

POSSIBLE REVIEW PROCESS TO FINALIZE ROUTE ONE STUDY

April 8, 2008

Nathan Poore, Amanda Stearns, and Theo Holtwijk were asked to review the 2005 Route One Study plus associated documents and prepare a proposed process to finalize this study. Below is a suggested process for Council consideration. Appendix A contains background information to the Route One Study.

Possible Review Process

1. Council to create (small) Ad Hoc Route One Working Group. This group could consist of one representative from:
 - Town Council,
 - Planning Board,
 - CPAC/LPAC,
 - Original Route One Corridor Committee,
 - Route One Property Owner/Business RepresentativeThis group also requires appropriate staffing.
2. Ad Hoc Route One Working Group to review all relevant documents.
3. Ad Hoc Route One Working Group to consult with any other parties as needed. This may include consultation with the original consultant Steve Mohr.
4. Ad Hoc Route One Working Group to determine level of existing political support to adopt the key components of the 2005 proposal.
5. Ad Hoc Route One Working Group to prepare modified Route One proposal.
6. Ad Hoc Route One Working Group to seek public advice/feedback on modified proposal as needed.
7. Ad Hoc Route One Working Group to submit modified proposal to CDC.
8. CDC to review modified proposal and make recommendation to Council.
9. Council to review modified proposal and consider adoption.

APPENDIX A: ROUTE ONE STUDY BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Materials Reviewed by Staff

In preparation of this work, staff reviewed the following documents:

- Falmouth Route One Corridor Committee minutes
- Executive summary, May 26, 2005
- Proposed Zoning Amendments, May 26, 2005
- Plouffe Review, September 9, 2005
- Thebarger Review, September 18, 2005
- Mohr Review, October 23, 2006
- First Report of Route 1 Study Committee (undated) – Re. Route 1 North

Key Components of 2005 Study

For sake of assessing the total scope of the 2005 study, three main components were identified: dimensional standards, design guidelines, and traffic recommendations. Each of these has various parts to it.

1. Dimensional standards

Three standards seem to stand out:

- Mandatory 55 feet Route 1 setback from the edge of the right-of-way (VC-1)
- Mandatory 2-story building height (VC-1 and 2)
- Minimum 0 feet setback from the edge of the right-of-way for parking (vs. landscaped berms) (VC-1 and 2)

2. Design guidelines

Guidelines apply in different ways depending on the scope of a proposed project:

- Below small-scale threshold: n/a
- Small-Scale Threshold
 - o New structures
 - Mandatory 55 feet Route 1 setback from the edge of the right-of-way (VC-1)
 - Mandatory minimum 2-story building height (VC-1 and 2)
 - o Existing structures: n/a
- Large-Scale Threshold
 - o All structures
 - Mandatory 55 feet Route 1 setback from the edge of the right-of-way (VC-1)
 - Mandatory minimum 2-story building height (VC-1 and 2)

3. Traffic recommendations

Traffic recommendations are split into public and private improvements:

- For Town: intersection improvements
- For Developers: driveway alignments + site interconnections

Key Issues Encountered

Reviews by the Town Attorney, former Town Planner, and consultant for this project in 2005 and 2006 (see above) have flagged various issues that still need a resolution. The top issues have been summarized below:

1. **Legal:** Does the 2005 proposal provide *too much* flexibility for PB, i.e. does it contain vague language and provide for undue waivers in violation of state statutes?
2. **Technical:**
 - a. Mandatory 55 feet Route 1 setback (VC-1): Will this setback have the desired effect? Will it create an imposition for developers?
 - b. Mandatory 2-story building height (VC-1 and 2): Will this requirement create an imposition for developers?
 - c. Min. 0 feet setback for parking (vs. landscaped berms) (VC-1 and 2): Will this setback have desired effect?
3. **Community consensus:** There appears to be a lack of consensus on the 2005 recommendations. The Town should consider the adoption of amendments that *all* parties can live with and that make tangible administrative and physical improvements over the current situation.

Other Possible Opportunities

A 2008 review of the 2005 study presents other possible opportunities for consideration:

1. Should the Town remove/reduce references to multiple other documents in its zoning ordinance?
2. Should the Town create a single illustrated, reference document by consolidating existing and proposed design guidelines?
3. A separate report was issued for Route One North, but no action followed that report. Should the Council establish an up-to-date land use direction for Route 1 North?