



## Long Range Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC)

Thursday, February 28, 2019  
Meeting Minutes

### Attendance

Name	Present	Name	Present	Name	Present
Breana Gersen <i>Chair</i>	✓	Rich Jordan <i>Planning Board</i>	✓	Claudia King <i>Council Liaison</i>	✓
Becca Casey <i>Vice Chair</i>	-	Sandra Lipsey <i>LPAC+</i>	-	Theo Holtwijk <i>Staff</i>	✓
Dimitri Balatsos	✓	Sam Rudman <i>LPAC+</i>	✓	Meredith Sells <i>Staff</i>	✓
Paul Bergkamp	-				

Other Councilors attending: Ted Asherman, Caleb Hemphill

Other Staff attending: Ethan Croce, Nathan Poore

Others attending: Keith Noyes, Tim O'Donovan, Valentine Sheldon, Sid Thorne

Breana started the meeting at 6:05 pm.

### 1. Review of Draft Minutes of February 7, 2019 Meeting

The draft minutes of the February 19, 2019 meeting were approved as written.

### 2. Continuation of Growth and Density Review

Theo provided an overview of the handouts that he had prepared. The first was the chart staff had originally created for the 1/10 LPAC meeting that compared the dimensional zoning standards in the RA district from 2016 to current with additional possible options. The updates made to the chart were the removal of all columns except the Pre-July 2016 RA zoning, July 2016 RA zoning, Current RA zoning (adopted March 2018), as well as the addition of the LPAC possible option discussed at the previous meeting. Theo added two options that had been sent to Theo for distribution by Valentine Sheldon on 2/28. Theo noted that staff had taken the liberty of inputting the numbers from the pdf Valentine had attached through email into the same format of the chart to enable LPAC to compare options consistently, and created two columns to also reflect the lowest numbers Valentine proposed in the brackets. The LPAC potential option on the chart was unchanged since it was determined on the 2/19 meeting, and was presented at the 2/25 Town Council meeting.

Theo provided a second handout of the results from testing the LPAC 2/19 proposed option using the same test methodology as used to test the LPAC 2/7 proposed option. The test analyzed, at a high level, how many units of each housing type - Single-Family (SF), Two-Family (TF), and Multi-Family (MF) - could result in three scenarios: Pre-July 2016 zoning standards, current zoning standards, and the proposed standards for LPAC's option. Different lot sizes were analyzed. Theo drew the committee's attention to the cautionary note included at the bottom of the test results handout, noting this is a high-level

assessment meant to capture typical scenarios. Theo emphasized there are multiple variables at play that could result in either greater or fewer dwelling units depending on a specific site.

The third handout Theo provided was a summary of feedback he had noted from the 2/25 Council discussion after the LPAC update presented by Breana. On the handout, Theo explained the three notes he had included from the overall discussion. He believed that the Council expressed an interest in further exploring a multi-zone approach as part of a phase two project. He stated that it seemed Councilors were not inclined towards enacting a moratorium. Theo also noted there seemed to be interest in making the effective date of any amendments the date that they would be introduced. Theo also included 7 comments that were suggestions for the committee to take another look at. Councilor or staff member's initials in parentheses had been added next to the comment made. Theo reviewed each suggestion. Theo noted that Ethan was present to provide further clarification. Ethan stated that regarding non-conformities, LPAC should be clear on how non-conformities are to be treated in any future proposal.

The fourth handout Theo provided was a summary of how lot width is defined in Falmouth and other surrounding communities, including Cape Elizabeth and Yarmouth. Theo clarified that the language for Yarmouth that was referenced by Valentine at the 2/19 LPAC meeting came from a footnote in the Yarmouth ordinance to be applied to two of the districts. The footnote stated that for two of the districts, lot width must be maintained from the front lot line to the minimum front yard setback. Theo noted that staff could review and analyze the lot width definition from other communities further if the committee wanted to do that.

