the opportunity to own their own homes, and 28% wished to have a yard or garden.” (Lewis Mumford, The City in History, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York, 1961, page 487.)

There are several reasons why citizens chose to join a community. Together they must be proactive and ask, “What does our community want to be?” Lincoln shows a common bond in the rural community near work centers and a particular socio-metropolitan identity. This bond cannot be traced back to any seventeenth or eighteenth century concept of a town – their bond focused on self-sufficiency of the community. The zoning ordinance should represent those values, which are not necessarily blanket statements regarding density, height, etc., but which represent twentieth century values and thereby
strengthen and reinforce the important parts of the community, be they new parts or eighteenth century elements. Then the most generally stated, yet probably most controversial section of the purposes of the zoning bylaw, ‘to improve and beautify the town by encouraging the most appropriate uses of land within the town’ may be fulfilled.

*Lincoln Revisited* proposes specific opportunities for future development. Reference is made to the 1958 Braun-Eliot Report and many of the proposed comments illustrate a contrary view. Jesson’s reference to density refers to a massing density rather than a density of population, except to make certain areas socially viable. Proposed opportunities include:

- Concentrate certain developments at critical points of intersection.
- Create nodes at two major points, the center and the village by increasing physical density.
- Characterize forests and woodlands as they relate spatially to the rest of town.
- Maintain an open feeling or spaciousness.
- Plan for communal areas as the community grows in size and needs.
- Develop a community within a community based upon higher accessibility for elderly.
- Build upon existing amenities in the center – around the library, church, town hall.
- Increase the density around Pierce Park to ‘foil the void’.
- Increase commercial activity in the village - around the train station.
- Increase public transportation through town to the village and center.
- Connect land strips for riding, hiking, and cycling that lead to ‘something’.

*Lincoln Revisited* also highlights specific proposals for the village (train station) and center (5-way intersection area) based on the need for physical identity and social interaction.

Principles for the village (train station) include:

- Separate parking for commuters and intermittent shoppers.
- Concentrate parking for intermittent shoppers next to the destination, and allow for pedestrian access to second and/or third shop without moving their car.
- Don’t stress the separation of the automobile and pedestrian to the extent that the former is excluded from participation in the activity of the complex.
- Concentrate pedestrian activity around the interior periphery of the complex.
- Scale the project to its intended activities.
- Create a mass from the outside in order to imply a limited center for commercial activity.
Scheme 1 proposes no change to Lincoln Road and Scheme 2 proposes re-routing Lincoln Road to allow for more building and development space.

Principles for the center (5-way intersection area) include:

- Assimilate several income groups as well as age groups into this particular area.
- Consider this as an area for the elderly, widows with children or newcomers.
- Require stimulation of activity at the center.
- Induce outside activity into the center to avoid the formation of a ‘ghetto’.
- Create facilities to serve more than one primary function.
- Differentiate private and public space, but orient ‘eyes’, or the building, to the street.
- Scale the center to the pedestrian – build and utilize sidewalks.
- Identify the area with the greater community, Lincoln.
- Identify the area within the community.
- Identify the unit to its particular surroundings.

The proposal for this area involves: redirecting Lexington Road and Old Lexington Road, increasing housing opposite Town Hall, plus permanent quarters for some existing communal facilities, and modifying the park by adding facilities that require little construction other than parking (tennis courts).

In summary, there must be an effective clearing-house for assembling these needs, desires and aspirations into a cohesive unit - not a system of piecemeal consideration of the value of individual proposals. This is the sense in which the Master Plan can act and be instrumental in ordering the socio-physical structure of the town.
“In January 1970 Lincoln held a two-day citizens' conference on 'Changing Values and the Schools', and 'New Directions for a New Decade.' Sponsors of the conference hoped that it would renew a spirit of mutual confidence between the town's citizens and its government of volunteer and largely unpaid officials. The substantial interest and participation in the conference, evidenced by the attendance of 400-500 people on each of the two Saturdays, and the many ideas and suggestions pertaining to current town issues that emerged, confirmed its value.”

A. Education

1. Analysis and Summary.
   a. Attitudes toward the schools:
      - Superintendents and teachers were highly praised.
      - Value the ability of teachers to encourage educational breadth and depth without overlooking the individual needs of the children.
      - Value dedicated teachers who are flexible and responsive to kids.
      - Value the relationship between teachers and students.
      - Value the ability to speak and be heard, tolerance, innovation, smallness of school system, flexible programming and diversity of student backgrounds.
   
   b. Educational needs and goals:
      - More highly trained teachers at better than comparative salaries.
      - Maintain small classes and increase individual attention.
      - 'Education of the whole child,' 'Education for life,' 'Education for survival.'
      - Training in skills – strictly structured pattern.
      - Cut electives at elementary level rather than high school level.
      - Only a few people asked for improvements in (recreational) facilities.
   
   c. Lincoln schools and the outside world:
      - While many advocated for increased sharing and involvement with a larger community for mutual benefit, others were quick to identify the difficulties and costs the Town might encounter.
• Few citizens at the conference had been educated in Lincoln.

d. The regional high school, 'Mini-Metro', METCO:
  • Support for present High School and for continuing with Sudbury was strong.
  • Suggested that Lincoln form a school district with some part of Boston.
  • Should allow METCO parents some say in the operation of the schools.

e. School costs and tax dollars:
  • Willing to spend increasing amounts for education in response to increasing school population and changes in demands of society for more education.

f. Who controls the schools.
  • Varying opinions – suggested that an evening group be organized at which teachers, students, parents and other interested persons talk over subjects of educational interest.
  • Make some space available in the evening for parents to work with their children on projects for which there was no equipment at home.

2. Recommendations.
   a. School committees seek new and effective ways to inform citizens about activities within the schools,
   b. Renewed efforts be made to bring METCO parents into sustained, active participation in school and school committee activities,
   c. Schools hasten to broaden the program for the non-academic and non-conforming, to the same extent it has been broadened for the academic pupil.

B. Town Affairs

“The second session of the Lincoln By '80 Conference, held on January 31, dealt with the physical environment of the town and the social and economic life of its citizens. The major topics of discussion and concern were Lincoln's physical environment, the social structure of the town, taxes, communication within the town, recreational pursuits, responsibilities and problems of town government, and the relationship of Lincoln to its region and to Boston.”

1. Analysis and Summary.
   a. Conclusions:
      • Love and respect for nature's resources, vitality of the town depends largely upon the collective actions of individuals of different backgrounds and ages, and strong sense of responsibility and commitment to the community.
• Wider diversity in population and better methods to exchange information within a diverse populace.
• Not enough information about town affairs and town boards.
• Lincoln must work closely with the region (contiguous towns) in the problem areas of conservation, pollution, waste disposal, and transportation.

b. Physical environment:
• Almost everyone was in favor of maintaining open space, although 22 people chose land conservation as a place where they wished to reduce expenditures.
• Establish a policy on land ethics based on the principle that 'land should be held in trust for people coming along many years after.'

c. Social structure:
• Primary concern was for Lincoln's own residents – young people with limited means, town employees that would like to live in Lincoln, and retired people.
• Desire for more varied population in town – wide spread of age, culture and professional backgrounds, race and income.
• Moderate income housing should be integrated randomly with existing homes.
• Desired scattered but clustered housing types.
• Maintenance of open, rural feeling was desired.
• Desired zoning changes to permit apartments to be made in existing homes.

d. Taxes:
• Study possibilities of doing away with real estate tax, either wholly or in part, in the next decade, and of substituting a town income tax based on the Federal and State income tax.
• Considerable tax revenue could be realized through the proper planning and introduction of small businesses in South Lincoln.
• Other ideas included operation of a camping area in connection with the National Park, formation of a farming cooperative to reduce the cost of open space maintenance, operation of a liquor store which would turn over profits to the town, purchase of commuter parking stickers.
• Areas which should be considered for new or additional expenditures include limited income housing, recreation, trash collection, planning and developing a commercial area in South Lincoln, and hiring more help for town boards.

e. Recreation:
• Desire to use and enjoy the natural environment.
• Farming program for youth or model communal farm.
• Interest for swimming, youth center, coffee house, radio station.

f. Communications:
• Citizens need more information about the affairs and problems of the Town.
• Town boards could publish pros and cons of alternative solutions to problems before open hearings.
• Most people get their news from reading The Fence Viewer.

g. Town government:
• In general, residents desired few changes in the system of government and felt the town boards were effective.
• Desire for day-time Town Meeting on Saturdays.
• More clerical, secretarial, and professional help to town boards was desired.

h. Lincoln, the Region, and the Core City:
• Necessary to start regionally based planning regarding road and highway location and maintenance, waste disposal, air, water and noise pollution.
• Responsibilities to core city include education, open space and recreation.

i. Intra-town Employment and Transportation.

2. Recommendations.
   a. Physical environment:
   • Conservation Commission undertake long range planning of open land.
   • Conservation Commission make a soil and water resources study and map of the town, propose ways to protect these resources, and determine the existence and source of any pollution.
   • Conservation Commission and Planning Board review, update, and implement the By ’70 Open Space Plan.

   b. Social structure:
   • Planning Board consider a study of trends in the changes in population.
   • Planning Board develop new principles of land use throughout the town.
   • Planning Board make recommendation to the town regarding the creation of more housing for people of limited means.
• Planning Board appoint a task force to report on the possibilities of renovating existing buildings and adapting existing rental units for the purpose of providing affordable housing.

c. Taxes:
• Finance Committee and Selectmen evaluate the ideas for other sources of town revenue such as Airport West and the development of the South Lincoln business area.

d. Recreation:
• Recreation Committee develop a proposal for a town swimming facility.
• Youth Center be established in town.
• Recreation Committee, Land Conservation Trust and Planning Board develop a long range plan with a time schedule for the establishment of more bicycle paths, horse trails, and walking and skiing trails.
• More use be made of existing recreational facilities.
• Recreation Committee report on the proposed uses of Lincoln land in relation to recreational needs of the region.

e. Communications:
• Selectmen study the problems of public relations.

f. Town government:
• Selectmen study problem of coordinating work of town committees.
• Find ways to relieve work load of overburdened boards.

g. Region:
• Selectmen and Planning Board appoint a Regional Planning Committee consisting of one of Lincoln representative from each regional agency.
1971 – Lincoln – A Tight Little Island
League of Women Voters

“Although Lincoln lies in an area of great metropolitan growth, the town itself has grown rather slowly. Other towns even further from Boston have experienced much more rapid population increases. The reasons for this slow growth are several: initially, the topography of the town made building relatively difficult and expensive; more recently, the town's deliberate policies of large lot zoning and land conservation, and the absence of sewers for more intensive development. This slow growth has made Lincoln a desirable place to live and has resulted in a rapid rise in the value of land and a related change in the character of the town's population.”

A. Lincoln Is Changing
   1. Outside Pressures.
   2. Chapter 774 ("snob zoning law").
   3. Legislative Proposals.
   4. Recent Court Decisions.

B. Background and History of Planned Development in Lincoln
   5. Regional Organizations

C. Planning Studies and Town Action
   2. South Lincoln Plan.
   3. "By-70 Plan".
   5. Industrial and Commercial Development.
   6. Residential Development.
D. Planning for Moderate Income Housing
   2. Real Estate Market.
   3. Housing Recommendations.
   4. Impact of Moderate Income Housing.
   5. Non-Profit Sponsor – The Lincoln Foundation.
   6. Alternatives
   7. Relocation.
   8. Housing Authority.

E. Proposals at hand
   1. Need for Subsidies.
   2. Chapter 774.
   3. Conversion of Barns and Garages.
1972 – A Cooperative Community for Lincoln – The Lincoln Foundation

The Lincoln Foundation is a nonprofit corporation concerned with the development of moderate cost housing for Lincoln. The Rural Land Foundation is a nonprofit corporation concerned with the maintenance and preservation of the Lincoln environment and the Greater Boston Community Development is a nonprofit corporation providing technical assistance to community sponsors of low and moderate-income housing.

“On June 7, the Planning Board will bring before the Town an article on the warrant calling for the rezoning of a parcel of land in South Lincoln from R-1 (Single-family Residential) to R-4 (Planned Community Development). The Lincoln Foundation will speak in support of the article as the sponsor of the subsidized housing planned for that land.”

