

## Forum 2, March 28, 2019

### Flipchart Responses re. Questions for Small Groups

#### Questions:

- 1) What questions for **clarification** do you have about what you just heard?
- 2) What did you **like** about what you heard?
- 3) What did you **not like** about what you heard?
- 4) What other **ideas, suggestions, requests** do you have on the proposed RA zone recommendations and/or other matters regarding growth and density in other zones; or topics related to growth and density (schools, taxes, character, etc.)?

Group	Question	Comments
1	1	1. Process has been inclusive, why do we waste our time doing Comp Plan, etc. when small sliver of people can bring to a halt? Can Council be bolder in moving forward?
1	1	2. Second person agrees with first. Think LPAC is doing great job. Not sure what RA is. Needs clarification of RA. Not even on handout.
1	1	3. Not at all satisfied that Comp Plan was comprehensive. No impact studies done on schools, roads, services. What is tax impact of planned growth '16 rezoning. SF unit potential pre-rezoning: 1,232. SF unit post rezoning: 3,758. Duplex potential post rezoning: 7,516. Please clarify: is this correct?
1	1	4. Want clarification on slide 17. Indicates a cap, but it is not broken down by districts. Inconsistency in data presentation.
1	General	Forum was supposed to be divided into two segments: 1. general growth and density, 2. RA district.
1	General	Reason this format was introduced was for Council and LPAC to avoid hostility.
1	1	What is the RA cap?
1	1	How many permits have been issued for slide 17?
1	1	Why are we here today about making RA zoning more restrictive when 869 of us last fall signed a petition to rescind the 2016 rezoning changes
1	1	Slide 17 shows increase in SF dwellings. Slide 19 says SF dwellings has remained consistent. These slides are inconsistent.
1	2	1. 2013 Plan was very inclusive and I liked that you talked about what went into plan.
1	2	2. Nothing. I liked nothing. Found presentation highly confusing (+2)
1	2	3. I don't pay attention to RA. Like the direction they're going in. Keeping density low in non-growth areas.
1	2	4. Liked nothing about it. Don't live in RA. Empathize with neighbors seeing quality of life diminished.
1	3	1. A little confusing - material and presentation.
1	3	2. "Totally confused"
1	3	3. Did not hear opposing views, stats
1	3	4. Presentation not enough time. Group not enough time. Will lead to unsatisfactory outcomes.
1	3	5. Dismissed slides 22 and 23 and didn't discuss reasons very well.
1	4	1. More handouts ahead of meeting.
1	4	2. Needed to hear opposition's "facts". Needed to hear LPAC "rebuttal."
1	4	3. Go back to pre-2016 and reduce density in RA zone today.
1	4	4. Was not format that we expected.
1	4	5. Only covered RA - expecting RA + overall growth and density concerns
2	1	Insufficient notice of 2016 changes
2	1	What is the negative feedback - clarify categories?
2	1	Protocol for notification for zoning changes? Postcard, email, phone call?

