



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

(Town Council Sub-committee)

Members

Claudia King, Chair
Russell Anderson
David Goldberg

Staff

Nathan Poore
Theo Holtwijk

Other Councilors Present: Karen Farber and Caleb Hemphill

Approved Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 23, 2015 - Large Conference Room

1. **Approve Minutes** –With a motion by D. Goldberg moved and second by R. Anderson the March 9, 2015 meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

2. **Outreach Meeting 3 Follow up**

C. King asked the committee members if they had any comments on the materials (outreach comments and responses table) and thanked the staff for developing the table.

D. Goldberg recognized that many responses suggested by LPAC support the creation of additional zones, RB1 and RB2 and that there be an increase in lot size such as from 30,000 sf to 40,000 sf. He further mentioned that the CDC has not yet discussed this and that we should take time now to focus on this suggested change.

T. Holtwijk confirmed that this was an LPAC recommendation at the request of CDC and he described the proposed changes and additions of these transition zones in the growth areas. He said LPAC considered other options but ultimately decided on what was presented.

R. Anderson indicated that the biggest controversy will be going from RB to FF. 80,000 sf to 30,000 sf is a big jump for some residents.

T, Holtwijk said that LPAC talked about going to 60,000 sf but they didn't want to dilute the objective. They did look at changing the boundary as that was decided upon by CDC.

D. Goldberg said we heard from a couple of concerned residents and one developer.

R. Anderson indicated that he thinks the LPAC recommendation is a reasonable response to some of these concerns.

D. Goldberg asked for a rationale behind selecting the reduced lot size in newly created RB zones.

T. Holtwijk explained that the 30,000 sf was based on making 75% of existing lots conforming in size. .

C. King said she is generally comfortable with the LPAC recommendation.

R. Anderson suggested that we keep some transitional properties in the growth area but also leave them zoned as FF. This would make them exempt from the non growth area caps.

C. King indicated that she preferred to accommodate the growth areas with zoning changes.

D. Goldberg said he believed there could be different zoning in the western and eastern portions of the town.

C. King said she is open to the FF transitional area. She is also in favor of moving the boundary to include some parcels in selected area from growth to non-growth. She referenced the maps prepared for this meeting.

R. Anderson said there could be a transition area. He further stated that the comprehensive plan defines rural and growth areas and it is tied to infrastructure and proximity to commercial areas. He said we should not consider moving the line so late in the process. He explained that keeping some properties in the FF zone and including it in the growth area doesn't change the boundary but might achieve the desired results.

C. King said she believed we could shift the boundaries so long as there is a good rationale.

D. Goldberg said he thought going from 30,000 sf to 40,000 sf, as recommended by LPAC, is good logic. He said he likes bifurcating RB into a west and east portion. He explained that he is not in favor of moving the growth boundary lines.

C. King said she like the idea of moving the line after she took another look at the specific area. She also said she respected the opinion of D. Goldberg and R. Anderson that the boundary should not change.

D. Goldberg stated that it is reasonable to look at exceptions to the rule but he doesn't see any reason why the line needs to move. He referenced how one parcel suggested by C. King that should move out of the growth area is located on Winn Road and situated between two existing neighborhoods that are characteristic of a growth area and could make sense if it is developed similarly.

C. King mentioned that the area could also be open space.

D. Goldberg stated that if we consider moving the growth area boundary in one location, we may want to consider surveying all the lines again to see if there are other areas that should be considered but he stated that he does not want to do this or open the door.

K. Farber asked if her understanding is correct that by keeping the area in question in FF and also in the growth area then this about the rate of growth.

C. King expressed concern that the growth area may be accommodating too much growth.

D. Goldberg reiterated his observation that area 9 is flanked by two neighborhoods with 2 acre lots.

C. King asked R. Anderson if his initial idea was to move area 10 to RB and move area 9 to FF but keep it in the growth area and R. Anderson confirmed that was his initial idea.

With a motion by R. Anderson, moved and second by C. King to keep area 9 in the growth area but keep it in the current FF district. The motion was unanimously approved.

The Committee also reached consensus that it approves of all of the other LPAC recommendations.

3. Council Presentation/Report

The Committee discussed different options of formatting the Outreach Comment and Response Chart. There were suggestions to have two versions – one FAQ version for the web site and another as a working document. The Committee ultimately decided to make no changes and rely on the current chart as a working document.

The Committee agreed that this matter should be presented to the Town Council on April 27. The presentation should be similar to what was presented at Outreach Meeting 3. There should also be a list of conceptual zoning amendments that will be brought forward at a later date. The presentation should be offered jointly by both the CDC and LPAC with an opportunity for Q&A. The PowerPoint presentation should have one final slide that identifies next steps but without specific dates.

Staff will draft the presentation for CDC review at its next meeting on April 13.

4. **Next Meeting** - The Committee agreed that the next meeting will be on April 13, 2015.
5. **Other Business** - There was no other business.
6. **Adjournment** - With a motion by D. Goldberg moved and second by R. Anderson the meeting adjourned at 10:06 AM by unanimous approval.

Respectfully submitted: Nathan Poore