

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

(Town Council Sub-committee)



Members

Claudia King, Chair
Russell Anderson
David Goldberg

Staff

Nathan Poore (9:15)
Theo Holtwijk(9:45)
Amanda Stearns

Other Councilors Present: Karen Farber and Caleb Hemphill

Meeting Minutes Monday, March 9, 2015

1. **Approve Minutes** – With a motion by D. Goldberg moved and second by R. Anderson, the February 23, 2015 minutes were unanimously approved.
2. **Outreach Meeting 3 Follow up**

Committee members discussed the general outcomes of the meeting. R. Anderson commented that he thought there would be more concerned about restricting growth in the rural area. He continued that he has a conversation with Sam Rudman, Co-Chair of LPAC about refocusing the work away from infill and more toward areas that are undeveloped. For every property owner that want to add on or add an apartment or cottage there will be neighbors that oppose it. Russ questioned changing the FF to the new RB, and whether that needed to happen. C. King noted that the controversy was focused around the boundary areas.

C. King reviewed the comments as outlined in the handout and the discussion ensued on the topics as noted below.

- ADUs – should there be a minimum unit size.
- Setbacks should be the same for duplex and single family
- Building cap in rural area – no objections
- Should the area around the school be RB?
- Conservation set asides – differential in rural and growth.
- Consider changing the terminology to assist people’s understanding of rural and growth. C. King and K. Farber
- Rezoning FF to RB in the growth area – The boundary favored putting land in the growth area. Thoughts offered were to change to the old RB rather than new. K. Farber stated that the comments weren’t about growth, but about lot size. Wise to respond to feedback. Other comments included needing areas to grow. How many new lots might be created in the dense areas as a result and would that help inform us for looking at transition areas? How many properties are affected by the transition areas? C. King asked if the jump from 80,000 to 30,000 was too big.

R. Anderson wondered if LPAC's recommendations were a little drastic and whether the emphasis should be on infill. K. Farber responded that she saw the LPAC charge differently; the evaluation of nonconformities was part of the bigger picture.

A. Stearns shared the estimated increase in lots both in RA and RB, as represented in the LPAC report. C. King stated she wouldn't change the growth area based on the number of lots. The recommendations give people choices. D. Goldberg commented on the nature of lots and that some will never be further developed and that the estimate is to look at the magnitude of possibilities.

C. King asked if CDC should look at the look at progress of the Route 100 plan and the sewer plan. It is timely enough to learn about those projects and have that inform us? K. Farber suggested that a check in would be good. The designation between Residential Growth and Commercial Growth has not been reviewed. N. Poore, Town Manager has joined the meeting and noted that he has been attending the Route 100 meetings. There are no radical changes beyond the current commercial area, maybe tweaking of some land uses, and a look at using the as a boundary. C. King mentioned that the western area of Route 100 is very restricted because of the floodplain. N. Poore responded that the area being identified as having the most development opportunity is on the west side. The committee is projecting infill on the east side.

D. Goldberg suggested that if the incentives in the growth area might more than double the opportunity for development in the growth area than perhaps it is twice as strong as it needs to be. More than 2,000 new lots is a very large number.

R. Anderson suggested the transition areas go from FF to the current RB and stay in the growth area. C. King stated that only two people voiced concerns and that may not be representative of the whole population of property owners in these transition areas. R. Anderson reviewed the current growth trends such as OceanView, Tidewater, and VC1 and asked how much more we needed to do. He continued that creating 2,000 new lots in the growth area is dramatic. C. King responded that the change creates possibilities for new lots, not creating lots now. She continued that we could back off and be more moderate. She clarified that the areas in question are the West Falmouth transition areas and maybe it should wait on the Route 100 work. N. Poore mentioned that the Route 100 work was very narrowly focused on the corridor. It was agreed that the overreaching issue is not the location of the Rural/Growth Boundary but the zoning districts and more specifically the lot sizes. K. Farber underscored using caution about using one or two objections as a town wide objection.

The discussion turned to process and it was agreed that an email response from CDC would occur to the participants and offer thanks for the feedback. A. Stearns will continue to collect feedback and any additional feedback will be forwarded to C. King

and be included in the next meeting packet. The website will stay up until the committee is ready for it to come down. The Council report will be delayed and the next meeting of the CDC will be March 23, 8:30 am.

The committee discussed whether or not more specific outreach was appropriate as Sandra has suggested. D. Goldberg asked if the meeting fundamentally changed the process. It was concluded that no further outreach was needed at this time and that the schedule had been slowed but the process remained the same.

3. **Wayfinding**
4. **Next Meeting** – March 23, 8:30 am to continue discussion on finalizing the report. No additional information is needed at this time.
5. **Other Business**
6. **Adjournment**