



# PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT

<b>File</b>	N/A	<b>Reported By</b>	Planning Board
<b>Project Site</b>	86-92 Union Street	<b>Application Type</b>	Special Permit Planned Residential Development

## Project Summary

The applicant proposes construction on combined parcels totaling 66,127 square feet under the Planned Residential Development (PRD) zoning. The parcels each currently contain a residential structure and an outbuilding. The structures on each are considered historic in the terms of the Town’s ordinance and the applicant has previously appeared before the Historic Commission and met the obligations.

The proposed development consists of 16 residential units clustered around open space with surface parking. Access to the parcel would be from an existing curb cut on Union Street. Egress would be through a new curb cut on Burriss Way.

## Zoning Districts

	<b>Current Zoning</b>	<b>Existing Land Use</b>
<b>Subject</b>	Residential High Density	Residential
<b>North</b>	Residential High Density	Residential
<b>South</b>	Residential High Density	Residential
<b>East</b>	Residential High Density	Residential
<b>West</b>	Residential High Density	Residential

## Documents Reviewed

- Data narrative for the Planned Residential Development dated December 22, 2025
- Project narrative for the PRD dated October 23, 2025
- Conceptual architectural renderings by Atelier Lalanne Incorporated dated June 20, 2025
- Civil plans by CSN Engineering dated July 30, 2025; last revision date December 22, 2025
- Correspondence from Randolph Fire Department dated February 6, 2026

## Analysis

### 1. Summary of Land Use Designation

**Planned Residential Development (PRD)** allows an alternative pattern of residential land development to encourage innovation and variety in housing design and site development and to promote a variety of housing choices to meet the needs of a population diverse in age, income, household composition and individual needs.

### 2. Compliance with Regulations

The proposed use of the parcel is **not wholly** compliant with Zoning Ordinances. Please see Comments & Recommendations for details.

### 3. Consistency with Plans

The proposed development is consistent with multiple sections of the Comprehensive Master Plan updated in 2017 that reference a requirement for diversity in housing options. Specifically, the Housing section of the Master Plan states *“Randolph does not have a large diversity of housing types. As mentioned in the Land Use Element, the predominant land use patterns in Randolph are residential uses composed of low-density single-family homes that are reflective of suburban residential character. Only 2.1% of all residential land (0.9% of Randolph’s total land area) is dedicated to multi-family development with four or more units,”* and further lists goals to:

- *Expand the mix of housing choices throughout town for a range of incomes, ages, and family types.*

### 4. Compatibility with Surrounding Neighborhood

This parcel is located near Crawford Square and the Town’s civic center approximately 1 mile from the Holbrook/Randolph commuter rail station. The parcel is surrounded on all sides by residential properties. The proposed use and structures are **in character** with the neighborhood which is composed of mostly single-family homes with a maximum height of 2 ½ stories.

## 1. Life & Safety

- a. The proposed width of the drive aisle at 12 feet is insufficient to meet access needs by Randolph Fire Department. **RECOMMEND:** revising plans for a minimum 16-foot drive aisle.
- b. The proposal does not include turning radii calculations for emergency services vehicles. **RECOMMEND:** use the provided template, calculate turning radii sufficient to accommodate Randolph Fire emergency apparatus and submit on a separate drawing.
- c. Per Randolph Fire, the one-directional entrance at Union Street may be inadequate for emergency apparatus AND does not appear to be adequate to accommodate southbound traffic. **RECOMMEND:** revise location and width of entrances/exits, calculate turning radii (see above).
- d. Per Randolph Fire, the proposed exit on Burris Way may be insufficient for emergency apparatus turning movements. **RECOMMEND:** revise width of exit, calculate turning radii to meet RFD requirements (see above).
- e. Per Randolph Fire, there is no hydrant proposed in the development. There is a concern regarding the distance to the nearest hydrant at the Burris Way exit/entrance. **RECOMMEND:** revise plans to include a hydrant in a location sufficient to serve the structures and to the satisfaction of Randolph Fire.
- f. Per Randolph Fire, there is a question about the distance of units 5D and 6D to the fire apparatus access road. **RECOMMEND:** revise plans to include dimensions and measurements.
- g. The proposed drive/access has, at points, a 12% grade. The Town's maximum accepted grade for roads is 10%. **RECOMMEND:** revision to grading to meet a 10% or lower threshold.
- h. The project plan sets have inconsistencies in the drawings for the number and location of entrances (Union Street & Burris). **RECOMMEND:** revise plans for consistency; determine number of entrances/exits to the parcel.

