



Town of Falmouth
Community Development Committee (Council Sub-Committee)
approved Meeting Minutes – May 12, 2014
Town Hall Large Conference Room

Members Present: Councilor Anderson, Councilor Goldberg
Staff Present: Amanda Stearns
Others Present: Sandra Lipsey and Sam Rudman, LPAC Co-Chairs
LPAC Council Liaison Claudia King

Councilor Anderson called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM.

1. Approve Minutes – there were no minutes to approve.
2. Comprehensive Plan Implementation Discussion – with LPAC leadership
 - a. LPAC role/CDC role – Sam and Sandra reviewed the points discussed at their meeting on May 8. Their efforts will be two-prong in nature, one to study and resolve the nonconformities under the current zoning and the other to look at undeveloped and underdeveloped parcels and look at possibilities for future growth. Sam stated the projected schedule is to complete the nonconformities study with zoning recommendations in 3-4 months and to complete the rezoning in one year. Sam mentioned having Judy Colby-George, GIS analyst, help with identifying characteristics in the growth area and the possibility of hiring a consultant to help with the infill. He also mentioned the idea of establishing a Pilot Project. A property owner with interest would be identified and LPAC would use this parcel of land to experiment on designing infill development. Also to be done would be a meeting with real estate and development representatives to better understand growth trends. This proved to be very helpful during the Comp Plan process. This was identified as something that should be done jointly with the town committees.

Russ inquired what the impact of the nonconformities has on the ability to generate more growth in the growth area. Sam and Sandra responded that there are many frustrated property owners and this came up during the Com Plan development. Amanda also commented that some of the tools that would be used to lessen nonconformities might also be the same tools that would be used to increase development potential.

[Note: Please refer to the May 8 minutes of LPAC for more information on their recommendations and findings.]

Russ reviewed the possible tools identified for the rural area including growth permits for lots and building permits, purchase of development rights, transfer of development rights, and decreasing density. Others might arise as the committee moves through the work. The possibility of looking at dividing the rural area up into more specific zoning districts was discussed. Amanda pointed out areas on the Development Potential map that are more or less densely developed, indicating that development in the rural area is not homogeneous.

She also mentioned that looking at growth permits could be prioritized as it would manage the growth occurring over the next year while other tools are studied and developed.

- b. Coordination of parallel efforts – One item mentioned was the mapping of existing conditions to look at patterns of development. This work would be performed by the Town’s GIS consultant. Otherwise the committee and LPAC reps did not see much area for overlap.
- c. Staff resources needed to support - Staffing for projects was reviewed. Amanda stated that the current plan is that Theo would be helping LPAC with the growth area work and Amanda would be helping the CDC with the rural area work.
- d. Communications with affected parties – It was agreed by the committee members that a communication strategy would be important to keep the public and affected parties up to speed on the work the committees are doing. All are concerned that input is requested and received prior to the formal zoning amendment process. The timing and type of communication will be important. Suggestions were to do a mailing to parties that would be considered stakeholders. For instance in the rural area this would include owners of vacant parcels and those with large parcels that could be further divided. It was also noted that all property owners within a study area could be considered stakeholders as they might be affected by changes in land use policy.

The idea of a stakeholder group was suggested and the committee agreed that this idea would be explored. It would not substitute for contact with a broader group at appropriate times but would augment that process and help provide input for the committees in developing communication strategies. For next meeting, staff will work on a list of the type of property owners that might be identified for a stakeholders group.

- e. Process and timeframe – LPAC noted in their discussion above the proposed timeframe for their two projects. It was noted that these were optimistic and would be affected by the hiring and schedule of a consultant if one is hired.

3. Other Business - none

4. Next Meeting – The next meetings scheduled are June 2 at 8:30 a.m. and June 9 (tentative) at 8:30 a.m. These dates are the only ones available before the organizational meeting of the new Council. It is hoped that a process for approaching the rural areas can be in place prior to the new committee meeting.

Staff tasks for CDC work for the next meeting are:

- Generate a set of variables that would be applied to parcels and used to characterize the current patterns of development.
- Develop a list of types of property owners that might make up a stakeholders group.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 a.m.