



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (Town Council Sub-committee)

Members Present: Karen Farber; Caleb Hemphill, Tim O'Donovan, Russ Anderson, and Claudia King

Staff Present: Amanda Stearns, Justin Brown, Ethan Croce, Amy Lamontagne, Lisa Sangillo

Meeting Minutes - Thursday, December 17, 2015

1. **Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order at 5:36 p.m.
2. **Draft Amendments:** C. King gave a brief overview of the direction the meeting would take this evening regarding the draft amendments. The group would discuss and try to solidify the amendments to bring to the Town Council in January or February with possible adoption in May. The first step was to determine the growth and rural areas, and the zoning concepts associated with them.

R. Anderson asked for clarification from C. King on “old growth” vs. “new growth” areas.
A. Stearns stated that for the first time, the Town is establishing a growth line between old areas and new areas as outlined below.

 - a. Zoning that reflects reality. Goal was 80% conformity by adopting zoning that accurately reflected historic zones.
 - b. An added component to minimum lot size of family and two family units. (Lots that have no access to water/sewer have to be larger than those that do.)
3. K. Farber discussed the Growth Area-CDC Draft Zoning Recommendations District Comparison – December 17, 2015 for the members. She explained that the first number on the chart signifies what is being proposed by the CDC, the second number signifies what is being proposed by LPAC, and the final number reflects current requirements. She explained that the ultimate goal in the RA district was to reduce the number of items going to the BZA. With respect to the RA SFD MLS and NRA figures, the goal was to make many non-conforming lots, conforming. She stated the CDC proposed that minimum lot size be reduced by 50% and the NRA requirement be removed. A. Stearns defined NRA (net residential area) for the group. K. Farber, while explaining the Front Porch/Step Reduced Setback, felt that this was a level of complexity that the CDC felt was unnecessary. She stated that LPAC recommended no maximum unit size for accessory dwelling units. CDC is recommending 850 s.f. or 100%, whichever is less. R. Anderson asked why the requirement wasn't 850 s.f. or 50%, whichever is smaller. K. Farber then explained the RA Two-Family Attached requirements. A. Stearns explained that the separation of two-family will allow them to go to the Code Office instead of the Planning Board. R. Anderson asked how much of the RA zone is not already built. K. Farber and A. Stearns pointed out the

areas on the maps. R. Anderson asked if half of the lots in the area were allowed to expand, would the CDC be happy with the results. A. Stearns explained that the Total Growth Cap would pace the level of growth in that area.

There was a discussion on two family splits. As long as the dwelling is on water and sewer, the minimum lot size isn't affected. Once there is the absence of one or the other or both, the MLS will increase.

K. Farber then explained the RA Muti-Family 3 units or more attached. The current properties in town were all built prior to the ordinance. She stated that they talked about a limit on cluster units of 4 units in a building. They also determined that multi-family *HAD* to be on water and sewer or it wouldn't be permitted. R. Anderson asked if LPAC knows what the CDC has done. C. King stated they wanted to speak with the Council first.

J. Brown explained to the members what the impacts would be regarding two new units versus converting to two units. K. Farber spoke about Growth Caps on two family and multi-family. J. Brown explained that a multi-family build falls under a different category than a single family build (i.e. residential vs. commercial).

C. King asked how the presentation was so far and if it was too in-depth. R. Anderson stated that for this group, it was fine that it was in-depth, but for the general public, he would like to see it simplified. A. Stearns suggested some graphics to show how certain lots are affected.

K. Farber then spoke about the RB districts as they relate to the discussion of RBEast and RBWest, with the goal of showing a progression from RA to the Rural areas (i.e. Farm and Forest). A. Stearns pointed out to Russ the areas on the map that are currently Farm and Forest that will be moved to the RB district and rezoned (hatched areas). She explained that they are becoming more restrictive in their proposal that there be both water and sewer. A. Stearns commented that it would be cost-prohibitive to pull sewer west of the turnpike. T. O'Donovan explained that his multiplex is on septic and is concerned that about becoming non-conforming if these changes pass. A. Stearns asked some questions regarding difficulties in becoming non-conforming. Russ asked why we would require a larger lot size with a larger building if what is being allowed now is acceptable. There was a discussion regarding lot size and non-conformity of multiplex lots where the new ordinance would require water and sewer.

K. Farber asked the staff if they felt this was a drastic change or not. E. Croce felt this was a step in the right direction and a good thing for Falmouth to be heading in this direction. C. King asked if this approach was straight forward or complicated. E. Croce felt it was getting a little more complicated. It's a more sustainable land use plan. J. Brown stated he felt the accessory dwelling unit would be simplified and straight forward. K. Farber asked A. Stearns if the materials should be available to the public. They will table this topic until the next meeting.

4. Next Meetings – January 7, 2016 at 5:30 p.m.

5. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.