



Long Range Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC)

Thursday, December 4, 2014
Minutes

Attendance:

Name	Present	Name	Present	Name	Present
Paul Bergkamp	√	Kurt Klebe	√	Jim Thibodeau	-
Sam Rudman	√	Sandra Lipsey	-	Erin Mancini	√
Bill Benzing	-	Claudia King, Council Liaison	-	Theo Holtwijk, Staff	√

The meeting was called to order by Sam at 6:00 PM.

1. Continued Review of Growth Area Concepts

Theo reviewed a chart with the current concept recommendations. He said he had added a few concepts relative to multiplex structures to make the package more consistent.

RECOMMENDED GROWTH AREA CONCEPTS

Draft: December 2, 2014

		CURRENT REGULATION	PROPOSED CONCEPT BY LPAC
DENSITY IN GROWTH AREA			
1	Minimum single family lot size in R-A District	20,000 s.f.	10,000 s.f.
2	Minimum single family lot size in R-B District	40,000 s.f.	30,000 s.f.
3	Minimum single family lot size in R-C District	60,000 s.f.	Keep as is
4	Single family lot width in R-A District	125 feet	75 feet
5	Single family lot width in R-B District	150 feet	100 feet
6	Single-family, detached setbacks in R-A District	Front: 25 feet Side: 20 feet Rear: 40 feet	Front: 10 feet Side: 10 feet Rear: 30 feet

		CURRENT REGULATION	PROPOSED CONCEPT BY LPAC
7	Single-family, detached setbacks in R-B District	Front: 25 feet Side: 20 feet Rear: 40 feet	Front: 15 feet Side: 15 feet Rear: 30 feet
8	Definition of multiplex	A group of attached dwellings containing dwelling units arranged side by side or back to back or in other configurations.	Keep as is
9	Minimum multiplex site size in R-A District	2 acres	20,000 s.f. for 2 units 30,000 s.f. for 3 units 1 acre for 4 or more units
10	Minimum multiplex site size in R-B District	2 acres	1 acre for 2 or more units
11	Min. net residential area per dwelling unit for multiplex in R-A District	15,000 s.f.	7,500 s.f.
12	Min. net residential area per dwelling unit for multiplex in R-B District	30,000 s.f.	20,000 s.f.
13	Distance between multiplex buildings	Multiplex buildings shall be located at least 200 feet apart	Delete this requirement
14	Multiplex lot width	200 feet	150 feet
15	Multiplex set backs	Front: 50 feet Side: 50 feet Rear: 50 feet	Front: 15 feet Side: 15 feet Rear: 30 feet
		CURRENT REGULATION	PROPOSED CONCEPT BY LPAC
ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS (ADU)			
1	ADU Review	All ADU's are conditional uses and are sent to Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA).	ADU's that are 75% or less of the main dwelling and less than 1,000 sf should be reviewed by the CEO as permitted by right. ADU's that are more than 75% of the main dwelling or more than 1,000 sf should continue to be reviewed by Board of Zoning Appeals as conditional uses.
2	Standards for ADU apartments versus ADU cottages	Different standards for ADU apartments versus ADU cottages.	Have same standards for ADU apartments and ADU cottages.

		CURRENT REGULATION	PROPOSED CONCEPT BY LPAC
3	Min. size for ADU	360 s.f.	No minimum size requirement for ADU
4	Min. size requirement for main dwelling unit with ADU apartment	1,260 s.f.	No minimum size requirement for main dwelling unit
5	Max. ADU size	For ADU apartments: Reverse proportional to single family dwelling floor area. For ADU cottages: Not to exceed 100% of main dwelling floor area or 850 s.f., whichever is less.	ADU cannot be more than 100% of main dwelling unit. No floor area maximum for ADU.
6	ADU appearance	There are general requirements for all exterior modifications of ADU.	Keep as is
7	ADU residency	No on-site owner residency requirement for ADU. Can be rental or for in-laws.	Keep as is
8	ADU parking	1 off-street space for ADU. (Single family requirement is 2 spaces per unit.)	1 off-street space for ADU 1,000 s.f. or less. 2 off-street spaces for ADU's greater than 1,000 s.f.

Erin asked how setbacks for sheds and garages are dealt with. Theo will look into that.

