

Long Range Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC)

Thursday, May 8, 2014 Minutes

Attendance:

Name	Present	Name	Present	Name	Present
Paul Bergkamp	-	Kurt Klebe	\checkmark	Jim Thibodeau	-
Sam Rudman	\checkmark	Sandra Lipsey	\checkmark	Erin Mancini	-
Bill Benzing	-				

Council Liaison:	Councilor King
Staff present:	Theo Holtwijk
Others present:	-

The meeting was called to order by Sam around 6 PM.

1. Review of Draft Minutes

The review of the draft minutes was deferred as there was no quorum present.

2. Update on CDC and Council Discussions

The top priority implementation actions that were recommended by the CDC were endorsed by the Council on April 16, 2014. The actions were:

Nov 2013 reference #	Action	Recommended Assignment
44 Rural and Growth	A - Review the existing Future Land Use Plan and finalize the boundaries between the rural and growth areas on the Future Land Use Plan map. <i>completed</i>	CDC
41/50 Rural and Growth	Review the current growth permit provisions in the ordinance and develop amendments that will result in the significant majority of new residential units to be constructed in the growth areas and limit the number of residential units in the rural areas over the next ten years. <i>This includes looking at a</i> <i>variety of regulatory tools that help to manage/plan growth.</i>	CDC

Nov 2013 reference #	Action	Recommended Assignment LPAC	
21 Growth	A - Study the growth areas to determine the historic growth patterns in established neighborhoods, such as The Flats, Foreside, Pleasant Hill, and Brookside, including density (lot size), dimensional requirements and pattern of development and compare the results to existing zoning requirements in these areas. Amend the Land Use Ordinance to reduce most of the non-conformities found.		
21 Growth	B - Use the results to evaluate underdeveloped, undeveloped and currently developed parcels in the growth area and recommend new regulatory standards and incentives to promote compact, walkable neighborhood design and increase the development potential of growth areas, while respecting unique characteristics of neighborhoods	LPAC	
44 Rural and Growth	B - Review the Areas for Potential Zoning Review map and confirm or amend the recommendations for areas to be reviewed for zoning changes including protection of natural resources and recommend zoning changes for Areas 1-9.	CDC	

It was emphasized that the CDC wanted to see a balance in this work between rural area measures and growth area measures. The CDC will focus on the rural area, while LPAC will work on the growth area.

3. Review LPAC Work Plan Approach for Growth Area

Theo reviewed a handout he had prepared with some ideas for a possible work plan approach. The memo follows below:

LPAC Work Plan Ideas – Growth Area Implementation of Comprehensive Plan Draft: May 2, 2014

LPAC Charge - Recommend ordinance amendments and incentives for growth area to:

- 1. Re-align zoning requirements with existing building patterns in established neighborhoods,
- 2. Increase development potential of growth area, while respecting neighborhood character, and
- 3. Promote compact, walkable neighborhoods.

Goal is to locate significant majority of new development in growth area of Falmouth.

Important background work:

 Compact Development Study, 2005: <u>http://www.town.falmouth.me.us/Pages/FalmouthME_BComm/LPAC/docs/2005</u> <u>Compact_Development_Study_Report8.5X11.pdf</u> • Compact Development Study, Interim report, 2007: <u>http://www.town.falmouth.me.us/Pages/FalmouthME_BComm/LPAC/Appendice</u> <u>sFolder/Appendix10</u>

Possible approach:

1. Reduce non-conformity in established neighborhoods

- **a.** Review recent BZA application record in established neighborhoods (RA, RB, and RC districts) Typ. lot size and setback issues? Typically approved? CEO/BZA considerations?
- b. Determine neighborhood character by examining existing lots and buildinsg what are the prevailing lot sizes and setbacks in each "neighborhood"? Is there a particular "pattern?"
 - i. http://www.losaltosca.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/Building%20 and%20Planning/page/430/neighborhoodcompatibilityworksheet_002.pdf
- c. Compare neighborhood patterns with current zoning requirements for each area.
- d. Assess in each neighborhood the number of vacant lots and acreage with development potential (lots with frontage on existing roads, absence of major environmental issues)
- e. Suggest ordinance modifications. These may include:
 - i. Requiring fewer future BZA applications for existing development
 - ii. Allowing development of any vacant lots that is currently not permitted

