



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

(Town Council Sub-committee)

Members Present
Claudia King, Chair
Russell Anderson
David Goldberg

Staff Present
Nathan Poore

Amanda Stearns

Meeting Minutes Monday, January 12, 2015

Chairman King called the meeting to order at 8:05.

1. **Route One** – Meet with David Jones – N. Poore indicated that staff is planning to place the light in most advantageous place to maintain the best photometrics and reduce any interference with Mr. Jones sign. J. Reynolds stated that all the conduit and base has already been installed. He continued that there may be service lines in the ground that would need to be removed if the light pole is moved. R. Anderson asked if it was appropriate to make changes for a tenant. Mr. Jones did not arrive by 8:20 so the committee moved on with the regular agenda.
2. **Approve Minutes** – approve December 22, 2014 minutes – With a motion by D. Goldberg and second by R. Anderson, the minutes were approved unanimously.
3. **Review Toolbox Matrix** – confirm items and priorities

C. King stated that the committee needed to make some decisions and she would like to spend until 9:30 on this and leave time for the schedule. N. Poore will use charts to guide discussion.

A. Residential Growth Permit

Claudia stated that this is the committee's priority tool, the one they have been discussing in detail. LPAC is also working and will continue to work on other tools after the report to the Council. It is good to have major and minor tools. King stated that the statute does not require the cap to be changed. A. Stearns explained the statutory requirements for the cap. King noted that permit data is messy so the committee is looking at assessing data for units built. The 40% allocation for single family units in the rural area that was discussed earlier is equal to the average. R. Anderson said that significant growth is already occurring in the growth area. C. King added that the data shows that the growth is occurring where we hope it to grow. A lengthy discussion ensued about the various factors that have an effect historic growth and how the committee should respond. Observations included:

1. The numbers as dispersed over the new rural/growth boundary are remarkably different than how they represent when using the zoning districts as a geographic division (Farm and Forest as rural).
2. With the trend of majority of growth being shifted to the growth area the change in regulation would serve to provide some "insurance" to maintain the current ratios of growth.
3. Adding an allocation from single family units will be most effective as the predominant type of unit constructed in the rural area is single family.

4. Proposing a conservative figure of 40% or 26 units to restrict single family units in the rural area would maintain the current growth pattern.
5. Other policies such as sewer expansion and aligning zoning districts with the rural/growth boundary would also serve to support the maintenance of the growth ratio. These should continue to be in the toolbox for future discussion.
6. The town has removed a lot of land in the rural area from development through its open space acquisition plan. This occurred generally between 2008-2012, the same time frame where growth shifted from the rural to the growth areas.
7. For purposes of moving a proposal forward, current exemptions for the growth permit should remain as is and be revisited in the future.
8. Fees will be revisited in the future.

B. Purchase of development rights/Conservation Development – N. Poore summarized a conservation development model. Conservation organization would target and purchase a particular property for conservation and withhold a certain amount out for development so that the majority of the property is conserved and the purchase and endowment are paid for by the portion that is developed. C. King mentioned that the FLT (Falmouth Land Trust) is currently working on a “conservation development” project. There was consensus that the CDC recommend the Council consider a resolution to support this type of conservation.

C. Cap on lot creation or subdivision – It was consensus of the CDC that this will remain in the toolbox and that as the Council reviews and updates the growth ordinance every three years, it be considered at that time.

D. Impact fees – The CDC consensus was that this would be referred to LMAC as a funding opportunity for the open space program.

E. Density – The CDC consensus is that this will remain in the toolbox and that reconciling the districts with the rural/growth boundary would be considered as future study. Lot frontage/width along with maximum size of lot in subdivisions was lumped in with density.

F. Transfer Development rights – The CDC consensus was not to pursue this.

4. Discuss overall schedule

5. Next Meetings – January 26 with leadership from LPAC (8:00 am)

6. Other Business

Committee consensus is that the installation of the light pole remain as currently planned.

7. Adjournment – adjourned at 10:10 a.m.