2	1	Upset with scale of projects and buildings.
2	1	People very upset with current allowances.
2	1	This presentation intentionally vague.
2	2	Liked deliberative process
2	2	Thoughtful presentation
2	3	Maps too small to read
2	3	Presentation too vague
2	3	Definition of zones and where they are would be helpful.
2	3	You didn't identify what their concerns have been.
2	3	Do you know why we are all here??
2	4	Notice
2	4	Look at Option #2 and look at RA subzones and character of each neighborhood preserved.
2	4	Architectural standards needed in RA zones.
2	4	Revert to prior space and bulk requirements in RA zone
2	4	High density/multifamily should be along Rt 1
2	4	Developers should pay impact fees.
2	4	We like option #3
2	4	Allow accessory apts in RA but no multif.
<hr/>		
3	1	Why are impacts to schools minimized as part of zoning changes.
3	1	Why this format rather than being able to talk about issues?
3	1	How was vision set to begin with?
3	1	Staff needs to be closely consulted so that zoning regulations don't result in unintended consequences
3	1	What's the difference between renovating for "mother-in-law" vs. just creating extra space?
3	2	I am very glad we're having this meeting and hope there will be some changes.
3	2	Glad that unintended consequences were mentioned/recognized.
3	2	Glad that we're open to ideas and changes
3	2	Glad that proposed changes are larger lot sizes/setback... etc. rather than smaller.
3	3	Making a big problem/mistake seem like a much smaller impact to the town. No ownership of the magnitude of the problem.
3	3	Not going all the way back to pre-2016 lot sizes/setbacks, etc.
3	4	Get more public involvement for next comprehensive plan that may start with pre-2013.
<hr/>		
4	1	This is a big task with a lot of details.
4	1	Does the town have a growth limit in mind?
4	1	What is the growth limit the town is looking for?
4	1	Is the town considering bringing in more businesses to increase the tax base.
4	1	Can these materials (handouts etc.) be presented in plain English without the confusing jargon and terminology?
4	1	What would the tax impacts be for property owners and for the town?
4	1	Report: Huge task/problem with lots of terminology that needs to be digested.
4	2	Will development along Route 100 corridor be affected by this discussion?
4	2	I like that the town is actively pursuing (3x) input from the public.
4	2	The intent of the town is good.
4	2	Report: Kudos to the town/LPAC+ for actively seeking public input.
4	3	The presentation had too much information.
4	3	Very hard for people with older eyes to follow along with the presentation/pace very fast.
4	3	Handouts from the public added to the confusion.
4	3	Why is it good for the town to increase density?
4	3	Report: Unclear for the need to increase density and the benefits.
4	4	I liked "it" the way it was (old zoning).

- 4 4 What is the history of wanting to subdivide? Who is/was the driving force for this?
- 4 4 Is affordable housing being taken into consideration? How ill this be enforced?
- 4 4 What traffic studies have been done? What school studies have been done?
- 4 4 Things have come up about vernal pools, environment, etc. How is the town looking at/considering environmental impacts of development/increasing density?
- 4 4 Should there be an environmental impact study for multi-unit developments of all sizes?
- 4 4 Report: Can we go back to the old standard and can we make sure to consider environmental impacts.

- 5 1 What are the general community concerns as they stand?
- 5 What are accessory developments
- 5 2 Like that lean is to revert to pre 2016.
- 5 3 Reduced setback and higher density without urban infrastructure!!! Sidewalks, storm drainage, sewer
- 5 3 Accessory dwellings being used as income property.
- 5 3 This process seems reactionary. What happened? How to fix.
- 5 4 Small subdivisions do not need to go in front of planning committee.
- 5 4 Ensure development is up to spec/code. Ensure new development uses utility.
- 5 4 Infrastructure for infill lots require sewer and sidewalks!!
- 5 4 Accessory dwellings should use common drive with prime house.
- 5 4 Require urban infrastructure to match development
- 5 4 Public access to open space, shoreline, parks, waterfront. Planned and enforced
- 5 4 Themes: Infill lots need public infrastructure to match development. Planning needs to be involved at smaller scale to prevent issues like sewer, water, sidewalks. Planning needs to be strategic, not reactionary.

- 6 1 Clarify impact on schools.
- 6 1 Accountability for burden on existing infrastructure.
- 6 1 Explanation how they arrived at numbers.
- 6 2 Appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback.
- 6 3 Not enough time before Council decision.
- 6 4 Return to pre 2016 changes
- 6 4 Lot frontage of 100'
- 6 4 Proposed changes to RA without reductions
- 6 4 Points for 2 minute report out: 1. Want more information, 2. Want more time before Council action, 3. Want to strike a fair compromise