2. Increase growth area development potential

- a. Do parcel inventory of all vacant land in growth, incl. proximity of existing utilities and presence of mapped environmental limitations (include areas in growth area that are not in "neighborhoods")
- b. Do parcel inventory of residential properties in growth area that have lot sizes greater than X (X=5?) times the minimum lot size in their district (these may be defined as potentially "underdeveloped lots").
- c. Meet with real estate community representatives to:
 - i. Understand market demand in growth area in Falmouth what are today's buyers looking for? What do tomorrow's buyers want? (discuss physical parameters lot size, building type/size, proximity needs)
 - ii. Identify specific ordinance requirements and other issues that inhibit appropriate development projects and suggest potential remedies
 - iii. Identify incentives necessary or desirable to enable appropriate growth area development
 - iv. Identify potential future development "pilot" sites in growth area
 - v. See also Chapter 4 starting on PDF page 57: <u>https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/8456/Portla</u> <u>nd_Infill_and_Redevelopment_Strategies.pdf?sequence=1</u>
- d. Explore development possibilities (and road networks) for pilot sites through sketch plan exercises and test these against current ordinance
- e. Suggest ordinance modifications and incentives that will promote appropriate development

3. Promote good neighborhood design

- a. Review/visit recently-approved and built residential projects in growth area
- b. Review and visit built "example projects" in region
- c. Review "best practices" literature on neighborhood infill design
 - i. http://www.maine.gov/dacf/municipalplanning/docs/traditional_neighborh ood_handbook.pdf
 - ii. <u>http://www.nrdc.org/cities/smartgrowth/files/citizens_guide_LEED-</u> <u>ND.pdf</u>
- d. Suggest ordinance modifications and incentives that will promote good neighborhood infill design

The committee liked the approach. It felt that the effort on resolving some non-conformities could relieve a regulatory burden on home owners and a recommendation could be developed in 3-4 months. That might represent an early accomplishment, which the committee termed "low hanging fruit."

The rest of the work may take 12 months to accomplish, depending on the possible hiring of a mapping consultant and landscape architect or architect to help with the sketch plans, Town staff's work load, and the committee's ability to assist with certain tasks. Theo will discuss the consultant possibility with the Town Manager.

Category	Task	Description	Who	When
Non-conformity	1a	Obtain BZA application record	Theo	By
		of last 5 years in established		5/22
		neighborhoods (RA, RB, and		
		RC districts)		
Non-conformity	1a	Review and categorize past	Theo	By 6/5
		BZA applications.		
Growth	2a, 2b, 2d	Review work plan with Town	Theo	By
potential		Manager to investigate potential		5/22
		for consultant assistance.		
Growth	2c	Identify real estate professionals	LPAC	By 6/5
potential		who can provide insight into		
		market trends.		
Growth	2c iv	Identify potential future	LPAC	By 6/5
potential		development "pilot" sites in		
		growth area		
Neighborhood	3a, 3b	Identify built residential projects	LPAC	By 6/5
Design		in growth area and in region that		
		make good candidates for LPAC		
		to visit and study.		
Neighborhood	1b i, 2c v, 3c,	Review best practices literature	LPAC	By 6/5

The committee agreed to work on a parallel track with several of the action steps. The following tasks were considered next steps:

Design	background		
	reading		

The committee was enthused by the prospect of working on this assignment. It discussed the upcoming meeting on May 12 with CDC by Sam and Sandra to coordinate the work.

The meeting was adjourned around 8:00 PM.

Draft minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, May 16, 2014