Kurt expressed concern with the suggested setbacks for multiplex as those could be large structures. Theo said he proposed something so the committee could react to it.

Paul wondered how the proposed density could be visualized by the Council and the public. Theo suggested taking photographs of specific Falmouth streets that have a known density, say 20,000 sf lots, 10,000 sf lots, and 5,000 lots. In addition, task 4 of the next steps list proposes to investigate hypothetical development sketches for some pilot sites. That could help one to see how a new development could be compatible with its neighbors.

Erin wondered how the public would find out what is being proposed. Theo said that outreach efforts could include:

- an ad in the Forecaster,
- a news article written by a reporter,
- posting on the Town's website,
- notification to News and LPAC subscribers.

Erin asked how soon the ordinance amendments could be approved and was concerned that a spring start of construction would be missed. The committee recognized that it may take

some time before final ordinance amendments are adopted and that some of the proposals may be viewed as controversial by some.

The committee discussed possible setbacks for a multiplex and the buildability of small lots for 2-unit structures if the 50 feet setback is maintained. The committee also discussed the word “multiplex” and found it not very appealing. There was concern that the multiplex proposals may be controversial. However, the committee also felt that multiplex housing options can help to provide housing for an aging population and cited Blueberry Commons as one example. Sam felt it was important to provide examples of good multiplex developments. The committee also felt that it would be good for the town to have design guidelines in place for multiplex developments.

The committee decided to recommend a front setback of 20 feet for duplex units, 20 feet for side setback and 30 feet for a rear setback, and keep the 50 feet setbacks on all sides for multiplexes of 3 or more units. The committee decided to recommend a side setback of 15 feet for single family units in the R-A district.

The committee discussed what the difference was between an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) that could be placed on a 10,000 sf lot and a 2-unit multiplex development that would require a 20,000 sf lot. It was felt that the ADU came with additional restrictions, such as the inability to sell the units separately.

The committee discussed possible pilot sites. Theo will try to connect with the owner of the site that was suggested.

The committee reviewed the Next Steps memo and was OK with that.

NEXT STEPS FOR LPAC

Draft: December 4, 2014

1. Finalize Residential-A and B District zoning and ADU concepts
2. Review with CDC
3. Conduct joint CDC-LPAC meeting with property owners and general public to review proposed Growth and Rural Concepts (conversation #3).

OTHER GROWTH AREA WORK

4. Apply recommended zoning concepts to sample pilot sites (with owner permission) to get a sense how that could be compatible with existing neighborhood character (seek consulting assistance with that)
5. Review areas 1-6 of land use “working map” that are being suggested to be rezoned from Farm and Forest to a growth zoning district and make concept recommendations for each one

6. Make concept recommendations for residential growth in commercial/mixed use growth area.
7. Make concept recommendations for other issues that could encourage residential growth in growth area, such as:
 - a. sewer policy
 - b. amount of required open space in RCZO in growth area
 - c. reward development with a residential density bonus for projects that exceed ordinance requirements for quality open space, public access to open space, and bicycle/pedestrian connectivity

Next, the committee discussed the need for vibrancy of the Route 1 area. Theo mentioned the efforts of FEIC and the current work by the Route 100 committee. Paul felt it was important to package the Town's message carefully as it needed to address different constituencies.

2. Review of Draft Minutes

The draft minutes of the November 13 meeting were approved with the correction of Andy Jackson's comment as drafted. The draft minutes of the November 20 meeting were approved with the correction of Paul's comment relative to the Depot Road-Route 1 corner. Paul felt that that corner would be a good location for a playground and could serve as a people magnet with other family-friendly sites and restaurants nearby.

3. Next Steps

Theo will request from Judy an assessment of the vacant lots in the R-A and R-B districts, the total acreage, range of lot sizes, and their locations, so that potential could be assessed. He will also update the concept recommendations and begin to package the committee's recommendations. The committee will review this draft package at its next meeting before sending it on to the CDC. Theo suggested that perhaps a joint CDC-LPAC may be useful, or that an LPAC delegation meet with the CDC to discuss the recommendations. He will review the best approach for this with Claudia and Amanda.

4. Other Business

There was no other business.

5. Next Meeting

The committee will meet next on January 8, 2015 at 6:00 PM

The meeting was adjourned around 7:50 PM.

Draft minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, December 9, 2014