- 7 1 Wasn't aware zoning changed
- 7 1 Town making decisions without hearing from residents
- 7 1 Where did the push for zoning changes come from? (citizens/developers)
- 7 2 Fellow citizens willing to volunteer to shape zoning rules
- 7 2 Town seems ready to listen (5 agreed)
- 7 2 Town and LPAC working together
- 7 2 Provide a forum for (220+/-) citizens to voice opinions vs. developers only
- 7 2 Communication from citizens (vs town) flier
- 7 3 Previous communication didn't include/reach all stakeholders.
- 7 4 A new, "well-thought out" Long Range plan
- 7 4 Study developmental impacts on: schools, traffic, taxes, etc.
- 7 4 How do we insure adherence to a new/revised long term plan?
- 7 4 Slow down development: listen to citizens.
- 7 4 Do we need to make Falmouth more appealing? (It already is appealing)
- 7 4 Consider adding "market rate housing" for "working" residents including teachers, police, fire/EMS.

8 1 Understand acronyms - RD vs RA. Laymen terms/understanding for the zoning.  
8 1 Visual comparisons to slides/PPT to existing neighborhoods  
8 1 Impact studies - schools, traffic - where are we at in knowing? Are there results. If so, we'd like to understand/see.  
8 1 Who pays for the infrastructure - town residents or developer?  
8 2 Opportunity to voice concerns.  
8 3 Changing community with new lot zoning - rural to dense - impacting long term residents.  
8 4 High density developments = adequate conservation land should be in play as well.  
8 4 Developer interests should not be part of town council members - recuse yourself immediately.  
8 4 Impact studies need to be done/accompany development proposals. Are there standards?

9 1 Completely confused. What studies done to justify 2016 amendments to ensure we can support growth.  
9 1 What prompted LPAC to review and recommend change in 2019?  
9 1 failed premise to reduce development in area of Falmouth that has space (rural) and squeeze everything into RA.  
9 1 How much rezoning thinking a result of Homestead Acres proposal?  
9 1 How much of new thinking is a result of/knee jerk reaction to Homestead? If this is a reaction to Homestead, why impact existing homes - I want to add an addition on existing homes. Keep 2016 amendments for existing homes.  
9 2 I like the forum  
9 2 Like this format, appreciate the prep work.  
9 2 I received good info.  
9 2 Why trying to change town character and cram houses in  
9 2 Small is better to get more houses in that are affordable.  
9 2 Should be asking do we as town want two families  
9 3 Increasing density in RA not benefit other than developers - lot splits on Foreside won't mean starter homes or affordable homes.  
9 4 Split RA in 2 zones  
9 4 Why do we care/want to stop more building on Foreside - good for taxpayers.  
9 4 Need more affordable - mixed affordability of housing with allowance to build throughout town.  
9 4 RA needs to be divided.  
9 4 This process making us all more aware and more informed.  
9 4 What do we want to say: 1. If change, existing homes grandfathered to keep current (2016 amend) dimensional standards. 2. RA into 2 or 3 zones. 3. Don't like growth cap in rural. 4. Tighten 2-family rules, e.g. owner occupied. 5. Can town handle increase from exempt units?

10 4 Purposefully confusing to silence the crowd.  
10 4 We are concerned about West Falmouth too. Why only asking about RA.  
10 4 If we wanted to live in a city, we would have stayed/moved to Portland.  
10 4 We are in favor of much larger lot sizes in RA, at least to pre-2016, but even larger like in Yarmouth and Cumberland along 88.  
10 4 We feel that with the size of this turnout many people are upset, but that you do not want to hear what we came to say.  
10 4 How are you going to be able to process all our feedback by Tuesday night?  
10 4 How can you not consider schools, taxes, traffic, environment when planning this.  
10 4 We are feeling the pressure on taxes and it could force out the lifelong residents. What happened to aging in place?  
10 4 More transparency about LPAC meetings and appointments. Consider televising.