In December 1971, the Rural Land Foundation purchased sixty-seven acres of land near the railroad station in South Lincoln from the Trustees of the Codman estate. The Lincoln Foundation planned to build a 150-unit community concentrated on 13-acres near Lincoln Road with the remainder of the land, a swamp (26 acres) and a field (28 acres) to be designated as permanent open space. The housing would be a cooperative ownership opportunity for families of different income levels with the most expensive unit costing approximately $317/mo.

After Town approval of the zoning change, a committee of Town residents and the Lincoln Foundation would design the development and hold public forums for input. The goal of the project was to “express the individuality of the units, and, at the same time, integrate the entire complex into the natural setting provided by the site”. The development was estimated to produce tax revenues of $81,374 with major costs being in the school system, producing a general additional cost of $300/household.
A. Criteria for site-development:

1. The site plan must be reviewed by the Planning Board for:
   a. impact on the neighborhood,
   b. relation to the long-range plan,
   c. relation to the natural terrain, and
   d. evaluation of the proposed open space.

2. The developer must file an environmental impact statement providing there will be no adverse impact to the neighborhood or water resource during construction or thereafter.

3. The Board of Health must consult with the Con Com and file a report that includes:
   a. evaluation of soils with particular reference to the suitability for development,
   b. provisions for sewage, waste and drainage,
   c. environmental impact of plan.

4. The Board of Appeals may grant the permit for construction only if it finds that:
   a. there is no adverse impact on the neighborhood,
   b. there is no adverse environmental impact,
   c. there is no adverse affect on the physical character of the town,
   d. plan is in harmony with the long-range plan,
   e. plan provides adequate parking and creates no traffic problems,
   f. adequate on-site waste disposal and drainage,
   g. plan for maintaining open space,
   h. open space is of size and shape to benefit Town and residents of development.

The cooperative housing is owned and operated by its members on a nonprofit basis. Each member owns a share in the development, which they purchase through an initial membership payment. Income limits for eligibility move up over time with the cost of living index and no family would be displaced because its income level rises above that specified as the maximum for the subsidy program under which it initially entered the cooperative.
1977 – Lincoln Land-Use Conference

This report looks at trends in population, housing values, income distribution and land use from the period of 1952 – 1977.

“We have regulated ourselves to save the land. If, with luck barring disaster, there is a Tricentennial, the Lincoln Town Historian, in a look back to the 20th Century, will have to reckon with us. Certainly, not particularly with us of Lincoln’s 1970’s – but rather with us as we are part of the Lincoln continuum that has long loved the land and affirmed affection by leaving well enough alone.”

Lincoln has served the land uncommonly well. The Conservation Commission performs impressively in Lincoln and is a strong example throughout the Commonwealth. The Rural Land Foundation provides a national example of creative, open-space development and the Lincoln Land Conservation Trust is an example of citizen action, independent of government.

Lincoln was an exciting innovator in land-use planning when it enacted its first Zoning By-law. In the years since 1929, the By-law evolved to protect the land and provide for the people. A one-acre residential lot was made part of the law in 1936 and increased to two acres in 1955. The Town also enacted R-1 Cluster development, R-3 Open Space Residential Development and R-4 Moderate Income Housing. Zoning also permitted the Town to regulate where its stores and services would be located, establish wetlands and conservation zones and provide for the possibility of light industry.

Planning studies, including the Braun-Eliot Report (1957) and the By ‘70 Report (1965) led to notable accomplishment in preserving open space. In 1970, the Town met to discuss Lincoln’s goals. The conference reaffirmed support of land conservation as a major goal: Task forces were created to search methods which would secure Lincoln’s future as a place of natural beauty and environmental resources; as a town containing a diverse population in terms of income, age and background; and as an area which makes a significant contribution to the present and future needs of the metropolitan area.
A. The By ‘80 Conference directed the Conservation Commission to undertake:
   1. Long-range planning for the use of open land.
   2. A study of soil and water resources and a mapping of the Town.
   3. The forming of plans to protect our natural resources.
   4. Updating of the “By ‘70 Open Space Plan”.

B. Potential uses for Undeveloped Land include:
   1. Housing for the Elderly.
   2. Dispersal of Moderate Income Housing Throughout Town by:
      a. increasing apartments in existing and accessory buildings,
      b. acquiring and preserving existing moderate income dwellings, and
      c. selecting sites that might have density greater than existing zoning permits.
   3. Provide a Second Large Site for Housing
      a. site for 160 units to allow 25% in moderate income,
      b. within R-3 development (Farrar Pond Village type) have 10-15% in low and moderate units.
   5. Acquire more Land for Municipal Services.
   6. Acquire more Conservation Land.
   7. Plan for Adequate Water Quantity and Quality.
"The Lincoln Conservation Commission is pleased to present to the citizens of Lincoln a comprehensive Open Space Plan for the future. The goals of the Open Space Plan are broad in scope and include the protection of the watershed resources, the promotion of adequate water quality and water quantity, the protection and promotion of agriculture, provision for open space and recreational lands for future generations, and the enhancement of the quality of life in our community."

A. Goals of Open Space Plan
   
   1. Identify natural features and systems which individually contribute vital functions towards the health and welfare of our citizens.
   
   2. Through an understanding of their interdependence, devise the means of integrating these systems into a coherent and viable open space plan.
   
   3. Devise the process and means for assuring their ongoing vitality.

B. Background
   
   1. The Lincoln Landscape.
      
      a. hill town, wet town, forest town.
      
      b. 30% of Lincoln's 15 square mile area is classified as wetlands.
      
      c. bedrock ledges run from southwest to northeast.
      
      d. major water course is Stony Brook through Beaver Brook, Iron Mine Brook, and Todd Pond Brook and draining into the Charles River.
      
      e. watersheds are SuAsCo, Concord, and Charles.
      
      f. glacial features include: drumlins, eskers, outwash plains, kettleholes.
      
      g. indian settlement approx 6,000 yrs prior to settlers, likely along Sudbury River.
      
      h. primary agriculture was marsh hay until 1800's. 1840's turned to upland hay.
      
      i. today primarily woodlands with oak, maple, birch, hickory, ash, beech, cherry, elm, pine, hemlock, spruce, cedar, arborvitae.

   2. History of Lincoln.
      
      a. 1635 – farms established as part of Concord Plantation.
b. 1746 – became a distinct and separate precinct, meetinghouse built on land of existing stone church and Bemis Hall.
c. 1754 – Town became incorporated.
d. 1768 – one of the first written protests against the tea tax.
e. 1773 – voted in Town Meeting, "we will hold and esteem all such as do use such tea as enemies of their country and will treat them with greatest neglect."
f. 1840 – Town built The White Church and the Town House.
g. 1844 – Railroad came through.
h. 1844 – Library was dedicated by George G. Tarbell.
i. 1892 – George F. Bemis contributed generously to Bemis Hall.
j. 1900 – 1,000 people in a suburban town of rural character.
k. 1975 – 4851 people and a changing demographic.

   a. Of the Town's 5858.5 acres, 1,190 are protected by wetland zoning.
   b. It appears that subdivision of roughly 4,000 acres currently held in parcels of three or more acres could yield approximately 1900 dwelling units.
   c. Maximum population figure of around 14,000 is incompatible with the capabilities of the Town's natural systems.
   d. Lot-by-lot analysis clearly shows that the possible growth potential under current zoning structure poses a threat to cherished fertile fields and woods.
   e. Detailed 200-foot scaled maps cover the entire town and serve as the basis for the 1000-foot Open Space Map of Lincoln.

4. History of Community Planning
   b. 1965 Land Use in Lincoln – By '70 Plan by consulting firm and citizens.
   c. 1970 Changing Values and the Schools – By '80 Conference.
   d. 1973 Lincoln, a Land Use Plan for Posterity.

5. Zoning

C. Examples of Community Planning
   1. Sandy Pond and LLCT.
   2. Sandy Pond and the Conservation Commission.
5. Farrar Pond Village and R-3 Open Space Residential Development.
6. Lincoln Woods and R-4 Planned Community Development District.
7. Orchard Lane and R-1 Cluster Development.
8. Militzer and R-1 and Private Purchasers and the Town.

D. Open Space Map

   a. Currently 1,217 acres.
   b. 924 acres are owned by Town through purchase, gift or taking.
   c. 293 acres are owned by LLCT through gift or purchase.

TABLE I
INVENTORY OF EXISTING CONSERVATION LAND – PUBLIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Identity</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>DateAcquired</th>
<th>Method of Acquisition*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSERVATION COMMISSION LANDS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Part gift, part purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiPerna</td>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Town, S-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnfield</td>
<td>45.34</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Town, HUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Pond Trust (Tpke.)</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarbell</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Town, HUD, S-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Town, HUD, S-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Town, HUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monks-Pertzoff</td>
<td>58.10</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Town, HUD, S-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butts</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeNormandie</td>
<td>235.50</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Town, BOR, S-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coonan</td>
<td>127.17</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Town, BOR, S-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Pond Trust</td>
<td>24.71</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Town, BOR, S-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Leer</td>
<td>61.10</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Town, BOR, S-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>118.40</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Town, BOR, S—H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeNormandie</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Militzer</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Town, S-H (gift)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton—Smith</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Town, S-H (gift)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pertzoff</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codman Field</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* S-H: State Self-Help
BOR: Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
HUD: Housing & Urban Development (Federal)

LINCOLN LAND CONSERVATION TRUST LANDS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Identity</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Method of Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler (Sandy Pond)</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haley (Sandy Pond)</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall *(Conant Road)</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks (Conant Road)</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vance (Silver Hill Road)</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cope (Silver Hill Road)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman (Silver Hill Road)</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colburn (Silver Hill Road)</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman (Silver Hill Road)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonehedge</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>Gift</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hiddenwood Path 6.40 Cluster
Twin Pond (Pertzoff) 11.32 Gift
Beaver Pond (Preston) 41.50 Gift
Codman Forest 25.00 Gift
Wheeler Farm (Bedford Road) 54.00 Gift
Nonks-Banks (Bedford Road) 19.65 Gift
Culver (Mackintosh Lane) 7.06 Gift
Condit (Concord Road) 2.10 Purchase
Wheeler Lot #3 2.63 Purchase
Woods End Road (Codman) 7.83 Gift
Roberts (Page Road) 4.76 Cluster
Long Meadow Road 4.85 Cluster
Coons (Beaver Pond) 11.67 Gift/purchase
Banks 11.09 Gift
Baker 3.96 Gift
Stevenson 5.01 Gift
Todd 12.00 Gift
Conant 4.65 Gift

TOWN LAND LISTED AS PUBLIC CONSERVATION LAND BUT NOT UNDER CONSERVATION COMMISSION:

Pierce Park 30.00 Gift

2. Private Conservation Lands.
   a. Total 134 acres.
   b. C-Open Space Conservation District (watershed protection)
   c. Conservation Restrictions.
   d. Private Land Trusts.

   a. Land owned by Town, State, Federal governments, and quasi-public institutions.

4. Wetlands.

5. Land of Conservation Interest.

E. Criteria to protect Land of Conservation Interest

   1. Place in Lincoln Conservation Land.
   2. Quality and accessibility of land for public use.
   3. Productivity of land for farm and forestry products.
   4. Open space adjacent to public ways and public areas. Part of trail connector pattern.
   5. Wetlands and watershed as storage areas and protection for public water supplies.

F. Major Open Spaces

   1. Minute Man National Historic Park.
   3. Walden Pond State Park.
   5. Codman Farm.
7. Sandy Pond.

G. Maintenance and Management of Conservation Lands
1. Currently managed by full-time land manager and part-time assistant.
2. Maintenance includes surveillance, trimming of fields, repair of walls, dressing of existing trails, clearing of new trails, grooming of forested lands, and tree planting.
3. 1976 – Park Ranger Program was established with two rangers.
4. Need for part-time winter ranger.

H. Implementation and Program Economics
1. Impact of 100% Valuation.
2. Implementation Techniques.
   a. Assignment to Chapter 61A Agricultural Tax Assessment.
   b. Gifts of Land to the Town.
   c. Conservation Restrictions.
   d. Zoning.
   e. Acquisition of Trail Easements.
   f. Wetland Protection.
   g. Purchase of Fee or Lesser Interest.

I. Five Year Action Plan - outline of specific actions to be achieved by the townspeople, the Conservation Commission and all involved Town boards. Although serving as a checklist for the Conservation Commission, the action plan acquaints all Town boards and residents with the goals of the Commission. By necessity, the phased plan becomes less definitive as it progresses.