Theo noted that the Council requested to hear final recommendations from LPAC at the 3/25 Council meeting. He also reminded LPAC that it wanted to hold a second public forum before finalizing any recommendations. Theo suggested a timeline to meet those two objectives. Theo suggested that the committee come up with a proposal at the current meeting, target a public forum on 3/14, and then schedule an extra meeting for Tuesday, 3/19, to consider feedback and make any final changes to the recommendations. Theo stated that this timeline would allow Breana and Theo 1.5 days to package the recommendations into a presentation for the 3/25 Council meeting because Council meeting materials were typically posted the prior week. In response to a question why the forum was no longer being targeted for 3/13, Theo stated that Councilors wanted to be present for the forum so the date was also dependent on Councilors' availability. Theo noted that the Council had a conflict on 3/13, and given other dates of conflict, 3/14 was determined to be the best option. Theo noted that he had inquired about space at Lunt Auditorium for many different dates, and Lunt Auditorium was booked for all dates. Theo had booked Council Chambers for the event, and suggested televising the event to enable overflow seating in Town Hall, and the option for people to stream it.

Sam asked what the forum format would look like. Theo responded that was up to the committee, but suggested that it would likely be more than a public hearing, with a combination of a presentation with LPAC findings so far, and time to seek reactions to LPAC's specific proposal. Theo stated that the committee could explore having Craig Freshley, a facilitator, come again, but Theo felt that LPAC had received general feedback at the 1<sup>st</sup> public forum and an objective for the 2<sup>nd</sup> forum was to receive more targeted feedback. Breana concurred, adding that part of the goal for having a specific, narrow set of recommendations was to be able to get feedback from the public on the specific numbers.

Dimitri asked what would happen if there is disagreement at the forum. Breana believed that having an additional LPAC meeting after the forum was important to take into account any feedback from the

forum. Breana felt that at a minimum, the committee would present what it came up with to the Council, and note other perspectives that had been provided. Dimitri believed the forum should be informative in nature, and provide the opportunity for LPAC to present the work completed so far. Breana agreed, adding that there should be a second part in the forum after presenting LPAC's recommendations to ask the public what they think of the recommendations. Theo clarified to those who were not present at the first forum that there was purposefully no presentation at the first public forum LPAC held. The purpose of the first forum was to hear what was on the public's mind about growth and density concerns in general, and have a free flow of comments and dialogue. Theo suggested that the committee should not prepare a long presentation. Dimitri asked if there would be any handouts, maps, or pictures. Theo stated that was up to the committee, but suggested that the most important information the committee needed is a specific proposal to present. Dimitri thought that Breana did an outstanding job presenting at the 2/25 Council meeting, and suggested shortening that presentation and getting to the bottom line faster.

Breana asked what others thought about the schedule that Theo had proposed. Dimitri and Sam agreed with Breana that the timeline made sense. Sam noted that he will be out of the state from March 10<sup>th</sup> – March 20<sup>th</sup>, so won't be present for the forum or 3/19 meeting. Sam stated that he could possibly join the 3/19 meeting by phone, and Breana thought that would be great.

Dimitri reiterated that Breana did a great job for the LPAC presentation at the 2/25 Council meeting, agreed with everything said, and felt unsure of how much history of the work and issues LPAC should present. Breana wanted to frame the issue to set the starting point for the public comments, and refer to background materials and where to reference.

Councilor Ted Asherman suggested that starting the forum at 7 pm compared to 6 pm might be easier for the public to attend. Theo responded that was a fair point.

Breana asked if the dates of the meetings and forum will be advertised to the public. Theo responded yes, that the dates would be advertised per the normal process and procedures.

Breana asked if there was any public comment, and asked if the public would possibly please keep comments succinct given the tight timetable.

Valentine Sheldon stated that he had changed his proposed numbers slightly after speaking with Theo earlier that day on 2/28. Valentine stated he had looked at how other communities used and defined frontage and lot width, and thought Dunstable, Massachusetts was an interesting example. Valentine provided a handout of excerpted zoning bylaws from Dunstable, Massachusetts to Theo to review. Valentine believed Theo had said that he did not know if developing zoning based on individual lots had been done before. Valentine had researched this topic further and felt that zoning based on lot size had been used mostly in urban areas, using multiple variables and taking an annual snapshot. Councilor Claudia King and Sam asked for any examples of towns that use this type of zoning by lot size. Valentine stated he could get back to them.