## 2. General Site Layout

- a. The civil plan set makes no reference to curbing styles or material. **RECOMMEND:** asphalt Cape Cod berm on the drive aisle. Granite curbing is required at the curb cuts to Union Street and Burris Way.
- b. The calculations for "exclusive use" used by the applicant as required in the ordinance incorrectly include parking areas. **RECOMMEND:** remove parking as "exclusive use", recalculate and revise plans as applicable to meet the minimum requirements.
- c. The proposed location of the transformer is not ideal to a residential neighborhood.

**RECOMMEND:** relocate further back from the property line, include bollards for protection and landscaping or other screening.

- d. Drawings appear to indicate a retaining wall to be constructed. **RECOMMEND:** call out location, height and details for any retaining wall.
- e. The utilities plan does not indicate waterline connection to all units. **RECOMMEND:** update civil plan set to specify locations of all utility lines.
- f. There does not appear to be walkways to each unit from the common walkway. **RECOMMEND:** revise plan pages to indicate location and width of all pedestrian access ways.
- g. There is no indication of signage for the site. **RECOMMEND:** Identify locations of all proposed signage including traffic circulation (e.g. One Way, Do Not Enter, etc.).
- h. **RECOMMEND:** confirm location of mail collection units. Confirm with Randolph Postmaster and update plans prior to final approval by the SPGA.
- i. **RECOMMEND:** eliminate the proposed sidewalk from the development to Burris Way.
- j. **RECOMMEND:** relocate the dumpster to the south side of the parcel; provide details on the pad and ensure that the enclosure exceeds the highest portion of the dumpster unit.
- k. **RECOMMEND:** call out any existing or proposed easements.

### 3. **Parking/Traffic Circulation**

- a. The plans indicate a one-way traffic circulation which would appear to be problematic for resident access to some units. **RECOMMEND:** maintain a one-way circulation but revise the entrance/exit to two-ways and modify to have appropriate drive aisle widths.
- b. The plan set does not specify the total count and size of parking spaces. There are inconsistencies between plan pages. **RECOMMEND:** specify parking space size, provide the count of required spaces vs. provided spaces. Ensure consistency across plan pages.

### 4. **Lighting**

- a. Plans are missing the height of the drive aisle lights. **RECOMMEND:** specify the height on the details page.
- b. Lighting seems to be insufficient along some of the walkways. **RECOMMEND:** provide an additions 3 walk lights.
- c. Provide a detail plan or specifications sheet specifying the appearance of all lighting fixtures.

### 5. **Landscaping**

- a. The plan set did not call out the method of “landscaping” in the common area. **RECOMMEND:** call out type and species of all plant material to be installed.
- b. **RECOMMEND:** Specify method of irrigation for all landscaped areas.

- c. **RECOMMEND**: clarify the landscaping plan for the perimeter of the property.

6. **Site Design**

- a. **RECOMMEND**: Install a 3-foot-high picket fence along the property boundary at Union Street.
- b. Units A and C appear to be too close in color to provide a variety as required in the zoning ordinance. **RECOMMEND**: choose another color scheme for one of the units.
- c. Unit #1 exceeds the maximum size requirement in zoning (1100 sq ft). **RECOMMEND**: modify to meet the zoning ordinance.
- d. Plan pages indicate some unit porches are less than 6 feet or not called out as required in the zoning ordinance. **RECOMMEND**: revise architectural drawings to ensure each new building has porches for each unit that are a minimum of 6 feet and depicted on plans.
- e. Architectural drawings do not specify the color of the two existing units. **RECOMMEND**: specify the color of each.
- f. There are discrepancies between the Narrative and the plan set submitted regarding the number of bedrooms in each unit. **RECOMMEND**: review and revise for accurate representation.
- g. **RECOMMEND**: call out style and color(s) that will be permitted for fencing at the exclusive use areas.
- h. **RECOMMEND**: call out the color of site perimeter fencing.

7. **General Notes**

- a. Plan pages state “for ZBA”. **RECOMMEND**: removal reference to ZBA.
- b. Architectural plan pages and elevations are not consistent. In many cases units are reversed left side vs. front and the location of porches is incorrect. **RECOMMEND**: revising plans for consistency.
- c. Plan page (sheet #5) calls out “Windsor Street”: **RECOMMEND**: correcting plans.

**Planning Board Recommendation**

The Planning Board met with the applicant and property owner on February 10, 2026 and each of the points referenced in this report discussed at length. Based on the significant number of issues with the plans and, specifically those impacting life and safety, the Planning Board voted 5-0-0 **NOT TO RECOMMEND** approval of this project based upon the plans submitted. The Board notes, however, that the applicant indicated a willingness to revise the plan pages based upon the recommendations. The Planning Board suggests that if the applicant submits revisions to the plans, that said revisions be forwarded to the Board for an additional review and report to the Town Council.