YEAR ONE
1. Obtain Town support of the $3 million proposed program of public acquisition of endangered lands of conservation interest at a special Town Meeting tentatively scheduled for June 1977.
2. Present at 1977 March Town Meeting proposals for the purchase of the Warner, Snider and Phillips Academy (formerly Sumner Smith) properties.
3. Apply for partial State and Federal reimbursement on the Warner and Snider properties.
4. At special Town Meeting (October/November and/or December 1977) present proposals for additional land acquisition.
5. Establish liaison with the Board of Assessors to encourage and assist landowners qualifying for agricultural assessment under Chapter 61A program.
6. Publish an advisory pamphlet on Conservation Restrictions and assist land owners interested in preserving their open space by such methods.

7. Expand agricultural utilization program.

8. Support proposed State pilot program of public purchase of development rights to agricultural land.

9. Continue to press for a northern alignment solution to Route 2 and the recycling of present Route 2 into a Town road and major regional artery into Lincoln’s conservation land.

10. Cooperate with the Commonwealth and the Walden Pond Restoration Committee in the re-routing of Route 126.

11. Cooperate in Cambridge Reservoir watershed protection efforts.

12. Participate actively in our regional solid waste management program.


14. Cooperate with Minute Man National Historical Park as it becomes a major tourist attraction.

15. Studies:
   a. Present to March Town Meeting, in conjunction with the Board of Water Commissioners, a proposal for a study of protection of the Tower Road Well Watershed area and obtain necessary funding authorization for the study. Begin study
   b. Begin study of the Chapter 61A (agricultural) and Chapter 61 (forestry) assessment programs as they apply to landowners in Lincoln.
   c. Support and work with the Planning Board on their Neighborhood Lot Open Space Program.
   d. Study parking problem created by out-of-town users of conservation lands.
   e. Devise a clear working system of insuring the privacy of landowners adjacent to conservation land and trails, and upgrade existing trails which have become overgrown or in need of re-routing.

YEAR TWO

1. Propose acquisition of additional parcels estimated at $1.5 million.

2. At special Town Meeting (October/November and/or December) continue proposals for specific land purchases.

3. Apply for State and Federal reimbursement funds on acquired land, where applicable.

4. Notify owners of land qualifying for agricultural and forest assessments under Chapters 61A and 61, respectively, and assist in applications.

5. Continue program of assisting landowners in applying for conservation restrictions.
6. Studies:
   a. Begin study of possible forest management program to be undertaken on selected conservation land.
   b. Along with the School Committee and Planning Board study possibility of leasing part of the Smith School complex for recreational oriented activities related to use of conservation land.
   c. Study demand for additional trails and new trails on newly acquired lands and construct determined trails.
   d. Continue study of Tower Road well watershed and support request for additional funding, if necessary.
   e. Continue study of various herbicides and pesticides and their environmental effects to determine those best suited for use on Conservation Commission managed agricultural lands.

YEAR THREE

1. Continue land acquisition program.
2. Apply for State and Federal funding for qualifying acquisitions.
3. Continue assistance program for Chapter 61A and Chapter 61 assessments.
4. Continue conservation restriction assistance program.
5. Continue Town well watershed study.
6. Continue pilot forestry projects.
7. Continue trail expansion as needed.
8. Encourage increased organized summer outdoor programs utilizing conservation lands.

YEAR FOUR

1. Complete original land acquisition program by vote at Town Meeting on specific sites.
2. Continue conservation restriction assistance program.
3. Continue pilot forestry projects.
4. Design small parking areas to provide access to conservation lands.

YEAR FIVE

1. Continue expanded trail system.
2. Begin construction of small parking areas to provide access to conservation lands while controlling number of users of lands by limiting number of parking spaces.
3. Expand those pilot forestry projects which are deemed compatible with the goals of conservation.
4. Update Lincoln’s Open Space Plan.
This report summarizes the status of privately held undeveloped land in Lincoln and the potential effects of future development and land acquisition on population and property taxes. The report analyzes the cost to the Town of buying and placing the land in conservation and provides methods for creative development. The report also discusses public access and use of open space, trails, methods of protecting open space, historic values, zoning and septic system regulations.

As a result of a Town vote in 1977, two research programs were launched, the Neighborhood Land Program and the Open Space Program. The Neighborhood Land Program focused on the smaller undeveloped parcels (10 acres or less) that could be developed without further approval of the Planning Board and the Open Space Program addressed larger tracts of undeveloped land.

A. Goals for establishing the status of all undeveloped land in Lincoln
   1. Parcels were clearly identified as to location, acreage, owner, wetlands, etc.
   2. Intentions of owner were sought regarding the future disposition of their land.

B. Criteria for Open Space Program
   1. A place in the Lincoln Conservation Plan: its position and importance within the overall concept, its area, and its relationship to conservation areas of neighboring communities.
   2. The quality and accessibility of the land for public use, under Conservation Commission criteria for public use, including trail easements.
   3. The productivity of the land for farm and forestry products.
   5. Wetlands and watershed lands for water storage and protection of public water supplies.

C. Criteria for Neighborhood Land Program
   1. Representation from all neighborhoods (eight)
   2. Owners convey their intentions of the land considering 100% valuation.
   3. Neighbors evaluate interest in parcels most likely to be developed based on trails, visual aspects, recreational needs, open space requirements, wildlife, general conservation, historical assets.
Land of Potential Town Acquisition Interest (as of October 15, 1977)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP I</th>
<th>GROUP II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donaldson, D.O., Jr., Adm. (1)</td>
<td>Todd Pond-Tower Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Pond Trust (1)</td>
<td>West side of pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Pond Trust (1)</td>
<td>North side of pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snider (1)</td>
<td>Lincoln Rd-Mackintosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbrella (1)</td>
<td>South Great-Tower Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ACRES:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bedford Road</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUP I VALUE:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bedford Road</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP III</th>
<th>GROUP II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams, J. O.</td>
<td>Old Concord Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks (2)</td>
<td>Bedford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (1)</td>
<td>Storey Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Edison</td>
<td>South Great Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowles</td>
<td>Lexington Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, E.</td>
<td>Old Concord Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caspian</td>
<td>Old Concord Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coburn (1)</td>
<td>Tower Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cope</td>
<td>Silver Hill Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delormandie, P.</td>
<td>Page-Tappah Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delormandie, T.W.K.</td>
<td>Cambridge Turnpike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danosky</td>
<td>Acorn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Arrigo</td>
<td>Cambridge Turnpike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, P.</td>
<td>Conant Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, P. (2)</td>
<td>Conant Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, P. (2)</td>
<td>Conant Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey (2)</td>
<td>Lincoln Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey (2)</td>
<td>Lincoln Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dooley</td>
<td>Old Concord Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ACRES:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lexington Road</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUP II VALUE:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lexington Road</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Parcels with creative development potential hence capable of protection at less cost than if acquired by the Town.
2. Land of Neighborhood Interest.
F. Use of Conservation Land

1. Limit to recreation that does not require permanent structures or motorized vehicles.
2. Hiking, riding, skiing, and nature study are to be encouraged, while use by trail bikes or snowmobiles is incompatible with Town desires.
3. Establish methods for limiting over use or damage to conservation land.
4. Some people feel that the use of open space should be limited to residents, particularly in cases where the Town has provided the entire funds for its purchase and maintenance. Others feel there is a regional responsibility to share the open space. Moreover, Massachusetts law apparently holds that, while (within limits) Town residents may be given parking preference and while the total number of users of conservation land may be limited, the Town cannot discriminate against out-of-town residents in the use of municipal land - even if the land was acquired without state and federal aid.

Along with Land of Conservation Interest should also include features of historical value including: old cart paths and roads, cellar holes, old houses, stone walls, abandoned wells, earthen dams or brooks, 200-year old ditches, 17th century Concord, Cambridge and Watertown boundaries, mill sites, limestone and bog iron mines, kilns and old dumps.

E. Methods for conserving land

5. Purchase for Protection by Private Interests
6. Conservation Restriction in Perpetuity
7. Public Purchase
8. Gift of Land
9. Decreasing Assessment
10. Agricultural Restrictions
11. Direct Tax Payment Assistance
12. Limited-term Conservation Restriction
13. Lease of Development Rights
14. Land-use Regulations
15. Creative development

This report also lists existing and possible new parking areas.
1983 –Route to Tomorrow: Challenges and Choices

“Route 2 and town-wide traffic are urgent issues for Lincoln. Attended by over 500 people, 'Route to Tomorrow' marked a beginning in the consensus-building process essential for effective planning to resolve these and other land use questions. The Planning Board appointed an eight-member committee whose threefold charge was: to prepare and distribute pertinent background information, design a format which would encourage community participation and to compile a record of the proceedings. The committee published a 103 page pre-conference workbook with reports and maps prepared by several individuals and committees. The morning conference focused on regional pressures including, Route 2, development in North Lincoln, and traffic. The afternoon session concentrated on housing and open space.”

A. Conference highlights

B. Route 2
   1. Concerns included isolation of North Lincoln residents and safety of existing Route 2.
   2. Majority of people preferred relocating Route 2.
   3. In the event of a relocation, the state should downgrade the present Route 2 to a local road.

C. Future Development in North Lincoln
   1. Northern alignment of Route 2 would have to precede any commercial rezoning.
   2. Some felt conflict between supporting a northern alignment and leaving residentially zoned a 47-acre triangle of land between Massport and Minute Man National Historic Park.
   3. Lincoln should 'think big and go ahead and buy the 47 acres'.

D. Responsibility to Landowners
   1. Equitable solutions should be sought, and compensation offered.
   2. Town should 'get busy with plans for North Lincoln and decide which parcels should be developed or not'.

E. Housing
   1. Continue the town's present policies of providing some moderate income housing and preserving open space.
   2. Maintain housing commission rather than a housing authority.
3. Preference for scattered site development. However some sites for development included the Umbrello land, conversion of Hartwell School, and construction near Lincoln Woods.

4. Identify housing needs of various groups.

5. Accessory apartments were, by far, the preferred alternative.

6. Creative approaches to funding scattered site housing included large house conversions, cluster zoning of small houses, the purchase and relocation of existing houses, scattered rental housing, congregate housing and low-cost housing units in future subdivisions.

7. Tax incentives to encourage development of diverse housing, for example, subsidies for installation costs, low-cost loans or tax shelters for developers of subsidized housing.

F. Open Space
   1. Strong support for the town's open space plan and land management program.
   2. Continue to acquire land of conservation interest, particularly for agricultural and watershed protection purposes.
   3. Minority felt the town had acquired enough land and money should be spent elsewhere.

G. Land Management
   1. Endorsed Conservation Commission's program, wanting good management of the land but not a 'manicured' or 'too neat' appearance.
   3. Trails are great and 'Kudos to the rangers'.

H. Questionnaire Analysis
   1. On each issue, more than half the people responding to the questionnaires checked either 'critical' or 'important'.
   2. More than 80% always or usually attend Town Meetings (Town-wide participation in Town Meetings is about 50% of adult residents).
   3. Older age groups are well represented; those under 35 are not, but 35-44 age group has the highest representation.
   4. Profile reflects the absence of younger residents and dwellers in condos, apartments, or other housing.
   5. 80% of respondents favor the northern realignment for Route 2.
   6. 62% favors development only under Lincoln control and even more strongly agrees (84%) that adequate access is essential before any development occurs.
   7. Most popular traffic control is closing a road to divert traffic. Also, make certain streets one-way. Traffic signals are a 'no-go'.
8. 58% support the revised open space plan outlined in conference booklet, and 22% more support it with modifications (unspecified).

9. Watershed and farmland are first (66%) and second (64%) choices in the total tally of responses.

10. Mixed tax and private donations is clearly the most popular method of financing land acquisitions. A tax increase of at least $.50/1000 to pay for land is acceptable to 53%.

11. All current land management practices are favored by more than a majority of all respondents, in the following order: active agriculture, conservation rangers, trail maintenance, clear field edges, woodland management, fire vehicle access, and income forestry work.

12. Support town's policy of continuing to seek housing alternatives. Favor accessory apartments, and rehabilitate housing, town boards favored new construction.