- 10 4 No multi-family housing in Falmouth.
- 10 4 No two-family housing.
- 10 4 Accessory dwelling w/ conditional approval.
- 10 4 Developers pay impact fee?
- 10 4 We shouldn't be able to do anything w/o impact studies.
- 10 4 Preserving the character will preserve our property values.
- 10 4 Against the Habitat development. What will that contribute to our town other than higher taxes for residents.
- 10 4 We're concerned about conflicts of interest regarding people on the council and personal business.
- 10 4 Our elementary is already largest in Maine. Why add to that?

- 11 1 What preserves character in non-rural areas? Can we have a rational and reasonable response? vs kneejerk!
- 11 2 Like increased setbacks, lot size, frontage.
- 11 3 Constant change and unpredictability
- 11 3 Too complex.
- 11 3 Too small front setback.
- 11 3 Restrictions on expansion existing homes.
- 11 3 Lack of design controls on high density residential (c.f. commercial)
- 11 4 100 ft vs 110 ft frontage
- 11 4 Increase front setbacks to 25 ft unless special design review
- 11 4 Apply residential design controls/guidelines on all hi density projects
- 11 4 Treat existing different than new projects.

- 12 1 What does conditional use vs. permitted use mean and why is conditional taken away?
- 12 2 LPAC is trying to listen/pay attention to Falmouth residents concerns.
- 12 2 Encourage initiation of zoning study by neighborhood, so it can happen sooner than later.
- 12 3 Doesn't address overcrowding of Falmouth school system. Will quality of schools suffer as growth continues?
- 12 4 Concerned about pollution caused by density flowing into Casco Bay.
- 12 4 Overcrowding of Falmouth schools, budget accordingly.
- 12 4 Limit building permits per year.
- 12 4 Report: 1. Concerns by residents who would not be able to go forward w/ plans for small construction projects. 2. Concerns about impact on Falmouth schools (overcrowding) and pollution into Casco Bay resulting from development. 3. Limit building permits annually and initiate planning for neighborhood zoning in RA so it is ready sooner than later.

- 13 4 Prolong decision process - allow more opportunity for dialogue.
- 13 4 Temporary moratorium on building permits in RA - avoid "gold rush" mentality.
- 13 1 Is this a done deal and/or is this lip service? - Can we effect some change?
- 13 1 Define "long range planning"
- 13 1 + 3 In reference to slide #13, why aren't the impact o schools, taxes, traffic included in the research and planning of the LPAC - or environment, infrastructure.
- 13 Again - possible freeze of permits granted in RA (pg. 1 bullet #2)
- 13 4 Why no mailer, town-wide announcement of this forum of changes in zoning? - suggest "alert sign up" at voting booths? - how can town better communicate w/ citizens?
- 13 1 What is optimal outcome? \* residents - what do residents really want?
- 13 4 Lack of trust in "the town" of citizens - we now require absolute transparency
- 13 4 Look to comprehensive guide for town planning/zoning devised by State of Maine
- 13 4 Referendum! - research on impact of changes in zoning on town's infrastructure
- 13 2 Data is not adequate. Focus on lot size does not take into account population size
- 13 4 What is total population density we are comfortable with? 30 years?

14 1 Why would you only look at the RA zone? VMU.  
14 1 The number of buildable lots is much higher than the pre-zone change. The school and financial impact will balloon.  
14 1 The comp. plan is a disaster, why not roll back to pre-2016?  
14 1 The comp plan did not include impact of residents in RA  
14 1 Current growth rate would make town too large.  
14 1 Why are they trying to have 3-unit homes?  
14 1 Why were 72 growth cap units allowed in 2018?  
14 2 Nothing  
14 3 Everything  
14 3 Impacts to taxes and schools are beyond zoning.  
14 3 No impact studies by LPAC, Town off. ?? - no clue re. impact to pub. service.  
14 3 People who participate in LPAC missed 50% of meetings. No historical continuity b/c many did not show up.  
14 3 No discussion of lowering # of cap permits.  
14 4 Roll back to pre-2016 levels - wasn't evaluated  
14 4 Look at other zoning including VMU  
14 4 VMU 30% commercial 70% Res. ?? On new dev.  
14 4 Cost/benefit analysis for schools, police, fire, services  
14 4 Impact fees  
14 4 Comprehensively look at nearby development relative to impacts, e.g. traffic.  
14 4 Look at reducing cap #'s.