Valentine's first handout was a comparison of other zoning districts along the Rt. 88 corridor in other towns, including Yarmouth and Cumberland, as well as an average of all towns' requirements including Falmouth. Valentine stated he had updated the chart to include additional rows.

Valentine's second handout was his updated numbers for his proposed zoning option. Valentine felt all the Councilors were open to multi-zones down the road, and mentioned Councilor Aaron Svedlow specifically. Valentine felt that there were a lot of concerns from Councilors about multi-family housing. Valentine provided his interpretation of what Councilors said at the 2/25 Council discussion following the LPAC presentation.

Breana took a moment to note that LPAC members had been at the 2/25 Council Meeting, but appreciated Valentine's comments.

Valentine felt that his proposed option was more conservative than LPAC's option. Theo clarified the changes Valentine had made to his option based on the handout of his current proposal. Valentine confirmed that he changed his proposed minimum lot size for TF to 2 acres or 87,120 sf, as well as the proposed minimum lot size for MF to 10 acres and then 5 acres for the "lowest" column. Valentine also confirmed that he had changed 150 ft as the proposed minimum lot width to 200 ft for the first column, and retain 150 ft as the "lowest". Theo emphasized that he wanted to ensure the committee had captured the changes on the chart of zoning options, so the committee could review all options. Councilor Caleb Hemphill asked if 65,340 sf was 1.5 acres. Theo and Sam believed that was the case.

Sid Thorne felt the committee should change the lot width to the 50 ft. and 100 ft. minimums currently in place. Sid suggested 50 ft. for TF and SF frontage requirements, and changing the 100 ft. frontage requirement to 50 ft. for MF because the setback requirements already created a buffer. Sid believed it was important to look at the change from 50 ft. to 100 ft. for frontage because that has the largest objections, and felt 100 ft. for frontage was too much. He believed that the LPAC proposed 20,000 sf for TF lot size minimum was fine. Sid felt that 50 ft. buffers for setback requirements are too extreme. Sid stated this was because when looking at setbacks, a 10 ft. setback is not 10 ft. from the tar on the road, but involves another 30 or 40 additional feet. Sid felt the LPAC proposed setbacks for SF and TF were fine, but would change the MF setbacks to 25 ft. for the front, 25 ft. for the side, and 50 ft. for the back. Sid felt that if the committee made some compromise, the people complaining will feel like something has been done. Sid felt that exploring multiple zones within a single zone would be very hard for people who own multiple parcels.

Rich asked if the 74% should be 54% that was noted on #4 of Valentine's rationale for his proposal on his handout of a proposed option. Rich also thought the 57% noted on #5 of Valentine's rationale for his proposal should be 20%. Valentine stated he had referenced those numbers from the LPAC presentation. Rich thought the percentages should be 20% and 54%, and confirmed his belief after reviewing the number of parcels over 60,000 sf from the map distributed at a previous meeting of lots categorized by size. Valentine thanked Rich and said he will take a look at his numbers again. Rich said he had only wanted to make sure he had the right numbers in his head and was on the same page.

The public comment period was closed.

Sam asked Ethan if someone would be prevented from adding an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) if the lot met the frontage requirements, but was otherwise non-conforming. Ethan responded that a lot that had been built upon and was non-conforming had no bearing on adding an ADU, that such could be done.

Sam asked Theo to expand further his thoughts on lot width. Theo stated he did not know how Yarmouth measures lot width for lots without buildings, given the definition measures the point where

the main building is closest to the street. Theo believed the staff can look into lot width definitions that preclude odd-shaped lots if the committee wanted to review that further. Ethan and Theo had talked about the potential of maintaining lot width at a greater depth into the property than the front setback, but were not sure if that would avoid any odd-shaped lots. They would have to research that further if the committee wanted to explore this option. Ethan added that the Yarmouth's definition of lot width directly paralleled the definition Falmouth had on the books, and was identical to Falmouth's definition regarding the minimum side setback. Ethan also believed that the July 2016 zoning amendments had not caused odd-shaped lots, because odd-shaped lots had been happening in Falmouth since the beginning of time. Ethan believed the only material change since the July 2016 zoning amendments is the front setback minimum for a lot reduced from 25 ft. to 10 ft.