13. No preference for any financing method is apparent.

14. Long-range planning priorities include; traffic, Route 2, land issues, future development of 47 acres between Massport and Minuteman, and low and moderate income housing.
“The League of Women Voters of Lincoln is a strong advocate of land-use planning which includes not only the preservation of open space but also provisions to encourage population diversity, especially for low and moderate income housing. The Town has added substantially to its conservation land in the last few years, but it has been less successful in its attempts to make affordable housing available in Lincoln.”

A. Introduction / History
   2. History of Moderate Income Housing in Lincoln.
      a. 1965 By-70 Plan recommended increased use of clustering and higher density developments to achieve better use of land and greater economic and social diversification of the population.
      b. 1967 Moderate Income Action Committee formed to study housing needs,
      c. 1968 Report of Moderate Income Housing Committee concluded that more ‘efficient’ housing types, such as apartments or row houses, are needed for older families, young families and town employees.
      d. 1968 Lincoln Foundation was organized in November to produce, maintain, operate, and finance housing in Lincoln.
      e. 1969 Chapter 774, the ‘snob zoning law,’ passed by state legislature. Allows a developer to override local zoning in certain cases to provide subsidized housing,
      g. 1971 Rural Land Foundation, a charitable trust founded in 1965 to combine conservation and development creatively to preserve open spaces, helped to purchase a large portion of the Codman Estate for housing purposes.
      h. 1972 Accessory apartment by-law, Section 14, added with the special purpose of encouraging units for people of low and moderate income.
i. 1972 A new zoning by-law, R-4, Planned Community Development, was added and applied to the Codman land. The Lincoln Foundation developed Lincoln Woods on 70 acres of land bought with the help of the Rural Land Foundation from the Codman Estate.

j. 1976 Lincoln Woods opened with 125 units, half subsidized, half market value.

k. 1977 Land Use Conference. Participants expressed many concerns about the housing situation which led to the appointment of a Housing Committee the following year.

l. 1978 Housing Committee, appointed by the selectmen, published a housing inventory for Lincoln.

m. 1978 Accessory apartment by-law liberalized.

n. 1979 Housing Commission created on recommendation of Housing Committee.

o. 1979 Selectmen signed the Area Wide Housing Opportunity Plan.

p. 1981 A parcel of land owned by the Umbrellos was purchased and held for the town by the Rural Land Foundation. Housing Commission developed a plan for 45 units of mixed market and subsidized housing in cluster zoning. This proposal was turned down by Town Meeting.

q. 1982 A second proposal by Housing Commission to build 30 units on the Umbrello land fell short of the necessary two-thirds majority by only 24 votes.

r. 1984 A third attempt at developing the Umbrello parcel, this time for the elderly by Lincoln Community Homes. A privately sponsored group. The proposal, to build fewer houses in clusters, defeated at March Town Meeting.

s. 1984 Housing Commission held initial neighborhood meeting concerning a parcel of Sandy Pond Trust land, which was not of conservation interest. Strong neighborhood opposition to a partly subsidized housing development caused the Housing Commission to abandon their plans. Land went to a private developer.

t. 1985 Rural Land Foundation decided to sell Umbrello land to developer, leaving some acres in conservation.

u. 1985 Codman Farmhouse, developed by Housing Commission into congregate housing for four elderly persons, opened for occupancy.

v. 1985 Accessory apartment by-law (Sect 14) amended to provide for larger additions and larger apartments than ordinarily allowed if the owner agrees to rent
to persons of low or moderate income under the auspices of the Housing Commission for 5 years.

B. Survey Highlights
   1. 1977 From a survey of 485 over 60 residents, 248 were returned: property tax was a burden, considerable interest in rental housing, both standard and subsidized, within walking distance of South Lincoln.
   2. 1979 Survey of 2000, 821 returned: 50% felt below-market housing should be provided.
   3. 1982 88% of 73% town wide return owned their house.
   4. 1895 Of 62 town employees, 46% would like to move to Lincoln.

C. Housing Needs
   1. Low and Moderate Lincoln elderly,
   2. People who work in Lincoln,
   3. 'tax-squeezed' Lincoln elderly,
   4. Low and moderate Lincoln families,
   5. Single-parent Lincoln families,
   6. Minorities and young families,
   7. Low and moderate income non-Lincoln elderly and families,
   8. Hanscom workers.

D. Statistics
   1. In early 1985, lowest price house was $190,000.
   2. Older condos cost between $140,000 and $160,000.
   3. In 1985 salaries for teachers were $16,000 starting to $32,000 with 16 years exp.
   4. In 1985 subsidized housing income eligibility was $12,000 and 23,700.

E. Solutions
   1. Put housing on town-owned land.
   2. Use land in North Lincoln taken for Route 2 realignment.
   3. Create a reserve account to acquire appropriate properties.
   4. Levy a local sales tax on real estate transactions.
   5. Create a 'Housing Trust' modeled after LLCT.
   6. Encourage tax-exempt land owners to lease land to Lincoln for housing.
   7. Trade conservation land for housing.
   8. Develop affordable housing near Hanscom that is considered for commercial/industrial.
9. Investigate public and private funding mechanisms.
10. Follow up with plan for tax shelters presented to Housing Committee in 1978.
11. Town owns land, but sells development rights to builder.
12. Federal, State or local rent subsidies to offer accessory apartments.
13. Acquire a paid staff person for the Housing Commission for administering housing.

F. Laws and Policies affecting Housing
   2. Areawide Housing Opportunities Plan (AHOP).
   4. R-2 General Residence District.
   5. Special Housing Provisions.
   6. R-4 Planned Community Development District.
   7. Development Bonus.
   8. Accessory Apartments in an R-1 District.
   9. Agencies: HUD, EOCD, MHFA, MAPC

G. Town Owned Property
   1. 18-6-0 Sanitary Land Fill 36.6 Acres.
   2. 41-2-0 Tax Title 1.37 Acres.
   3. 35-4-0 Tax Title 2.37 Acres.
   4. 29-26-0 School Property 53.91 Acres.
   5. 65-18-0 Pierce Park 30.0 Acres.
1986 – Report of the Roadside Path Master Plan Committee

“The roadside path committee was established by the Planning Board in September 1985 in response to concerns regarding the original master plan for roadside paths that was developed in 1975 and updated in 1977.”

A. General need for roadside paths

B. Design Standards for paths
   1. Use for walkers, joggers, children on bikes, and casual bicyclists.
   2. Not used by high-speed bicyclists – considerations should be given to widening paved shoulders beyond white lines to safely accommodate high-speed bicyclists.
   3. Asphalt is the most practical surface for a roadside path for maintenance and safety.
   4. For safety, paths should have clear sightlines and be well separated from the road.
   5. Abutting residents should be considered throughout stages of path construction.
   6. Important to maintain liaisons with other town organizations.

C. Proposed roadside paths
   1. Rt. 117, from Rt. 126 to Mt. Misery Park, 3/10 of a mile.
   2. Rte 126, from Baker Bridge Road to Walden Pond, 7/10 of a mile.
   3. Bedford Road, from 2-2A, 8/10 of a mile.
   4. Codman Road from Lincoln Rd. to Rt. 126, 6/10 of a mile long.
   5. Drumlín Farm, Rte. 117 from Codman Rd to Lincoln Rd.
   6. Baker Bridge Road, Sandy Pond Road, Weston Road
   7. Connection from Page Road to Lexington Road
   8. Foot path from Sandy Pond Road to schools
   9. Rte 117 from Tower Road to Weston line.
   10. Rt. 2A, Conant Road, Silver Hill Road, Tower Road, Winter Street
   11. Lincoln Road from Rt. 117 to Wayland town line

D. Criteria for determining Path Priorities
   1. Safety, Connection, Access, Cost, Abutters, Questionnaire, Construction and Maintenance
1988 – An Interim Report on the Open Space Plan for the Town of Lincoln

“The present document is concerned with implementation; the management of land already secured, and the acquisition or the security by restriction of land of conservation interest now under private ownership.”

A. Introduction
   1. Over 100 of the 1400 acres so designated have been acquired or otherwise protected.
   2. Another 400 acres have been temporarily protected through CR's or APR's.
   3. Protection of other land may be expected through R-1 Cluster Development with its provision for at least 35% in Open Land, or by R-3 Open Space Residential Development with its provision for at least 70% in Open Land.
   4. Estimated in 1977 that Lincoln's land of conservation interest was valued at $7.5 million.
   5. $4.5 million would be required to complete the task.

B. The Pattern of Open Space
   1. North of Route 2.
      a. 90.59 acres of town-owned conservation land,
      b. 182 acres marked for conservation interest, of which 50-60 are not wetland,
      c. Significant segment of high land – 30 acres bordering Route 2.
   2. West of Concord Road (Rte 126 to the Town Line).
      a. Land of interest is directly tied to existing conservation areas including: Mt. Misery, Concord Land Conservation Trust, Walden State Park, U.S Fish and Wildlife preserve along Sudbury River, Militzer Field and land around Farrar Pond,
      b. Focus is on creating travel corridors between these major conservation areas,
      c. 230 acres of town-owned conservation land,
      d. 4 acres of Lincoln Land Conservation Trust land,
      e. 36.4 acres owned by Farrar Village Conservation Trust,
      f. 37 acres belongs to Old Concord Road Trust, operating under Chapter 61A,
      g. 12 acres owned by Irma Kistiakowski,
      h. 68 acres south of Farrar Pond beginning at the dam owned by the Winchell's.
   3. Land east of Concord Road, West of Bedford, Lincoln and Tower Roads.
      a. Currently water supply and their watersheds, the schools, the Town offices and Library, and Lincoln Woods housing developments,
b. 720 acres of town and LLCT-owned conservation land,
c. 197 acres owned by Sandy Pond Trust,
d. 5.46 acres northeast of Sandy Pond, owned by Mrs. Donald Forg,
e. 3.32 acres northeast of Sandy Pond, owned by Richard Graddis,
f. 1.2 acres belonging to A. Payne,
g. 14.25 acres owned by Mrs. Greta Snider, for immediate sale,
h. 7.5 acres owned by J. and E. Lennon, mostly wetland,
i. 32 acres belonging to the Donaldson family and 47 acres to the Umbrello family,
j. 107 acres, partially under Chapter 61A owned by Hans Van Leer.

   a. Area that falls away southerly from the Cemetery neighborhood near Iron Mine Brook extending to the town line,
   b. 127 acres owned by the Lincoln Land Conservation Trust,
   c. Pierce Park and the adjacent playground owned by the town,
   d. 83.5 acres owned by the Flint's,
   e. 40 acres of open fields owned by the Flint's,
   f. 25 acres owned by the DeNormandie's under Chapter 61A,
   g. Property owned by the Cannon's.
   h. 24.31 acres near the center of the valley, owned by Mrs. Gardner Quarton,
   i. 25 acres owned by the Hunsaker's,
   j. A large parcel owned by Winthrop Harrington,
   k. 14.25 acres of the Harrington's,
   l. 43.78 acres owned by J. Irving Connolly and sons considered for R-1 subdivision,
   m. 11 acres owned by the Coburn's under Chapter 61A.

5. East of Page, Silver Hill and Weston Roads to the Town line.
   a. Drainage area toward Valley Pond,
   b. 90 acres owned by the town and LLCT,
   c. 70.42 acres owned by the Stratford Realty Corporation,
   d. 62 acres owned by the Jerodel Realty Trust.

C. Natural Resources

1. Water.
   a. Sandy Pond,
   b. Tower Road well,
c. Other well sites including the Winchell and Lennon land,
d. Other alternatives are limited.

2. Land Resources.
   a. Farmland: 150 acres currently rented to active farmers,
   b. 150 acres of abandoned farmland the could return to production or forest,
   c. Woodland: majority of remainder of conservation land.

3. Physical Resources.
   a. 700 acres of town-owned woodland in Lincoln consisting of wetland (200 acres), ledge outcrop (25 acres) and forest land (450 acres),
   b. Still 800 wooded acres of conservation interest in private hands.

D. Trail System
   a. 30 miles of trails going through varied terrain including wooded hills, lowlands, edges of ponds and swamps, orchards and fields,
   b. Extends over land owned by town (controlled by Conservation Commission), LLCT, private institutions, and private ownership,
   c. Uses intended for passive recreation including walking, hiking, riding, skiing, kite flying, bird watching, nature study, etc.
   d. Current parking is for 25 cars off 117 near Farrar Pond,
   e. Need additional parking near Route 2.
   f. Supervision and maintenance is the responsibility of the Conservation Commission.