15 1 How long did LPAC deliberate on 2/28/19 proposal  
15 1 Can moratorium be placed to allow for comprehensive study  
15 1 Why do we want growth and rural @ same time.  
15 1 What, besides complexity, caused you to not fully investigate "option 2" - multiple RA zones.  
15 1 Can a true economic analysis be done on developing West Falmouth

16 Calculation of growth cap, different information in Forecaster vs. the presentation.  
16 Review how RA interfaces with the business area.  
16 Fear of multi unit neighborhoods coming to other neighborhoods  
16 Like that inviting public comment on what happened 3 years ago.  
16 How do we end up with meaningful change when we change every two years.  
16 Why is rolling back not consistent with comp plan. Revisit the comp plan.  
16 Why did growth spike in 2018.  
16 More analysis on the impact on schools and traffic.  
16 For schools, what is the impact of multi-family housing.  
16 What is the impact on taxes of cluster housing.  
16 Suggestion to consider roll back to 2016 and be more thoughtful.  
16 Why do we set time limits (figuring out RA) on resolving complex issues.  
16 Coordinate school growth with zoning/growth caps.  
16 Look at the overall impact of any proposed changes on infrastructure and taxes.

17 1 No knowledge of change. No notice for residents.  
17 1 Where was the transparency??  
17 1 Are we just focusing on RA (map).  
17 1 How does this impact no RA areas?  
17 2 Open to change (really?)  
17 2 Like the apology - too little too late.  
17 2 Lack of process that took place to make changes.

- 17 2 Lack of clarification of what the Council and LPAC want
- 17 2 Dismissed the impact made on schools
- 17 2 In infrastructure?
- 17 2 Meeting in November did not seem to go anywhere. Why are we here again?
- 17 4 No duplexes or multi-family
- 17 4 Harder growth caps with fewer exemptions.
- 17 4 Lower growth caps.
- 17 4 Unclarity of in-law apartments (definition).
- 17 4 More transparency.
- 17 4 Go back to pre-July 2016 RA levels.
- 17 4 Screening of developers? (i.e. tree removal)
- 17 4 How are you planning to add res/ change impact on schools?
- 17 4 Go back to pre-July 2016.
- 17 4 What next?

- 18 Traffic - amount, speed
- 18 Walkability
- 18 Aging in place challenges
- 18 Schools
- 18 Taxes
- 18 You will always have resistance to changes.
- 18 Blowback is inevitable.
- 18 Public presentation is fragmented; need context of other planning efforts, including commercial.
  
- 18 "Infill" - language matters.

- 19 1 Basic concerns not addressed by forum (move to #3)
- 19 1 Why exclusive focus on RA?
- 19 1 Rationale (precise) for making/formulating the current proposal.
- 19 1 Being asked to make "micro" decisions without understanding "macro" vision or providing input there on (move to #3).
- 19 1 Why isn't there a question about # of new dwellings we think should be allowed.
- 19 2 Public input solicitation, open discussion.
- 19 3 Development of recommendations in 2016 with 0 evaluation of impacts on environment, habitat, schools.
- 19 3 Appears 2019 rec's were simply "reverse engineer" of 2016.
- 19 3 No explanation for rationale behind 2016 rules + attempt to bring more RA properties into compliance/conformity.
- 19 4 Desire to ensure that community remains true to original comprehensive plan + that new developments - especially large ones - conform.
- 19 4 Town should moratorium on changes + take time to study impacts.