Breana asked which numbers in the zoning standards represented lot width. Rich responded frontage and lot width were the same thing in this case, and asked Ethan to confirm he was correct. Ethan confirmed that for the purpose of this analysis frontage and lot width were the same. Ethan stated that when a development project had to be approved by the Planning Board, the Planning Board had authority and could use subjective judgement to have more consistent lot lines in a subdivision. Ethan stated that this is not the case for the Code Enforcement Officer, who is tasked with purely checking whether the lot meets the zoning requirements. Rich believed that the concept of flag lots, where there is a long and skinny disproportionate side to the broader lot, happened in several other communities besides Falmouth. Theo added that lot splits can be drawn in many ways to meet zoning requirements.

Theo stated that he had found a study of lot width across 187 communities in Massachusetts, but needed more direction from the committee if this is an issue it would like to explore further.

Claudia asked Ethan if the lot width definition for Falmouth required the lot width to be maintained to the back setback. Ethan responded no, that the lot width only had to be maintained at the front. Sid felt that any change in frontage requirements would eliminate the development potential for all properties with 100 ft. of frontage that have an existing house in the middle of the lot. Ethan added that any increase in frontage requirements would make a huge difference because of the history of Falmouth lots. Ethan explained that since 1965, the RA district had many lots that have exactly 125 ft. of frontage. If frontage was changed to 100 ft., the number of lots that could be split would be greatly reduced.

Valentine felt the Town Council mandate in his opinion was to preserve character, include a multi-step process, and hitting a pause button to stop any more damage. Councilor Hemphill suggested that the discussion return to the committee to let it do its work. Breana believed she was allowing others to speak because it was helpful to have the public provide feedback.

Sam asked staff to clarify the non-conformity comment Ethan had made and that Theo had included on his handout of excerpted comments from the Town Council and staff. Ethan responded the basis of his comment: that it needed be clear how LPAC wanted to handle new non-conformities as there would be new non-conforming lots if RA were to be rolled back. Ethan believed the committee should be deliberate in making policy recommendations about non-conforming lots when making any future zoning amendments. Ethan explained some potential options. The committee could recommend an additional amendment to "grandfather in" non-conforming lots that were legally conforming during previous zoning standards and retain buildable status, or decide to proceed without any additional amendment if the committee did not feel it was a problem it should address. Breana asked if anyone knew how many of these lots existed. Ethan responded that there was no way to keep updated Town records because property owners often made unrecorded changes to their lots. Dimitri asked Ethan if he

could take a guess of whether there were several or a few lots that would fit this case. Ethan said it would be hard for him to make an estimate, but elaborated that the lots that would apply would be some of lots split for development since 2016. In response to further requests from Dimitri, Ethan said he would doubt there would be over 100 lots and could believe there were 5 to 15 lots since 2016. Valentine said his attorney has been involved with a lot of the lot splits since 2016 and felt it was not just 5.

Sam felt that LPAC or another committee would be back evaluating zoning standards and exploring multi-zone options at some point in the future. Sam felt that in a perfect world, the zoning standards would be completely reset to pre-2016 zoning standards, because he felt RA would be reviewed again in the future and may leave any proposal made now unnecessary. Sam stated he had also made a proposed option with updated numbers. Sam believed there were two options: to present the numbers the committee determined during this meeting or reset to pre-July 2016 zoning standards. Sam felt he had heard good arguments from both sides, and believed this was a really important and complex task. Rich felt the same way, and added there was an additional risk of non-conformity if the Town adopted new zoning standards following this work and then another set of standards down the line. In this case, Rich believed there would then be 3 periods of non-conformity to deal with. Dimitri believed the committee had done a lot of work, and should not throw the careful work done to date out.

Valentine wondered if the people who had invested time and resources into the past work should still be working on it. He believed it should be a different group of people who evaluate this issue rather than those who invested years into the process. Valentine felt it was extremely hard for someone invested in something to recognize when they have made a mistake and reset.