E. Financial Burdens and Benefits
   a. Purchase price,
   b. Administration, management and maintenance,
   c. Opportunity cost or benefit,
   d. Resource value,
   e. Total cost of open space program in 1978 was projected at $132,000 or 3.7% of $3.7 million tax levy. Proposed program would raise 1978 level to $176,000 and would peak in 1985 at $293,000 and when added to present program would result in a total cost of $371,000 or 10.3% of present tax levy. From there, program burden would decrease as acquisition bonds are retired and conservation program costs would be contained within the 10% level.
   f. See Table 1: Annual Fiscal Impact of $3 Million Acquisition Program and Table 2: Ten Year Conservation Program Cost Projections.
1988 – Evaluation of 5 Town-owned Properties for Potential Affordable Housing
K.E. Alexander & Associates, Inc. for the Lincoln Housing Commission

“With one exception, only a small portion of each property is considered as a potential housing site. It is recommended that the current use(s) and visual perceptions of four properties be retained, with housing introduced as an additional use.”

A. Town Barn Property
   1. Single site and therefore the exception to the above
   2. Excellent site for housing but the current uses would require relocation
   3. Location
      a. South Lincoln near shopping and commuter rail station.
   4. Site Conditions
      b. Suitable soils for septic and no constraining wetlands.
      c. Vegetation on the southeast boundary buffers neighboring house lots.
      d. 10" water main in Lincoln Road and 6" water main in Codman Road connected by a 6" loop in Lewis Street and Town Barn Road.
      e. Direct vehicular access from Lewis Street and Town Barn Road.
   5. Conclusions
      a. Ideal for housing.
      b. With one exception, the abutters' rear yards are adjacent to the site.
      c. Presence of Town Barn and its light industrial use is not the best use for the site.
      d. 20-24 dwellings, arranged as three or four dwellings per townhouse, seem reasonable. If limited to two or three dwellings per building, approximately 16-20 homes could be accommodated.
      e. Currently property is fully utilized and not available unless a new location for vehicle and material storage is found and repair facilities constructed.

B. Mill Street Property
   1. Single potential housing site
   2. Location
      a. North Lincoln near I-95 and Route 2A.
      b. Access to regional highways but further from school and center.
3. Site Conditions
   a. Zoned R-1, single-family residential.
   b. Suitable soils for septic but constraining wetlands.
   c. Capped land fill currently used as a solid waste transfer station.
   d. Site is buffered from current and prior uses by trees and vegetation.
   e. Minuteman Tech is located to the east, National Historic Park is to the north.
   f. 8" water main located in the Mill Street with adequate capacity and pressure.

4. Conclusions
   a. Rezone to a modified R-4 zone.
   b. Family housing is more suitable than elderly housing.
   c. Park and/or recreational activities could take place on capped landfill.
   d. Siting of other DPW activities may be appropriate.
   e. Approximately 20-30 dwellings can be accommodated on the site in 3-4 townhouse type structures. The presence of wetlands could reduce this estimate.

C. School Property
   1. Two potential housing sites north of Codman pool with access from Sandy Pond Road
   2. Location
      a. In historic Lincoln.
      b. Close proximity to school and library.
      c. One mile from mall and commuter rail by Lincoln Road.
   3. Site Conditions
      a. Zoned R-1.
      b. Suitable soils for septic but constraining wetlands.
      c. Viable school use is difficult to envision.
      d. Challenging slopes: housing can better adapt to the site than educational uses.
      e. Bedrock may hamper construction.
      f. Water mains are located in Sandy Pond Road and on school grounds.
   4. Conclusions
      a. Rezoning will be required.
      b. The site along Sandy Pond Road could be a single building with 3-4 dwellings.
      c. The larger site could accommodate 3-4 buildings each with 3-4 dwellings.
      d. Architectural and site design is important due to the proximity to schools.
e. Siting of other DPW activities may be appropriate.
f. Wetlands must be carefully evaluated.

D. Pierce Property

1. Two potential housing sites
2. Location
   a. In Historic District.
   b. Close proximity to schools and library.
   c. One mile from mall and commuter rail by Lincoln Road.
   d. Center School site and Upper Woods site are considered, not meadow.
3. Site Conditions
   a. Zoned R-1.
   b. Largest buildable land area of all sites.
   c. Suitable soils for septic but constraining wetlands.
4. Conclusions
   a. Rezoning will be required.
   b. Center School site would be accessed by Lincoln Road.
   c. Center School site is good for mixed-use development: one option is to retain
      Town Offices and introduce housing behind the building, the other is to convert
      the school building into elderly apartments.
   d. Upper Woods Site would be located to the south and west of the Pierce House.
   e. A 3-4 acre site could be delineated for housing, while maintaining buffers.
   f. Vehicular access to Upper Woods is from Weston Road.
   g. Two sites suggest potential joint use facilities.

E. Codman Farm Property

1. Three potential housing sites
2. Currently used for farm activity
3. Location
   a. South Lincoln near commuter rail station.
   b. In Historic District.
4. Site Conditions
   a. Zoned R-1.
   b. Suitable soils for septic but constraining wetlands.
c. A 10 inch water main is Lincoln Road and an 8 inch water main in Codman Rd.
d. Point site is in the northernmost point of the farm. Access is from Codman Road.
e. Farmstead site would add house to existing barn and farm house cluster.
f. Service Station site utilizes the abandoned ROW along Lincoln Road.

5. Conclusions
   a. Town would need to approve use of site.
   b. Town must approve dwelling and site design.
   c. All sites could be used for elderly or family housing. Point site and the Service Station Site could accommodate 16 homes each.
“Formal planning for expanded housing opportunities in Lincoln goes back to 1967, when a Moderate Income Action Committee was formed. This Committee found that market conditions had constricted housing opportunities for persons of low and moderate income and recommended the formation of a local non-profit corporation that could use State and Federal housing funds. The result was the Lincoln Foundation.”

A. Introduction

1. History of Affordable Housing in Lincoln.
   a. 1967 Moderate Income Action Committee formed,
   b. 1976 Lincoln Woods developed with 125 cooperative apartments,
   c. 1979 Lincoln Housing Commission was created and charged with preserving and increasing the supply of affordable housing in Lincoln,
   d. 1986 Battle Road Farm developed with 72 affordable homes.

2. Constraints on the Development of Affordable Housing.
   a. economics of the private real estate market,
   b. local environmental factors including limited water supply, septic requirements, regional and local aquifer protection, and desire to preserve rural character,
   c. present financial and administrative realities, particularly because the housing commission does not have access to State or Federal funds.

B. Housing Stock and Housing Need

1. Lincoln’s Affordable Housing Stock is 10% of present stock (including Battle Road Farm). Includes: two single-family houses, Codman Farmhouse Shared living (4 people), one accessory apartment, one single-family house subsidized by the Cooperative for Human Services, Lincoln Woods (125 units), and Battle Road Farm (72 units).

2. Lincoln’s Shortage of Affordable Housing.
   a. supply of smaller houses continues to decrease with expansions,
   b. rising rents,
   c. impracticality of Town purchasing smaller houses outright.

3. Summary of Current Need
   a. elderly persons, singles or couples, needing affordable rental housing,
b. elderly persons needing affordable housing with on-site services, including supervised congregate and assisted living,
c. families needing affordable rental housing, with or without on-site services.

C. Housing Goals in Order of Priority (adopted by Housing Commission, Board of Selectmen, Planning Board and Conservation Commission)

1. Administer Town’s existing housing programs fairly, effectively, and efficiently.
2. Provide timely information regarding potential housing sites, types of housing needed in Lincoln, appropriate program models (and site and design guidelines) and ways of funding the creation and operation of needed housing to guide housing decisions made by the Town, developers and/or individuals.
3. Increase the supply of subsidized housing for those in greatest need, particularly low-income families, low and moderate-income elderly, and persons with special needs.
4. Continue to support the creation of affordable housing by the private market through creative zoning approaches and other available means.

D. Action Plan for Lincoln

1. Effectively Administer Housing Programs.
   a. Provide staff support to the Housing Commission to administer existing programs, handle correspondence and clerical work, and assist with research, program development, planning and proposals, either from Town budget or other sources.
   b. Seek adequate appropriations from Town Meeting for professional housing management services, routine property maintenance, operating expenses and renovation when needed. Since rent receipts go into the Town’s General Fund, all housing operation expenses must be appropriated by Town Meeting vote.
   c. Apply for grants to assist the Town in achieving its housing goals.
   d. Reevaluate the benefits of a Housing Authority in the light of current economic conditions. If and when appropriate, propose to Town Meeting that a Housing Authority be established so the Town may receive State and Federal funds for staff support, program subsidies, research and new projects.
   e. Evaluate alternative entities such as local or regional non-profit housing corporations when appropriate.

2. Provide Timely Information.
   a. Make a detailed assessment of the housing needs in Lincoln and surrounding region in order to identify areas of highest priority.
b. Complete initial analysis of the five potential housing sites owned by the Town.
c. Complete the inventory of privately owned land that is suitable for housing.
d. Develop site selection guidelines.
e. Work with community and regional groups to develop program models, funding sources, specific proposals, and Town Meeting support.

3. Increase Supply of Subsidized Housing.
   a. Continue to work with Lincoln House Association and E.O.C.D. to acquire 6 rental units at Battle Road Farm and to preserve them as family rental units available to eligible low and moderate-income families.
   b. Pursue public/private sources of financing for options, property acquisition, rehabilitation and construction. Support the use of funds generated by such vehicles for affordable housing as well as for conservation and other municipal purposes.
   c. Establish procedure and responsibility for negotiating purchase options and rights of first refusal for land and property suitable for housing.
   d. Acquire excess D.P.W. lots from the State at prices consistent with their housing potential. Work with Minuteman Tech to construct housing units.
   e. Explore various methods of providing housing subsidies or rent vouchers.
   f. Based on the Housing Commission’s current understanding of need, three programs are viewed as critical at this time: elderly rental units; rental units for persons with some degree of mental disability; and low and moderate-income family rentals.
   g. With Lincoln Woods Board, study methods for insuring that Lincoln Woods units will remain permanently affordable after 2016.

   a. Continue to work with Lincoln House Associates, Lincoln Foundation, and E.D.C.O to assure the success of Battle Road Farm and the long-term affordability of all 72 H.O.P. units there.
   b. Continue to work with private developers wishing to provide low and moderate income housing in exchange for support for zoning changes requested.
   c. Draft and propose an inclusionary zoning bylaw that requires the provision of needed affordable housing, land or property donation, or direct contribution of housing funds by developers.
   d. Prepare a developer’s information kit so developers have adequate information regarding Lincoln’s commitment to affordable housing, funding sources, tax
benefits, financing methods, impact on market price, etc. Educate local and regional businesses about Lincoln’s housing goals and their potential roles.

e. Clarify and simplify the procedures for developing affordable accessory apartments. Provide guidelines, education and support to homeowners interested in renting accessory apartments to low and moderate-income persons. Propose bylaw changes when appropriate.

E. Appendix

1. Table I – Lincoln’s Housing Stock.
2. Table II – Lincoln’s Housing Stock, Battle Road Farm Completed.
3. Table III – Income Levels & Affordable Housing Costs: An Overview
4. State Legislation Establishing Lincoln’s Housing Commission
5. Preliminary Guidelines for Site Selection and Planning
   a. Sites selected for housing shall be distributed throughout Town.
   b. Sites for those needing accessible resources shall be located nearby South Lincoln, eastern section of Route 2A, and Lincoln Center.
   c. Sites selected should enable housing to be produced at the lowest possible per unit cost and with the lowest possible subsidies over time. Slope, soils, access, water supply, neighborhood character, and energy efficiency will be considered through planning process.
   d. Selected sites will enable housing to be placed in such a way as to minimize impacts on abutters and housing will be planned to provide buffers, screens, open space or trails that enhance neighborhoods.
   e. Income levels will be mixed, either within a housing development or in relation to the neighborhood where the housing is located.
   f. When possible and appropriate, ages and family types will be mixed.
   g. Planning for selected sites will address affirmative action targets, local preference provisions, and the needs of families with handicapped members.
"Lincoln Logs the Future has continued the tradition of citizens planning for Lincoln's future. The building blocks remain essentially the same: time, thoughtfulness, creativity, shared goals, and commitment. However, each time the resulting edifice looks different. Discussion topics at the conference included government structure, town and human services, land use, education, the region, and finances."

