



# Long Range Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC)

## Thursday, February 11, 2016 Minutes

**Attendance:**

Name	Present	Name	Present	Name	Present
Paul Bergkamp	√	Kurt Klebe	-	Jim Thibodeau	-
Sam Rudman	√	Sandra Lipsey	√	Erin Mancini	-
Tom McKeon	√	Karen Farber, Council Liaison	√	Theo Holtwijk, Staff	√

Sam started the meeting at 6:00 PM

**1. Review of Resource Conservation Zoning Overlay (RCZO) District**

The committee reviewed the summary chart that Theo and Ethan had put together and discussed of the four items:

- Amend the required minimum percentage of common open space required in conservation subdivisions,
- Eliminate, modify or limit the waiver allowance for roads exceeding the town’s 1,500 foot dead end road length limit,
- Reduce/eliminate minimum lot dimensional requirements (e.g. lot size), and
- Expand conservation zoning to include more than just single family home development & eliminate 200 ft. separation distance requirement between multiplex buildings.

Sandra felt that the old way of calculating open space may not have gotten the Town what it wanted. It has created “polka dots” but not a better quality of living experience. Sam was wondering if the requirement in the growth area should be changed to 10%. Sandra felt that the use of open space needed to be defined, and not so much the amount of it. She saw benefit in linking open spaces and having certain activities take place there.

Paul felt that the value of open space in the growth area was so that people there would not live on top of each other. He felt that in the rural part of town open space helped to define the character of that area.

Tom stated that the quality aspect was already built in the RCZO rule. Theo suggested that a fee in lieu of open space may also be a tool to help acquire higher quality open space.

Sandra felt that smaller properties should not be required to set aside open space. Karen thought that open space in denser areas could be better labeled “green space” and felt that the “dots” could have a value.

The committee discussed the percentage requirements. Sandra felt that reducing the amount in the growth area was OK and that a fee in lieu option should be added. Sam asked who determined that. It would be reviewed by the Planning Board. Paul felt that the Town needed a map, so the Planning Board could see where adding open space was most valuable.

Karen asked who typically owned the open space. Tom responded that open space can be owned by the Town, the land trust, but frequently also by home owners associations. He added that over time, open space provisions that home owners associations are required to follow are often ignored. Karen said that the “polka dots” typically do not have public access, but that the original intent in the growth area may have been to add greenery and in the rural area to preserve visual character.

Sandra wondered how the RCZO tool could help to leverage growth in the growth area. Paul suggested that if the percentage stayed the same, developers could lower it by buying the difference.

The committee agreed to not suggest any changes to the current road waiver provisions.

The committee was OK with making the dimensional requirements more flexible. Tom felt that interest to develop in the growth area could be increased by making the standards more flexible. No specific flexibility recommendations were made.

The committee agreed that RCZO should be applied to all forms of housing. The committee had already addressed the 200 feet separation issue between multiplex buildings as part of LPAC’s year 1 Growth Area recommendations. Tom felt that it was important to require common space for multiplex developments.

The committee then returned to the percentage open space requirement issue. Sam felt that increasing the requirement in the rural area was OK. He thought that a fee in lieu in the growth area was a good idea and that developers should be able to “buy down” to 0%. He felt that the open space was traded in could then be traded for additional development.

Karen mentioned that the CDC had done some research into purchase of development rights. Theo will look into that to see if it is of use to the committee. Accordingly, no decision on amending the minimum required open space was reached.

Theo reviewed the Freeport materials. The committee was interested to learn how those provisions have worked there and asked a series of questions that Theo will review with the Freeport planner: have these rules been applied? How often? Have they worked? What hurdles did Freeport encounter?

Sandra brought up the issue if the RCZO should be eliminated in the Growth area. The committee agreed to discuss that question more in the next meeting.

## **2. Other Business**

Theo gave a brief update on the West Falmouth Sewer Master Plan. He said that this project will become an agenda item with the Council soon. He will keep the committee informed when any discussions will happen, so the committee can weigh in.

Theo also mentioned that the Town hired Wright-Pierce to do a water system study of the Town, again with an emphasis on the growth area. He will keep the committee posted on that as well.

### **1. Review of Draft Minutes of November 24, 2015 Meeting**

The draft minutes of the 11/24/2015 meeting were approved as written.

### **2. Next Meeting**

The committee agreed to meet next on March 10 2016.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35PM.

Draft minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, February 29, 2016