



# Long Range Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC)

## Thursday, January 8, 2015 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**

The committee reviewed the revised draft Recommendations report, dated January 8, and made the following changes:

Page 6: Insert “in the R-B district” before the 40,000 sf reference.

Theo shared Paul’s e-mail feedback on the draft and reviewed the changes he had made to the four bullets on page 1. He had brought in some of the language of the Comprehensive Plan. The committee felt that this adequately addressed Paul’s comments and noted that it was not necessary in the LPAC document to restate the Comprehensive Plan as that was not up for debate. The committee did recognize that certain readers may need this background to fully appreciate where the committee’s recommendations came from.

Page 6 and 10: Theo suggested separating “minimum lot size” from “minimum net residential lot area.” The latter regulates density. For R-A it is currently proposed that both would become 1 unit/10,000 sf. Theo suggested that perhaps lot sizes could be as small as 5,000 sf if someone desired that, but to leave overall density at 1 unit per 10,000 sf. In such cases, the remainder of a 5,000 sf lot would be open space. There are several desirable neighborhoods in Falmouth where the existing lot size is 5,000 sf or less. Right now one could not recreate that pattern if one wanted to. Sam was wondering how that would affect neighborhood character and cited the Town-owned former Brown property as one example. If that lot is about 1.5 acres then maybe 5 new houses could be built where there used to be just one. Would that respect neighborhood character, Sam wondered. It seemed that such a lot size worked OK on a side street from Route 88 such as Underwood Road. The committee discussed if this could be addressed by excluding the proposed change for any lots fronting on Route 88. It ultimately steered away from that as it made it complicated and would not necessarily solve the neighborhood character issue. It was recognized that the R-A district has a great variety of lot sizes and that solving all compatibility issues may not be possible.

Some on the committee felt that people would build 5,000 sf lots where that made sense and that having that option was ultimately a good thing that provided more flexibility.

Page 8: Clarify the capacity analysis statement as the current wording is unclear. Theo explained that some work was still outstanding from Judy. Results from that may help to come up with better phrasing. The main idea is that it makes more sense to compare capacity on the relative potential impact to existing versus proposed zoning than to focus on an absolute number. The committee discussed the annual growth cap on housing permits and recognized that once Judy's growth capacity numbers are known it will be many years before capacity would be realized, assuming there is demand .

The committee discussed the growth cap formula that is being discussed by the Community Development Committee and wondered why the Town would want to limit how many accessory dwelling units get built in a single year. Sandra felt most of these would be built to suit lifestyle issues and not aimed at bringing new families to town. The committee felt it would be useful to get an update on that from the CDC when it meets with that group.

Theo reviewed the current ordinance language on accessory structures. This provides for allowances of sheds into the required setbacks. He suggested adding a recommendation to allow front porches and front steps to encroach into the front setback with five (5) feet. The committee was OK with that.

Page 8: Use consistent wording for section 3: "promote compact, walkable neighborhoods." That wording comes directly from the Comprehensive Plan and may be less confusing than "good neighborhood design."

The committee agreed that having section 3 was important to understanding the possible implications of the recommendations. Theo will use the former Brown property and Stepping Stones property (if possible). Sam recommended that a third site be identified in an area with larger lots. Theo will do some simple illustrations of what may be possible on these sites.

Fix the typo in "Modokawando Road." This appears on several pages.

The committee liked the illustrations and data on the neighborhood examples. It requested some additional illustrations of accessory dwelling units, but felt that the two multiplex examples were sufficient. Theo will add a Tidewater cottage and multiplex example. The committee discussed that some people really like or do not like that development. Having choice available in the community was important.

Theo will update the report accordingly.

The committee wondered how the public roll-out meeting would be conducted. Claudia arrived and the committee reviewed the project schedule. She noted that the intent was to look at the CDC and LPAC recommendations together. It was understood that a sign off was needed from CDC on LPAC's concept recommendations.

The plan is for LPAC to review the final recommendations on 1/22. The committee recommended against reviewing a partially completed draft with CDC on 1/15. Claudia will see

if the CDC can meet on 1/26 at 8:30 AM with LPAC. If CDC has few or no revisions to the concepts, the public roll-out could be held on 2/12 at 6:00 PM. A fallback date for that could be 2/26.

Based on the public's feedback the concepts would be finalized and sent to the full Council. Upon a nod from the Council, specific zoning amendment language could then be prepared by staff and reviewed with CDC. The committee wondered how soon that could be completed and approved by the Council. It was recommended to take up the full package of amendments and not do it piecemeal.

Theo asked the committee how it felt about recommending that the required minimum amount of open space for Resource Conservation Zone Overlay District projects in the growth area be reduced from 30 to 10%. The committee was in favor of that change.

Lastly, Theo suggested that the committee on 1/22 may be in a position to make some recommendations on the zoning district designations for those areas that are to be included in the growth area. He showed two maps that indicated where those areas are. Many of them appear to abut the R-B district. The committee was agreeable to add recommendations on that to the Part 1 package, if possible.

The remaining Part 2 issues will be left for future LPAC work. The committee was Ok with that.

Sandra commended Theo on the way he had pulled the recommendations together. She thought it was a very well-done document.

## **2. Other Business**

There was no other business.

## **3. Next Meeting**

The committee will meet next on January 22, 2015 at 6:00 PM

The meeting was adjourned around 7:55 PM.

Draft minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, January 9, 2015