Claudia stated that the Council, staff and committees had spent significant time on developing a vision and policy and recommendations. Sam agreed. Claudia believed there were a lot of great concepts and language in the Comp Plan. Claudia stated she had done a lot of thinking about the implementation of the Comp Plan recently and believed the implementation was not terrible or great. The implementation was purely carrying out the policy, vision and concepts developed in the Comprehensive Plan. Claudia felt that the Comprehensive Plan should not be changed or ignored at the flip of a switch, because it came out of a large public process. Claudia felt that if the committee rolled back to pre-July 2016 zoning standards, it would be countermanding the policies developed in the Comprehensive Plan, and would be changing policy instead of implementing it. Claudia suggested the committee look at changes to the zoning that would not revert all the way back. Dimitri added that not all of the current zoning standards were a big issue or an issue at all. Breana also agreed with Claudia and Dimitri in not rolling back the zoning standards to pre-July 2016. Breana added that she felt any zoning changes recommended by LPAC should be made in line with the Comp Plan. Breana suggested that the committee identify problem areas in the current zoning standards and determine specific numbers that help mitigate the problem for now.

Breana asked if there were ways or strategies to reduce non-conforming lots, knowing that zoning standards may change again. Ethan responded that non-conformity is a tough issue to address. Ethan reviewed that there was a provision put in the 2016 zoning amendments to make any lots conforming that existed and were less than 5,000 sf. Ethan noted that retaining non-conformity for some lots may have benefits regarding the development of those lots. Ethan explained development on non-conforming lots goes through the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA), and an increase in development on non-conforming lots could place additional administrative burden on the BZA. Ethan thought any answer to reducing non-conformity of lots is complicated, and a lot of factors would need to be considered.

Breana noted that one of the initial strategies of the 2016 zoning amendments was to reduce non-conformity. Breana wondered if the committee should take the effect on non-conformity that the proposal would have into account. Theo reviewed the committee's discussion two meetings ago of whether to focus on reducing non-conformity. Theo believed the committee had discussed letting go of that idea and try to solve other problems, recognizing that may result in an increase in non-conformity. Rich stated that non-conformity was an important issue. Rich asked if it would be fair for the committee to recommend the Council or committee work with staff on the issue of non-conformity in the future as part of the committee's final recommendations. Ethan thought that would be fair.

Rich believed that the committee should not throw out the work done thus far and revert to pre-July 2016 zoning standards. Rich asked the committee members to confirm if they were in agreement to dismiss the idea to throw out the current proposal and recommend reverting back to pre-July 2016 standards. The committee members agreed. Rich felt the Council may not have grasped the potential impact of the LPAC proposed option. Rich thought only a few small tweaks needed to be made to the LPAC proposed option for him to feel comfortable.

Sam stated he had ideas for tweaks to the LPAC proposed option based on what he heard from the Council discussion and had looked if the projects that had been enabled by the zoning amendments could still be built with his adjustments. Sam cited the standards he proposed. Claudia asked Sam to confirm if he was suggesting almost an acre for TF minimum lot size. Sam confirmed that he was, and his rationale was that this would still be consistent with the Comp Plan goals, while cutting back on the number of projects that would be allowed. Sam added that some of the duplex projects were startling.

Sam asked Theo to confirm that there had been no MF units enabled since the 2016 zoning amendments. Theo responded that 1 MF unit had been enabled. Sam believed that MF housing was a concern for Falmouth. Claudia noted that there is existing MF housing on the Foreside now.

Sam stated he had tried to tie his proposed standards to public comments, the Council's comments and past standards. Claudia asked what Sam had based his test on to evaluate his proposed option. Sam reviewed that he had tested his proposed standards on all projects in the RA zone that could not have been done before the July 2016 zoning amendments. Theo noted that staff can run that same test on all projects that were enabled by the July 2016 zoning amendments, but cautioned that these projects were just a sample, and that many lots have an unknown development potential.

Valentine asked if the number of MF referenced represented the number of units or the number of multi-family buildings. Theo responded that all data was done with number of units.

