Town of Falmouth
Community Development Committee (Council Sub-Committee)
DRAFT Meeting Minutes – February 10, 2014
Town Hall Conference Room

Members Present: Councilor Anderson, Councilor Pierce, Councilor Goldberg
Staff Present: Amanda Stearns, Theo Holtwijk
Others Present: Sam Rudman, Sandra Lipsey

Councilor Anderson called the meeting to order at 8:04 AM.

1. **Review of Draft Minutes –** With a motion by Dave Goldberg and second by Teresa Pierce, the draft minutes of February 3, 2014 meeting were unanimously approved as submitted.

2. **Comprehensive Plan –Discussion of Land Use-Related Actions**

   a. Discussion with LPAC members on Areas for Potential Zoning Review map, especially rationale for Area 8.

Russ welcomed Sam and Sandra. CDC has been wrestling with priorities for land use specifically elements to achieve a mix between rural and growth areas. They have generated a short list of six actions to move in that direction. The discussion about the rural/growth areas identified the issue of gray areas and the need to create more detail for purposes of ordinance writing.

Of special interest to the CDC is the Potential Zoning Review map, with a focus on #8, Falmouth Rd area. The committee would like to know the rationale for determining rural and growth areas and how it applies to that area. Also of discussion is what tasks might be assigned to LPAC and create a reasonable division of labor.

Sam Rudman, LPAC Chair and Sandra Lipsey, V-Chair LPAC addressed the committee. Major points were:

- The development of the purple areas and pink areas evolved from more definitive lines to less definitive. The bolder colors were close to streets to emphasis that the designation is clearer in those areas. Final maps were done by a mapper to help people visualize the text. The intent was for educating.
- LPAC did not get into the details of specific parcels. The discussion was intentionally conceptual.
- Started with commercial centers Route 1 and 100, then identified adjacent neighborhoods for residential. The remainder was considered rural.
- Idea is hatched areas should be revisited but LPAC was leaning toward area 8 being reviewed for rural development due to its location and the constraints of the turnpike spur. Falmouth Road is a connector between Route 1 and Route 100.
- Area 8 would be under pressure for development.

- State was concerned about school area being in rural. LPAC expanded growth areas to include school, very limited. An attempt was made to keep the two growth areas separate.

The committee commented on the presentation:

- Wonder what the right mix is in that area.
- Perhaps the areas north and south of Falmouth Road need to be addressed separately.
- There are large tracts of land that have limited access.
- How to change zoning and how much to leave to the Planning Board for policy decisions/waiver requests as land is developed.
- Logic to area 8 being purple, maybe with a different set of criteria than other growth areas.
- Look at utilities, sewer is not currently feasible.
- Constraints on Falmouth Road for site distance.
- Toughest area to discuss
- Where are areas in growth areas that are developable?
- Area is near both growth areas for commercial development.
- How much growth can the town handle and where should it occur?
- What zoning criteria could be applied to moderate growth?

The committee agreed that the area should be more of a transitional area ~~and have a growth designation but~~ with its own set of unique provisions to reflect the constraints. It was noted that the area has some qualities of a growth area such as proximity to schools, but also has a rural feel. Teresa felt that to her it was more a transitional-rural area than a transitional-growth area. Some suggestions for development would be better connectivity for pedestrians in open space areas and sidewalks, street interconnectivity where feasible, impact fees for sidewalks, moderate growth, review types of development, maybe look at decreasing density but allowing cluster style development, so that open space is preserved, but there are denser neighborhoods. It is recognized that sewer is a constraint and that it might make sense for all development to be connected to water. Amanda was asked to come back to the next meeting (March 10) with a list of characteristics that might describe the type of development and some zoning methods to address them. Then the CDC can update the Council on March 24. Theo mentioned that the state recognizes the notion of transitional areas.

b. Review prioritized actions and agree on changes to actions

Amanda reviewed the makeup of the chart. She added and edited actions with rewording to reflect the CDC discussions. The committee was in agreement with the rewording of the actions, with an amendment to 44 to include zoning ideas and 41 to suggest that the time frame is long term. Russ emphasized the desire to take actions on both fronts, to study growth and find things to do to promote growth, and then look at rural areas to add restrictions to slow growth in rural areas.

c. Rank prioritized actions and determine if there are any low hanging fruit for immediate implementation

The order presented in the chart is good. The only low hanging fruit is 65 and the CDC will wait on this as it is not a priority.

d. Suggest entity to complete actions

It was agreed that CDC would focus on 44 (clarifying the rural/growth areas) and 41 (striving for majority of growth in the growth areas and working on a differential growth cap) and LPAC would work on 21 (looking at current neighborhoods in the growth areas) and 42 (how to incent compact walkable neighborhoods in the growth area)

e. Next Steps

The committee agreed to plan an update to the Council on March 24. Teresa suggested perhaps the Council would consider a facilitated discussion as part of the Council retreat to work on the remainder actions of the plan in conjunction with the Council Work Plan.

3. Other Business

Theo updated the committee on the State approval process. The plan was found complete and consistent. Staff made some tweaks to address state comments. One word was added in the recommended actions, review wetlands and "stream" provisions. He will finalize a packet to Council as the text changes will require re-adoption of the plan. The update to the Council will occur on February 24.

4. Next Meeting – March 10, 3014 at 8:00 am. Homework consists of:

- Staff will work on variations of the Future land use plan boundaries between rural and growth areas for the committee to review
- Staff will prepare a list of characteristics for Area 8 as well as regulatory tools that could be used to achieve them.
- LPAC will schedule a meeting and work on a plan/schedule to accomplish their tasks. They will present back to the CDC at the March 10 meeting. A written report will be adequate.

Theo mentioned that staff will meet to sort out how LPAC will be staffed for these tasks. Historically zoning work is led by Amanda.

5. Adjourn - The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 AM.

Draft Minutes prepared by Amanda Stearns, February 10, 2014
Rev. 1 by Theo Holtwijk, March 10, 2014