A. DiaLogs for Lincoln at 250

"Naturally, when new names and new ways come into old towns, there is a temporary dislocation felt by both parties. The old residents who value and continue the ways and standards of their ancestors may be anxious and disturbed. The newcomers, brought up under different conditions, may not be quite prepared to live on old-time country principles. We felt this in our town [Concord], as doubtless you do here. Now as we went through all this – as you are doing now – and seem to be coming through pretty well, I trust to your good nature to let me say a few words to the new and old elements. First to the old stock: We found that the new infusion, coming in, as it did gradually enough to be assimilated, did us good. In loyal pride in the town, and in zealous and unpaid service of her interests, many of the newcomers have vied with the best of the old leaders. More than that, they have waked up and contributed good ideas and methods. Most of them have honored the best standards of the old town, yet these must grow and broaden with that growth. So give the newcomers a welcome and a chance. Now to the new settlers may I say: Do not come to Lincoln to enjoy its quiet, its air, and its scenery, and lead your lives apart from it. Live in a simple country town in simple country ways, and don't spoil the place by enhancing class distinctions and living in a style which may make your neighbors uncomfortable. There are many wholesome lessons to be learned from a fine independent old New England village: to serve yourselves more, and to come into sound and helpful touch with town affairs. Learn the sweetness of good neighborhood." – Dr. Edward Waldo Emerson at the banquet held in celebration of Lincoln's 150th anniversary in 1904.

B. Summary

1. Thoughts on Lincoln.
   a. How much service is proper for Lincoln's human services portion of town govt.?
   b. How do our schools relate to other schools?
   c. How do we prepare our children for a changing world?
   d. Do we accept the responsibility for shaping our children into tomorrow's leaders?
   e. What will 'educated' mean in 2004, how will we measure it, what are our standards?
   f. What actions should we take to get to our Lincoln of 2004?

2. What is a Community?
   a. caring, concern, children, cooperation, communication, commonality, citizenship, contribution.

3. A Vision of Lincoln at 250.
   a. High quality of education,
   b. Value of volunteerism,
   c. Rural character retained,
d. Regionalization of some municipal services,
e. Traffic control improved,
f. Affordable taxes,
g. Affordable housing,
h. Elderly housing,
i. New sources of revenues found,
j. Recycling the norm,
k. Farming revitalization,
l. Citizen task forces used to address issues,
m. Community center available,

n. Schools center of activity for all ages,
o. Lincoln a 'Model Community',
p. Pride in Town Meeting,
q. Cooperative town spirit,
r. Appreciation for diversity,
s. Value of townwide conference process,
t. Day care provided,
u. Hovercraft school buses,
v. In town transport on mail vans,
w. Privatization by franchise of local school,
x. Computerized traffic surveillance,
y. No loss of students to private schools.

   a. Resolution of town finances,
b. Volunteerism,
c. Housing issues,
d. School issues,
e. Community center,
f. Renewal of community spirit,
g. Elderly issues,
h. Regionalization,
i. Communication improvements.
C. CataLog of a Process

1. Blueprinting Expectations.
   a. How do we adapt to change while retaining what we most value?
   b. How do we balance tax burden and need for services?
   c. What are our priorities for the future?
   d. How might we choose among them in a fiscal crunch?

2. Building the Platform.
   a. Want the town to remain basically the same,
   b. Wish to sustain the feelings of a close community,
   c. Preservation of open space and rural character,
   d. Support and regard for educational excellence,
   e. Affordable housing, excellent town services,
   f. Active role in addressing regional issues.

3. Selecting the Tools.
   a. More and better use of volunteers,
   b. Need for community center,
   c. Social and municipal forces need to be mutually reinforcing,
   d. Regional cooperation.

D. Planning Committee's EpiLog

1. Background

2. Recommendations
   a. Further institutionalization of the town's use of 'supplemental processes',
   b. Participatory management model,
   c. Task forces and project teams,

3. An Example – building a Community Center.
   a. Surveying the Territory,
   b. Site Preparation,
   c. Laying the Foundation,
   d. Finish work,

4. Structure of Town Government
   a. Work to achieve a higher level of efficiency,
   b. Diligent application of available tools,
   c. Town officials as moderators, facilitators and managers.
1998 – Article 7 Zoning Bylaw Study Committee

“Our Committee was initiated by the 1997 Town Meeting in response to a zoning bylaw amendment that was proposed by the Planning Board. Article 7 would have reduced the maximum gross floor area of homes from the existing limit of 25% of the lot size to a new limit of the greater of 8% of the lot size or 2,500 square feet. This controversial measure was intended by the Planning Board to address a perceived change in development patterns towards the construction of ever larger homes and the resulting loss of ’starter homes'. We were appointed by the Moderator to look at (1) the issue of the fairness of the treatment of nonconforming lots and structures under the Lincoln zoning bylaw and (2) the broad issue of the trend towards very large houses and its potential effect on Lincoln.”

A. Recommendations

1. Seek clarification of non-conforming lot policies and practices including dialogue with town boards, committees and key employees and make recommendations to the Planning Board for bylaw language changes to insure that Lincoln's policies are clear and consistently administered over time;
2. Broaden discussions about the trend to 'big houses' to increase awareness and encourage creative, community-based solutions. Examine possibility of a townwide conference on issues of town vision, affordable housing, and responses to the 'big house' trend.
3. Pursue fair, reasonable and creative solutions to the 'big house' trend that addresses the considerations in this report, including recommendations for future Town Meeting action.
4. Prepare and publish a set of non-building guidelines and educational materials for owners, builders, and/or developers which describe what we value about Lincoln in hopes that it will promote respect for the natural environment and consistency with the character and feel of Lincoln without prescribing aesthetic or dimensional requirements.
5. Examine workload of Planning Board to insure adequate time is allotted for long range planning, research, and an inclusive discussion process for new initiatives.
6. Examine current subdivision control laws, other regulations and current practices to insure that decisions regarding private and municipal development infrastructure reflect common aesthetic values.
7. Prompt completion of the town's computerization process so that the records of the Planning Board, Building Department, and Board of Assessors can be cross-referenced.

B. Introduction

1. Assessment of current land use and building trends must occur in the context of Lincoln's land use history and appreciation of its unique characteristics as a community.
   a. Rich traditions, agricultural heritage and rural character,
   b. Creatively protected open space,
   c. Diverse housing which has been sited to minimize disturbance to the land's natural contours and surrounding natural environment,
   d. High level of public spiritedness and community involvement.

2. Trend toward large, new homes.
   a. What exactly can community do to protect from new style of development?
   b. How can we embrace changing lifestyles and individual needs while preserving traditions and uniqueness?

C. Charting our Course

1. Concern about the unfair impact of Article 7 on rights of owners of legal, non-conforming lots and structures under the existing zoning bylaws and about exactly what the current rules and policies are that govern them;

2. Concern about a trend towards the building of very large homes and the potential impact such large homes will have on the feel and character of the town over time;
   a. Proximity to open space has significantly increased the value of land and property.
   b. Development costs are driven higher by scarcity and difficulty of developing remaining vacant but buildable land.
   c. Influence of additional marketplace demands is great.

3. Concern about the decreased supply of smaller and more affordable housing in Lincoln over time, due to expansions and renovations, and concomitant concern about the loss of diversity among local residents.

D. Building As of Right

1. Zoning bylaw currently permits the construction of very large homes and outbuildings without any town review – up to 25% of the lot area.

2. For example, on a standard 80,000 square foot lot, a home that meets setbacks and other zoning requirements could be as large as 20,000 square feet.

3. Typical homes in Lincoln range between 2,000 and 6,000 square feet.
E. Questionnaire Results

1. Less concern about large homes than homes that are out of scale or character with other homes in the neighborhood.
2. Older residents, no matter how long they have lived in Lincoln, felt most concerned.
3. Four neighborhood meetings confirmed that residents are concerned about 'big houses'.
4. Maintaining natural contours of land, leaving natural vegetated buffers and using native flora and stone contribute to a home's sense of belonging to its location.
5. Calculating the permitted size and contours of a new home based on buildable lot area, not of wetlands or other restrictions, might draw more attention and respect to the land's own natural features.

F. Solutions

1. Community should work to develop criteria to evaluate possible interventions.
2. Provide incentives to encourage specific outcomes.
3. Adjust regulations to actively discourage undesirable outcomes.
4. Guide, encourage, discourage and/or prohibit specific types of activity.
5. Volunteer guidelines.
   a. Preserve rustic elements of landscape.
   b. Use natural colors for fencing.
   c. Retain natural vegetated buffers to retain visual continuity when driving.
   d. Create meandering rather than straight driveways.
   e. Avoid plantings that require substantial chemical support.
6. Increase importance of environmental constraints.
7. Encourage avoidance of the 'McHouse'.

G. Legal and Nonconforming Lots and Structures

1. Development rights of non-conforming lot owners are critical to understanding development trends in Lincoln.
2. 1/3 of all properties in Lincoln do not conform to the current zoning bylaw.
3. Concern about the unfair treatment of legal, non-conforming lots and structures under proposed Article 7.
4. Confusion about rules and policies governing buildings on non-conforming lots generally, as expressed in the zoning bylaw and as carried out by the town personnel and boards.
5. Boards need to concur on legal precedent and town practice.
H. Current proposals

1. Change the current bylaw to permit alteration of structures on non-conforming lots to proceed 'by right' under clearly defined circumstances, with relief offered by the current Special Permit process if those circumstances are not met.

2. Create a new bylaw that would not prohibit the construction of Large Houses per se, but would define threshold 'triggers' above which public review and site plan approval would be required. Structures below these size triggers could be constructed 'by right' if they accord with all other provisions of the existing bylaw.

3. Any construction proposed to be over a certain size will henceforth be subject to site plan approval by the Planning Board. The method of calculation is detailed and includes the square footage in buildings and accessory structures but not existing barns or basements, whether or not they are finished. The basic size threshold that starts the review process is 8% of the lot area. Two other factors either enlarge or decrease the 8% threshold. First, the 8% isn't in effect until the proposed size exceeds 4,000 square feet, making it possible to enlarge homes on smaller lots beyond 8% of the lot area. Second, any proposed size over 6,500 square feet, no matter how large the lot it is on, would be subject to review.

4. The proposal would apply to non-conforming lots with the same threshold formula for Planning Board Site Plan Approval. The applicability of the formula to smaller lots would permit proportionally larger structures that remain under the review threshold on smaller lots, in that 4,000 square feet is allowed until 8% of the lot size produces a larger number. The 8% threshold would effectively take over once a lot exceeded 50,000 square feet.

5. A streamlined version of the existing site plan review process would be applicable for new subdivisions. The proposal offers the Planning Board the right to waive or reduce submission requirements in appropriate cases.

6. Standards and criteria for Planning Board review include preservation of landscape, relations of buildings to the environment and to the neighborhood, building siting and landscaping, open space visibility and preservation, circulation, and screening with specific objectives and considerations detailed in the bylaw.
“The Committee's efforts, which were initiated in January 1998, address both the particular issues raised by the proposed relocation of the Post Office as well as issues related to the long range potential of the entire business and residential district.”

A. Background: Proposals for Change and New Development
   1. Potential for change is increasing as a result of several events.
   2. Need for new Post Office with increased square footage and improved loading facilities.
   3. Recent acquisition of 3-S Pharmacy building with preliminary plans to expand or remodel.
   4. Potential changes to Mike Farney's building.

B. The Charette
   1. In May of 1998.
   2. All day charette with over 100 town residents.
   3. Conducted to look at options for the long range development of the South Lincoln area.
      a. Business expansion opportunities/constraints,
      b. Housing opportunities,
      c. Open space preservation,
      d. Pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems,
      e. Parking supply,
      f. Building design and placement criteria.

C. Criteria from Charette to guide development include:
   1. Village center concept with attendant scale and character.
   2. More attractive with facilities that reinforce community, vitality, connectiveness.
   3. Pedestrian convenience, town green, traffic calming and pedestrian links.
   4. Buildings near street, small scale 2-3 story buildings preferred over large 1 stories.
   5. Preserve rural land nearby, especially Codman Farm.
   6. Provide better connected retail rather than much more retail.
   7. Provide a restaurant.
   8. Address parking concerns.
   10. Build commuter rail shelter and have both stops on same side of Lincoln Road.
11. Provide public bathrooms.
12. Provide more housing.
13. Post office less than 7200 square feet.
14. Relocate DPW to make better use of land.
15. More landscaping details: trees, benches, more attractive paving, lighting.