Breana suggesting testing Sam's numbers using the same methodology as the test completed by staff in the second handout for the 2/19 LPAC proposed option. The committee determined that 0 units would be possible for SF, TF or MF for a 10,000 sf lot; 1 unit of SF and 0 units of TF or MF would be possible for a 20,000 sf lot; 2 units of SF or TF and 0 units of MF would be possible for a 40,000 sf lot; 3 units of SF, 2 units of TF or 3 units of MF would be possible for a 60,000 sf lot; and 6 units of SF, 8 units of TF or 9 units of MF would be possible for a 100,000 sf lot. Ethan believed there were less units possible with lower lot sizes for this option because there was a higher barrier of entry, and then the option stayed consistent with the density in the LPAC 2/19 proposal. Sam stated he had not thought of it that way. Rich reviewed that 262 lots exist that over 60,000 sf, and believed many were near the ocean.

Sid asked why the frontage was changed to 110 ft., when 110 ft. was greater than the minimum for the RB zone. Sam felt the committee would have to re-evaluate the RB zone in the future. Sid asked what the intent was for this change. Sam responded that the proposed standards would allow some development but not as much as currently allowed. Valentine felt the proposed standards would not make development come to screeching halt.

Claudia asked if growth caps had been studied. Sam believed that the committee's charge was not about building caps, and the committee was not addressing at this time. Sam believed the committee was tasked by the Council with directing growth more than the pace of growth.

Dimitri asked what proposed standards would be included in the presentation to the Council. Theo stated that was still for the committee to decide.

Breana believed that Sam's changes to the proposed standards had the biggest reduction of possible units for 40,000 sf. lots, also reduced the number of possible units for 60,000 sf. lots in half, and left the number of units possible for 100,000 sf. lots unchanged. Breana reviewed previous discussion by the committee of focusing on larger lots. Breana felt unsure whether the committee was focusing on the impact on smaller lots, or was trying to focus on larger lots. Breana felt the smaller lots were where the concerns were regarding character, and that the larger lots were the focus on future-range planning because of the development potential. Breana wondered if the committee knew that a multi-zone would be explored in the future, that perhaps the committee should not worry right now about larger lots. Breana stated she was trying to determine how to evaluate the test results and if the test results were what the committee wanted. Theo noted that it seemed Breana was expressing that Sam's proposal might make sense for a sub-zone of smaller lots, or that maybe it also worked as a one-size-fits-all for now and that a sub-zone for larger lots could be evaluated in the future. Breana agreed with that assessment. Breana asked if the committee was concerned with larger lots, because Sam's proposal did not affect the number of units possible for larger lots by much.

Ethan asked if the committee could elaborate on what it felt was the issue with larger lots. Breana believed that larger lots had the most development potential and might be impacted by any zoning changes. Claudia wondered if that was the case. Claudia believed that 9 units of MF on a 100,000 sf would also require developers to be responsible for open space preservation. Theo stated he felt the sense of the committee was that a significant portion of the RA zone has large lots. Theo continued that the smaller lots are generally built out, so the changes in the neighborhood would most likely happen on large lots. Theo stated the committee had looked at lots of 1.5 acre or more and felt that was where the development potential lied. Theo reviewed that the committee's discussion on larger lots was the starting point for exploring a multi-zone option, but had then ratcheted back exploration of a multi-zone option. Theo felt the committee was anticipating where the RA district will grow.

Valentine felt character needed to be preserved or incentivized. Sam asked if the boundary of his proposed option should apply to lots smaller than 40,000 sf. Breana responded that she was trying to determine if the numbers were having an effect the committee wanted, and were balancing interests. Breana felt the numbers first proposed on 2/19 were the middle ground between pre-July 2016 and 2016 zoning standards. Ethan felt character was subjective measure, and suggested that one way to evaluate is the impact on future development of the standards. Ethan suggested the committee keep in mind that development projects for 3 or more units on, for example, a 40,000 sf lot would have to go to the Planning Board for approval. Ethan compared this scenario to a lot split, where the Code Enforcement Officer is involved and is tasked with determining if the proposed lots meet the zoning



standards. Ethan stated the Planning Board had the authority and the tools, including regulations and subjective discretion to evaluate character for the project and request design modifications. Ethan additionally noted that the conservation zoning standard require a 50 ft. buffer that cannot be waived. Ethan stated that the Planning Board had the authority to shift building envelopes and mandate buffers and setbacks. Ethan added that the Planning Board process allowed abutters to a project to have a voice in the review. Ethan believed that a subdivision allowed the Planning Board to influence projects, where as the Planning Board did not have control on a single lot. Theo added that the projects that were enabled by the zoning amendments were lot splits and not Planning Board projects.