- 20 1 Please explain the mechanisms for public opinion and input in crafting the Comprehensive Plan and the 2016 zoning rules.
- 20 2 Some of us "liked" that this forum is designed to address the concerns about high density growth. Others feel this is simply an exercise in appeasement.

- 21 1 How many units are allowed to be built currently in RA
- 21 1 What is LPAC's timeline going forward?
- 21 1 Could we get more clarity on what constitutes the RA zone and all others?
- 21 1 When exactly was the RA zone designated?
- 21 1 Is slide 16 town wide or RA only?
- 21 2 Willingness to listen and being willing to make change.

- 21 2 Learning the explanation about the OceanView exemption.
- 21 2 Liked seeing the result of the test on "enabled" projects (slide 27).
- 21 2 Graphs on slide 16 - but would like more.
- 21 3 + 4 1. We feel this is not the right question. We should be asked what our issues are (see below #2).
- 21 3 + 4 2. There should be discussion of issues that are of concern to us, not just the zoning, e.g. taxes, school crowding, traffic, environmental, more infrastructure (fire + safety) for more residents.
- 21 3 + 4 There should be as much data for all new growth (subdivisions, etc.) as was presented for OceanView.
- 21 3 + 4 More concrete examples of what we are talking about - visuals of frontage comparisons between existing - 2016 - and new proposed zoning rules.
- 21 3 + 4 The assumption that growth is inevitable. Why not a moratorium? Towns in Southern New England have found success w/ this.
- 21 3 + 4 The RA zone changes assumed that the old infrastructure such as sewer and water pipes + roads were able to handle all the new growth.
- 21 3 + 4 The zoning committee assumes that growth means building houses, rather than preserving open space.
- 21 3 + 4 Zoning laws were intended to protect residents, but we feel the goal posts have been moved, maybe negatively impacting residents.
- 21 3 + 4 Why aren't we looking at the annual building cap?
- 21 3 + 4 Don't like any of the LPAC 2.28.19 possible RA zoning recommendations.
- 
- 22 1 Need more clarification. There is a lot of information.
- 22 1 LRBP assumed base knowledge and understanding
- 22 1 Why are we focusing on RA and not the rest of the town when the growth metrics are accord to plan.
- 22 1 Folks didn't realize the area's that encompassed RA.
- 22 2 Council and LPAC acknowledge that outcomes might not echo intent - and they are reconsidering.
- 22 2 We are taking a step back and community involvement.
- 22 2 Taking it seriously that actual growth matches the projected growth.
- 22 2 Like that they are maximizing input from the group and hoping they will pay attention to it.
- 22 3 When we talk about single/2 family don't like 2 family housing on less than an acre or max. density @ 1 unit per 5K sq. ft.
- 22 3 W/ proposal I don't like drive up cost of lots of people moving in.
- 22 3 Proposed plan make the exist lots worthless (grandfather) invites lawsuits.
- 22 3 RA is focused on single family ?? When 2 family's are the concern.
- 22 3 Single family does not seem 2 B the problem.
- 22 3 In that are multi or 2 family homes should not be allowed.
- 22 3 RA zoning is a combination commercial/residential.
- 22 3 Too infatuated w/ density. We aren't south Florida/North Portland. The way they are talking is calling them in.
- 22 3 We started to create town center and it wasn't fully confirmed.
- 22 3 Don't like continued focus on promoting or clearing the path for multi + 2 family housing.
- 22 4 Allow single family density
- 22 4 Allow multi family subject to conditions w/ 1 acre or more lot, planning board, etc.
- 22 4 Extend above to all zones.
- 22 4 More study before decisions. Impacts on traffic, taxes, schools, services.
- 22 4 Keep current zoning for existing lots.
- 22 4 Reduce the pressure desire to build multi-2 family homes.

- 4 Report: 1. More emphasis on single family homes and development. 2. Impact studies: schools, traffic, environmental, services. 3. Preserve the character of Falmouth as a single family community (we don't want 2 B Portland).