D. Reinforce the Concept of a Village Center based on four quadrants at Lincoln Road and the tracks

E. The Mall Quadrant
   1. Includes existing retail shops/offices and the Lincoln Woods residential area.
   2. Locate new post office in an L-shaped structure that defines a new town green.
   3. Relocate east-bound T loading area to this quadrant.

F. The Ridge Road Quadrant
   1. Includes a mix of housing, businesses, and St. Joseph's church.
   2. Possible changes in Boynton and Farney properties and an overlay district.
   3. Require redevelopment of commercial properties to be adjacent to the road.
   4. Reinforce concept of pedestrian-oriented village center.
   5. Locate parking areas to the rear of structures facing the road.
   6. Encourage housing development/redevelopment with an emphasis on increased diversity and affordability – apply overlay district.

G. The Lewis Street Quadrant
   1. Includes offices, light industrial, Town DPW yard, and mixed housing.
   2. Apply overlay district to allow for increased density.
   3. Increase visual quality by adding sidewalks, planting, and lighting.
   4. Redevelopment should give preference to residential over office uses.

H. The Codman Farm Quadrant
   1. Includes Dougherty's service station, commuter rail parking, and Codman Farm.
   2. Permanently protect open space at and around Codman Farm and link gardens into Village Center through development of trails.
   3. Address parking and add screening at commuter rail lot and service station.

I. The Lincoln Road Corridor
   1. Develop a preliminary design for road improvements in cooperation with neighbors.

J. Zoning Bylaw Issues
   1. Current zoning has B-1 and B-2 business zones and R-1, R-2 and R-4 residential zones. Overlay zone would be necessary for changes in land-use and density.
“The Consolidated Housing Plan will be submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in order for the Town of Lincoln to be eligible to participate in the MetroWest HOME Consortium. Participation in the HOME Consortium will enable Lincoln to receive an annual allocation of federal HOME funds to be used for affordable housing projects. The Plan discusses Lincoln's housing needs and sets forth strategic long and short range plans to address Lincoln's housing needs.”

A. Introduction
1. Population of 5,152 has remained relatively stable with a 5% increase since 1989.
2. School population dropped during the 80's, but since the early 90's it has been climbing rapidly (The Lincoln K-8 campus experienced a 40% rise in students from 1994-2000).
3. Regional growth and prosperity has put pressure on affordable housing in Lincoln, particularly due to it's proximity to business, cultural and academic centers, a reputation for excellent schools and the success of Lincoln's open space and rural character preservation.
4. Careful planning will be required to maintain affordable housing options central to the Lincoln's unique identity, while preserving other important elements of its character.

B. Persons in Need
1. **Extremely Low-income**: 5% of households in Lincoln (98 out of 1,995). No members of a minority ethnic or racial group (111 households contain members of a minority group).
2. **Low income**: 5% of households in Lincoln. 100% (9) Hispanic and Latino households.
3. **Moderate income**: 9% of households in Lincoln (177 out of 1,995). 31% (9) Black and African American households and 8% (5) Asian households.
4. **Middle income**: 5% of households. 31% of Black and African American households.
5. **Race and Income**: 38% of Black and African American households have income over 95% of the median, All Hispanic and Latino households are low income, median income of Asian households is above $200,000 and 10% of white households have low incomes.
6. **Elderly**: 17% of Lincoln's population is over 65, but 29% of all households (556 of 1,995) are over 65. 19% of elderly households are low income and another 10% are moderate income. Few tax exemptions were given by the Assessors based on income.
7. **Renters**: maximum affordable monthly rent (30% of income) for very-low income is $556, low income is $928, moderate income is $1484, and middle income is $1855.

8. **Owners**: 21% (229 of 1417) are paying more than 30% of their income on housing. 17% of households making more than moderate income pay over 30% of their income for housing.

9. **Size of Households**: 22% of households consist of a single person. 37% are two-person households. 11% have 5 or more people. 7% are headed by a single female and 15% of persons over 65 live alone, and all are single females.

10. **Town Employees**: 148 town employees. 10% live in Lincoln, 40% would like to live in Lincoln of which 77% would buy and the rest would rent.

C. Homeless and Special Needs Population

1. Lincoln is part of the MetroWest suburban service area for State supported social services. Residents with a variety of special needs receive services from agencies located in surrounding communities. Because Lincoln has very few residents who utilize services these agencies do not separate out Lincoln in their statistical reports.

D. Summary of Needs

1. Population is largely higher income with few minorities.

2. 86% of Lincoln's housing stock is owner occupied.

3. With low vacancy rates, long waiting lists, and few available apartments, there is a need for additional rental housing with a critical need for stabilization of the existing single-family housing stock and the need for additional affordable units available for purchase.

4. Most pressing problem is simply the very high cost of housing in town.

5. Housing prices have exceeded income growth and it is difficult, if not impossible, for middle or moderate-income families, including town employees, to move into Lincoln.

6. Alternatives for senior citizens other than large, expensive single-family homes are in very short supply and there is an insufficient number of accessible units in Town.

E. Housing Market

1. **Home sales**: According to the Boston Globe, Lincoln has the second highest real estate value in MA. 21% drop in the number of sales from 200-2001, but prices continue to rise.

2. Lincoln's stock of smaller, affordable homes is diminishing as substantial additions are being made – In 2001, 16 were approved for over $100,000.

3. **Rents**: The 2000 Census reported an area median rent of $888, but a more realistic picture is by the listings: a one bedroom for $1700/mo, a two bedroom for $1650/mo, etc.
4. **Town-owned property**: Currently all town land is used by town. The 1988 Report of 5 Potential Housing Sites designated the DPW site as attractive for affordable housing.

5. **Private, Institutional and State-Owned Lands**: Currently, there are several larger properties that are either undergoing a land use change, on the market, or may be on the market within the next five years. BIIC has expressed interest in developing a multi-unit housing project.

6. **Condition and Lead Paint Hazards**: Lincoln's housing stock is relatively old leaving approximately 1200 housing units in Lincoln with the potential for lead paint.

7. **Public Housing**: Lincoln does not have a Housing Authority, but has a Housing Commission. One Section 8 house in town is managed by the Concord Housing Authority.

F. **Impediments to Affordable and Fair Housing**

   1. High cost of land and construction.
   2. Local environmental factors.
   3. Financial and administrative realities.
   4. Attitudes.

G. **Strategic Plan**

   1. Increase affordable and accessible rental opportunities through new development.
   2. Increase affordable rental opportunities in existing housing stock.
   3. Increase affordable home ownership opportunities in the existing housing stock.
   4. Short Range Plan (next 12 months).
      a. commence a medium scale apartment development of 15-20 units,
      b. develop accessory apartment affordability program,
      c. buy down existing housing units,
      d. add small scale rental developments.
   5. Long Range Plan (2-4 years).
      a. build incentives for affordable accessory apartments,
      b. continue buy downs,
      c. designate task force to assess assisted living options,
      d. add additional apartment developments,
      e. pass inclusionary zoning bylaw.

H. **Institutional Structure and Coordination**

I. **Appendix A: Citizens Participation Plan**

   1. meetings, information, technical assistance, public hearings, plan, comments, amendments.
Appendix E: Historical Timeline of Affordable Housing in Lincoln

1965 'By 70 Plan' recommends increased cluster and higher density developments to achieve better use of land and greater economic and social diversification of the population.

1967 Planning Board and Selectmen established the Moderate Income Housing Committee to study housing needs and set policy.

1968 The report of the Moderate Income Housing Committee concludes that more 'efficient' housing types such as apartments or row houses are needed for older families, young families and town employees.

1968 The Lincoln Foundation organized in November to 'produce, maintain, operate, and finance housing in Lincoln'.

1969 The state legislature passed Chapter 774, the 'anti-snob zoning law' which allows a developer to override local zoning in certain cases to provide affordable housing.

1970 The League of Women Voters report 'Tight Little Island' urged moderate-income housing development.

1970 The Lincoln Foundation leased two houses on Tower Road from the town, improved them, and made them available to persons of moderate income.

1971 RLF helped purchase a large portion of the Codman Estate for housing.

1972 The town added the accessory apartment by-law, Section 14 with the special purpose of encouraging units for people of low and moderate income.

1972 The town added a new zoning by-law, R-4, Planned Community Development, and applied it to the Codman land. The Lincoln Foundation developed Lincoln Woods on 70 acres of land bought with the help of the Rural Land Foundation from the Codman estate.

1976 Lincoln Woods opened with 125 units, half subsidized, half market rate.

1977 Land Use Conference. Participants expressed many concerns about the housing situation, which lead to the appointment of a Housing Committee the following year.

1978 The Selectmen appointed a Housing Committee which produced an inventory of housing in Lincoln, developed a list of housing needs and recommended that Lincoln establish a Housing Commission (instead of a Housing Authority).

1978 Lincoln liberalized its accessory apartment by-law.

1979 Lincoln created a Housing Commission.
1981 The Rural Land Foundation purchased a parcel of land from the Umbrellos and held it for the town. The Housing Commission developed a plan for 45 units of mixed market and subsidized housing in cluster zoning. Town meeting turned down the proposal.

1982 The Housing Commission's second proposal for the Umbrello land was also turned down.

1982 The Governor issued Executive Order 215. Lincoln lost state assistance in its purchase of the Umbrello conservation field because this order denied funds to communities 'unduly restrictive of housing growth'.

1984 Lincoln Community Homes, a privately sponsored group, made the third attempt to develop the Umbrello parcel, this time with fewer houses in clusters for the elderly. The March Town Meeting defeated the proposal.

1985 RLF decided to sell the Umbrello land to a developer with some acres in conservation.

1985 The Codman Farmhouse, a congregate housing facility for four elders developed by the Housing Commission, became operational.

1985 League of Women Voters produced a housing needs study for Lincoln.

1986 Special June Town Meeting appropriated $2,000,000 to purchase 31 acres of McHugh property in North Lincoln for potential development of affordable housing.

1986 Special November Town Meeting approved construction of an affordable housing development in North Lincoln with 60% (72 units) of the total development (120 units) to be constructed under the provisions of the new Massachusetts Homeownership Opportunities Program and sold to first-time buyers of low or moderate income.

1986 Housing Commission appointed a marketing advisory committee to advise the Commission on issues relating to Battle Road Farm including the marketing process; eligibility criteria and procedures for affordable units; first owner agreements for the affordable units; and long term ownership issues for affordable units.

1986 Housing Comm. distributed a draft resource manual for building accessory apartments.

1986 The town signed a long-term lease with the State for a house on Sunnyside Lane, began renovations to make it suitable for rental. The Concord Housing Authority agreed to apply for a Chapter 707 rent subsidy and select a low-income tenant so that Lincoln could the maximum rent allowed to recoup rehabilitation costs in a five-year period.

1988 Housing Commission submitted its Five-Year Housing Plan for the Town, which included an account of current housing stock and an assessment of needs for affordable housing, to the Executive Office of Communities and Development.
1988 A consultant completed survey of five Town-owned sites identified by the Long Range Planning Committee for suitability as low and moderate-income housing.

1988 Town Meeting voted to file special legislation to establish a modified Housing Authority. No action was taken.

1989 Housing Commission leased the house at 10 Mill Street from Minuteman and rented it.

1989 Upon completion of the renovations of the 65 Tower Road house, the Housing Commission chose a qualified tenant by lottery.

1989 Town established a position for a Housing Commission Clerk.

1989 Battle Road Farm completed Phase 1 with 28 affordable units and 12 market rate units.

1990 The Housing Commission reviewed all town-owned housing for each unit's capital needs, and income guidelines for each tenant.

1991 Housing Commission Clerk cut from Town budget.

1991 Battle Road Farm completed Phase 2 with 9 affordable units and 23 market rate units.

1992 Lincoln requested legislation permitting the town to convert the Housing Commission to a Housing Authority. Senate failed to vote on it in 1992 and Lincoln re-filed it for 1993.

1992 St. Joseph's Church initiates the Ryan Estates development, which offered elders 24 luxury condominiums with an assisted living component. Although Ryan Estates offered two 'moderate rate' units, they do not officially qualify as affordable housing because their moderate rates were above the affordable moderate rate limitations.