Ethan stated he felt that any changes to lot width would have a huge impact because a change to 100 ft. required for lot width would eliminate the development potential for many one-off lot splits.

Dimitri asked how Sam's proposed standards were different than the standards proposed by LPAC on 2/19. Sam responded that his proposed standards were not necessarily good. Sam stated that he had looked at what past development projects could be done under his proposed standards, and personally believed his proposal made sense and recognized it was not a middle ground. Sam felt that 40% of the projects he reviewed still could be done under his proposed option. Claudia asked if Sam had applied lot width first when looking at past projects, and if TF and MF were then still possible because she believed Sam had doubled the proposed lot size minimums for TF and MF. Sam responded that he had not compared the lot width, and had only looked at past projects based on lot size. Claudia responded that it would be interesting to determine the base factor that enabled the projects. Sam believed the committee had seen from the data that increases in TF had to do with reductions in lot size. Sid believed that Sam's proposed lot size minimums and standards were too extreme, and felt the committee should focus on frontage.

Theo suggested the committee determine a preliminary conclusion given the remaining meeting time. Breana agreed, adding she believed the committee should keep the 2/19 proposed lot size minimums and focus on lot width based on the Council. Sam stated that he disagreed, and felt all the standards were problematic, including lot size. Breana was unsure on how to proceed. Theo suggested one idea was the committee could take each of the parameters and take a straw vote. Sam agreed that maybe that was what the committee had to do. Theo suggested another idea was the committee could take an average of the two sets of proposed numbers for each standard. Breana believed the committee should take a vote for each parameter.

The four committee members proceeded to determine the proposed options for each standard, and then took a vote on the different options. The committee first reviewed the minimum lot sizes for the different housing types. Four members voted for 15,000 sf. minimum for SF. Two members voted for 20,000 sf minimum for TF, and two members voted for 40,000 sf. minimum for TF. The committee broke the tie by agreeing on 30,000 sf. minimum for TF. Two members voted for 50,000 sf. minimum for MF, and two members voted for 60,000 sf. minimum. The committee broke the tie by agreeing on 55,000 sf. minimum for MF.

The committee then reviewed the minimum lot widths for the different housing types. Four members voted for a minimum lot width of 100 ft. for SF. The committee discussed whether the minimum lot width for TF should be 125 ft. or 150 ft., and ultimately three members voted for 150 ft. minimum lot width for TF. The committee members discussed what lot width minimum would make sense for MF, and ultimately four members voted for 200 ft. lot width minimum for MF. The committee agreed to

retain the proposed 20% maximum lot coverage and each maximum residential density required for Planning Board projects from the 2/19 LPAC proposal.

The committee then reviewed the setback standards. Four committee members voted for 10 ft. as the minimum front setback for SF, 20 ft. as the minimum side setback for SF, and 30 ft. as the minimum rear side setback for SF. Two members voted for 10 ft. and two members voted for 20 ft. as the minimum front setback for TF. The committee broke the tie by agreeing on 15 ft. for the minimum front setback for TF. The committee agreed the minimum side setback for TF should be 35 ft., and the minimum rear setback for TF should be 40 ft. The committee agreed the minimum front, side and rear setbacks for MF should each be 50 ft. The committee agreed the minimum net residential area per unit should be 10,000 sf.

Theo suggested the staff could test the draft proposal using the same methodology as the test on the 2/19 LPAC option for the LPAC public forum. Theo stated the staff could also look at the 10 projects that were enabled by the 2016 zoning changes and determine how many could be done with the new proposal.

### **3. Other Business**

There was no other business.

### **4. Next Meeting**

The committee decided on the following special schedule for the upcoming meetings:

- Thursday, March 14, 7:00 PM: Targeted date for Public Forum #2
- Tuesday, March 19, 6:00-8:00 PM LPAC – Wrap up RA recommendations
- Monday, March 25 at 7:00 PM: Targeted date to present RA recommendations to Council

The meeting was adjourned at 8:07 pm.

Draft meeting notes prepared by Meredith Sells, March 6, 2019