1993 The Senate counsel ruled that Lincoln's legislation needed another approving vote by Town Meeting. Housing Commission decided, in the absence of available State and Federal funding for housing, to postpone its request for Housing Authority legislation.

1995 Both Mill Street residences revert to Minuteman Vocational Technical Institute for their management because the rental Minuteman requires from the town put the units beyond the state income guidelines for affordable housing.

1996 Battle Road Farm completed Phase 3 with 11 affordable units and 37 market rate units. The total mix at Battle Road Farm is 48 (40%) affordable and 72 (60%) market rate units.

1997 Codman farmhouse leased to Community Farm for farmer housing.

2000 Housing Commission negotiates with State to purchase house on Sunnyside Lane.

2001 Five town-owned housing units and the Sunnyside Lane house accepted as 'affordable' by the State under the Local Initiative Program.

2001 Five town-owned housing units, the Sunnyside Lane house, and 2 homes under perpetuity deed restrictions accepted as 'affordable' by the State under the Local Initiative Program.
2002 Lincoln Housing Commission negotiated with the State for the purchase of three state-owned undeveloped acres surrounding the Sunnyside Lane house.

N. Appendix F: Lincoln Comprehensive Housing Plan Task Force
O. Appendix G: Housing Priorities Matrix
P. Appendix H: Lincoln's Housing Stock
The planning study was conducted under a federal grant from the Department of Defense's Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA). The chief purpose of the advance planning grants under the Base and Realignment and Closure (BRAC) legislation and the OEA mission is to help communities understand and anticipate the array of economic, fiscal and governmental service impacts that are likely to occur under a base closure scenario, and to begin considering ways to respond to those changes.”

A. Purpose and Key Findings

1. Background and overview
   a. Land was purchased in 1941 for a Boston Auxiliary Airport. In 1973, flight activities ended and Hanscom became largely high technology Dept. of Defense. The airfield reverted to state control under Massport. Today, Hanscom AFB is on 810 acres and is the headquarters to the Air Force's Electronic Systems Center.

2. Purpose of Grant
   a. Planning level assessment to generally identify the economic, fiscal and administrative impacts under a base closure scenario.
   b. Begin considering ways to respond to findings, including concepts for reuse.
   c. Consideration of models to understand disposition process and methodology.

3. Defense Technology Initiative (DTI)
   a. An intensive public/private effort to keep Hanscom Air Force Base open and to expand its research role.

4. Key Findings
   a. Excluding housing, there are approximately 166 major buildings on the base.
   b. Approximately 850 housing units are being privatized by the Air Force.
   c. Existing infrastructure systems are in good condition and capacity exceeds use.
   d. Several Installation Restoration Sites with hazardous waste are being cleaned up. A more detailed study of contamination would be required if the base were to close.
   e. Current intersections with the most traffic include 2A/Bedford Rd, 4&225/62.
   f. Future transportation demand management techniques are likely in the future.
g. The Town of Lincoln will experience the greatest impact with an estimated deficit of $6.6 million.

h. A Local Redevelopment Authority should be formed quickly.

B. Existing Conditions

1. Land and Building Use
   a. Includes 736 acres, with 74-leased acres in south Bedford.
   b. Bordered by MMNHP to the south, the Wood Street Neighborhood and the Hartwell Avenue business parks to the east the Massport Civil Airport to the north, and the Virginia Road neighborhood to the west.
   c. 53% in Lincoln, 23% in Lexington, 25% in Bedford, and <1% in Concord.
   d. 33% employment, 30% open space and active recreation, 25% residential, 9% community and retail and 1% is airport support services.
   f. 28 acres of wetlands, 92 acres of unexcavated land.
   g. 4.9 million square feet of buildings on base.
   h. 500,000 square feet of annex buildings off base and 200,000 square feet of space outside MA that supports the base.
   i. 60% of existing building area falls within the Town of Lincoln.
   j. Approximately 200,000-400,000 square feet of existing buildings could be demolished under a reuse plan.

2. Transportation
   b. General policy under any future scenario will be to minimize net traffic gains on Rte. 2A, Battle Road.
   c. The contribution of HAFB to regional traffic volumes is significant.
   d. Base currently contains shuttle service to Concord Station, Rideshare Program, Bike to Work Day, and two MBTA bus routes.

3. Infrastructure
   a. Utility demands are generally far below capacity and contractual agreements.
   b. Stormwater is handled through a closed system located throughout the Base that primarily discharges to the Shawsheen River. There is a current NPDES permit.
c. The Base has several hazardous waste areas, some have been remediated through capping or found to have no contamination through testing. Others have both groundwater and soil contamination.

C. Economic Conditions and Impacts

1. Job and contracting losses are a real and significant negative impact.

2. The base supports approximately 10,000 employees in active military, military reserves, civilian military employees, private business and private contractors.

3. Theoretical On-Base Employment Scenarios

   a. USAF Realignment: base would close as a federal/military community, but ESC would continue to pursue its defense contracting functions, occupying base office and lab properties.
      • Military jobs relating to base governance and services would be lost.
      • 1,800 Civilian Military jobs would be lost.
      • Reuse would involve substantial levels of business.
      • Private contractors would most likely retain jobs for some period of time.

   b. Private Sector Reuse: ESC would relocate elsewhere; base properties would be occupied and redeveloped by the private sector.
      • Active Military would be lost, but may stay on base.
      • 1,800 Civilian Military jobs would be lost.
      • Reuse would involve substantial levels of business.
      • Private contractors would most likely retain jobs for some period of time.

   c. No Reuse: Privatized housing and public facilities would represent the only envisioned uses under this scenario.
      • Active Military would be lost, but may stay on base.
      • 1,800 Civilian Military jobs would be lost.
      • Demand for Private Business would be limited.
      • Private contractors would most likely retain jobs for some period of time.

4. Fiscal Impacts

   a. Housing Privatization.
      • Regardless of BRAC outcomes, Hanscom's base housing could be transferred to a private entity for redevelopment and management.
b. Municipal benefits and burdens.
   - Will be allocated in accordance with existing jurisdictional boundaries.

c. Public Education and school enrollment.
   - Lincoln must provide public education for all households.

d. Reuse Scenarios
   - 'No reuse' scenario would result in $5,190,410 total new revenues.
   - 'Reasonable reuse' would result in $6,552,584 aggregate tax revenue.

e. Net Fiscal Impacts
   - Lincoln would gain 850 households, 6.4 miles of roads and 385 acres.

D. Reuse Principles and Reuse Concepts
   1. Realign road through Hanscom, thus defining a 'main street'.
   2. Connect existing open spaces through greenways and additional open space.
   3. Build on opportunities to add creative housing and integrate mixed uses.

E. Local Redevelopment Authority Models and Property Disposition Overview
   1. Structure a Local Redevelopment Authority under BRAC law and form the ultimate governance structure for Hanscom.
      a. Develop the base Reuse Plan
      b. Conduct state, local PBC and homeless provider property screening process
      c. Negotiate the disposition of the base with the Military Department
   2. Engage in property disposition negotiations with the Air force.
   4. Department of Defense Actions
      a. Expedite 'federal to federal' screening process and instigate the creation of an LRA
      b. Perform Environmental Baseline Surveys
      c. Perform required environmental cleanups
      d. Dispose of land through public sale

F. Appendix
## HISTORICAL STATISTICS

### DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>population</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8 enrollment (#kids)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total population (#kids)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 0-4 (#)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 5-14 (#)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 15-19 (#)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 20-29 (#)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 30-44 (#)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 45-64 (#)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 65+ (#)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>housing starts - building permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total housing units</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people per housing unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single-family residences (#)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condominiums (#)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garden apartments (#)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessory apartments (#)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-operative units (#)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Woods congregate living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LAND (acres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total area</td>
<td>9490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ponds</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uplands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undeveloped land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bedford air base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONSERVATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>town buildings and grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cambridge (acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parks and reservations (acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools and institutions (acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLCT &amp; LCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INFRATRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>roads (acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>railroads (acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING

established

### ZONING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st by-law</th>
<th>120' SY</th>
<th>80' FY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>houses (#)</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 40,000 sq ft (# lots)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50,000 sq ft (# lots)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60,000 sq ft (# lots)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-80,000 sq ft (# lots)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000 sq ft-4 acres (# lots)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 4 acres (# lots)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ASSESSMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>open space (land $)</th>
<th>residential (land $)</th>
<th>non-residential (land $)</th>
<th>total land ($)</th>
<th>residential (building $)</th>
<th>non-residential (building $)</th>
<th>total building ($)</th>
<th>real estate ($)</th>
<th>personal estate ($)</th>
<th>residential (building permit $)</th>
<th>value per residence ($)</th>
<th>non-residential (building permit value $)</th>
<th>alterations ($)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>871,660</td>
<td>896,050</td>
<td>940,015</td>
<td>944,740</td>
<td>1,010,565</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,492,075</td>
<td>3,363,735</td>
<td>3,401,925</td>
<td>3,584,960</td>
<td>3,777,210</td>
<td>4,177,485</td>
<td>43,700</td>
<td>369,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>non-property tax ($)</th>
<th>tax per house ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COSTS ($)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>general government</th>
<th>personal &amp; property protection</th>
<th>highways</th>
<th>library</th>
<th>recreation</th>
<th>schools - elementary</th>
<th>schools - high school</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>LLCT Established</td>
<td>ConCom Established</td>
<td>30'S&amp;R: 160'SY</td>
<td>80,000; 120'FY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>built upon</th>
<th>% town area</th>
<th>657</th>
<th>678</th>
<th>730</th>
<th>774</th>
<th>818</th>
<th>912</th>
<th>943</th>
<th>1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1,245</strong></td>
<td><strong>808</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1,055,225  | 1,112,300   | 1,145,110         | 1,170,256       | 1,204,740     | 1,208,420   | 1,264,805 | 1,285,035 | 1,439,200 |
| 3,497,045  | 3,692,565   | 3,933,840         | 4,247,690       | 4,600,350     | 4,903,550   | 5,442,580 | 5,833,210 | 6,029,400 |
| 4,552,270  | 4,804,865   | 5,078,950         | 5,417,945       | 5,805,090     | 6,111,970   | 6,707,385 | 7,118,245 | 7,468,600 |
| 507,248    | 412,300     | 419,597           | 444,556         | 448,225       | 505,300     | 541,245   | 600,690   | 803,000   |
| 404,700    | 395,100     | 587,900           | 656,452         | 817,400       | 1,006,200   | 739,400   |           |           |
| 9,870      | 10,200      | 13,200            | 12,100          | 13,300        | 13,300      | 22,000    |           |           |
| 11,250     | 18,300      | 13,975            | 19,450          | 8,400         | 6,764       | 526,125   |           |           |
| 42,250     | 299,034     | 47,465            | 170,897         | 131,800       | 73,760      | 128,890   |           |           |
| **458,200**| **712,484** | **649,360**       | **846,799**     | **957,600**   | **1,086,724**| **1,394,765**|           |           |

| 321,000 | 351,000 | 423,000 | 414,000 | 534 |

| 139,000 | 140,000 | 143,000 | 155,000 | 178,000 | 196,000 |
| 90,000  | 86,000  | 90,000  | 112,000 | 178,000 | 112,000 |
| 95,000  | 82,000  | 102,000 | 110,000 | 97,000  | 109,000 |
| 9,000   | 12,000  | 22,000  | 31,000  | 136,000 | 36,000  |
| 3,000   | 17,000  | 5,000   | 7,000   | 30,000  | 6,000   |
| 296,000 | 380,000 | 442,000 | 515,000 | 7,000   | 616,000 |
| 121,000 | 116,000 | 156,000 | 170,000 | 576,000 | 213,000 |
| 754,000 | 832,000 | 958,000 | 1,100,000| 1,224,000| 1,287,000|
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 360 |      |      |      | 277  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 60  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

Lincoln Foundation  Mall purchased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

336,000 499,000
1,167,200 1,812,600
53,900 72,000
1,557,100 2,383,600
6,808,400 10,264,600
174,500 206,900
6,783,000 10,471,500
8,340,000 12,855,400
988,300 1,079,500
1,167,000 1,813,000

427,000
802

208,000
121,000
108,000
40,000
7,000
742,000
193,000
1,419,000