

Land Use Committee
Town of Cumberland
Council Chambers – Town Office
September 25, 2014 – 6:00 p.m.
Minutes

I. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. **Roll Call:**

Present: Steve Moriarty, Chair, Adrienne Brown, Beth Fitzgerald, Tom Foley, Chris Franklin, Lynda Jensen, Bob Maloney, James Orser, Sally Pierce, Sally Stockwell, Bob Waterhouse, Peter Bingham, Town Council, Shirley Storey-King, Town Council, Peter Sherr, Planning Board, Chris Neagle, Planning Board

Absent: Peter Gagne, Jeff Porter

Staff: Carla Nixon, Town Planner, Pam Bosarge, Administrative Assistant

Consultant: Brian Robertson, Market Decisions

III. **Minutes of Previous Meeting: August 28, 2014**

Mr. Orser moved to approve the minutes of August 28, 2014.

Mr. Foley seconded Vote: 8 in favor Unanimous

IV. **Second Full Committee Survey Review**

Mr. Moriarty stated the survey committee has met six times, one time last week, for over two hours, and a half hour tonight prior to the meeting. This is the latest version to present to the full Committee for review and approval.

The Committee reviewed the survey and voted on the enclosed as the final approved survey.



Cumberland Land Use Committee Survey

Hello. My name is Steve Moriarty and I am writing as the chairman of the Cumberland Ad Hoc Land Use Advisory Committee. This committee was recently appointed by the Town Council to gather information and provide recommendations on a few specific planning and development related issues; you may have read about these issues in the Forecaster over the last six months or so.

The Committee has developed this survey so that residents could share their views on a variety of quality of life and land use issues. Please take a few minutes to answer the attached survey. The Town

is using an independent research company for this research so feel free to be as candid as possible as all responses will be kept confidential. You may indicate your opinion by checking the appropriate response or by writing your answer in the space provided. The survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete. When you are finished, please return the survey in the postage-paid envelope provided. For your voice to be counted, it is important that we receive your completed survey by **FILL DATE**.

If you have any questions about this research, please feel free to contact Carla Nixon, Cumberland Planning Director at 829-2206. If your household needs additional copies of the survey, they are available at the Town Hall and Prince Memorial Library.

Thank you in advance for your time and your help. We are confident that together, we can help shape the future development of Cumberland in a way that fosters community, pride, and enjoyment.

Sincerely,



Sincerely,
Steve Moriarty

Chairman, Ad Hoc Land Use Committee
Email: smoriarty@cumberlandmaine.com

Cumberland Ad Hoc Land Use Advisory Committee Members

Steve Moriarty, Chair	Lynda Jensen	Peter Bingham, Town Council
Adrienne Brown	Bob Maloney	Shirley Storey-King, Town Council
Bob Waterhouse	James Orser	Chris Neagle, Planning Board
Beth Fitzgerald	Sally Pierce	Peter Sherr, Planning Board
Tom Foley	Jeff Porter	Staff: Carla Nixon, Town Planner Pam Bosarge, Committee Secretary
Chris Franklin	Sally Stockwell	
Peter Gagne		

Before getting into questions on specific issues, please think about the following:

1. What do you enjoy about living in Cumberland:
(Please check all that apply.)

It is generally peaceful and quiet.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I like that it is centrally located and convenient to travel to other towns.	<input type="checkbox"/>

I enjoy the passive recreation areas (e.g., Rines Forest, walking trails).	<input type="checkbox"/>
I enjoy the active recreation areas (e.g., Ball fields, running, hiking and skiing trails).	<input type="checkbox"/>
I like that there are still active farms and apple orchards.	<input type="checkbox"/>
As I drive or bike along the main roads, I enjoy the scenic views.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I appreciate the high quality of the schools.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I enjoy the quality of municipal services provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I enjoy the people who live in this town.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I enjoy the developing Town Center that now allows a mix of uses.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I frequent the new restaurants located on Main Street.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I frequent the restaurant and retail/service businesses on Route 100.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I own a large lot of land that provides me with privacy.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I intend to subdivide my large lot someday to sell or give lots to family members.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other reasons (please specify below).	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Do you have any concerns about living in Cumberland?
(Please check all that apply)

Taxes continue to rise and I may need to move to a town with lower taxes.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The quality of municipal services has declined.	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is too much residential growth.	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is too much commercial growth.	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is not enough growth to hold the line on taxes.	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is not enough open space.	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is no public oceanfront to enjoy.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I do not like the changes that have taken place on Main Street.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I do not like the changes that have occurred on Route 100.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I do not like the changes that have occurred on Route 1.	<input type="checkbox"/>
There are not enough activities for young people	<input type="checkbox"/>
There are not enough activities and/or services for older residents.	<input type="checkbox"/>
There are not enough bike paths or sidewalks in town.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other concerns (please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. How would you describe the character of the town? Please write in the space below.

4. Next, please look at the Official Zoning Map that is included with the survey. In the box to the right, please write the zone in which you live (e.g. RR1, RR2, LDR, MDR, etc.).

	Less than 5 years	5-10 years	11-20 years	20-30 years	> 30 years
5. How long have you lived at	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

your current address?					
6. How long have you lived in Cumberland?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Too Fast	Just About Right	Too Slow
7. How would you rate the pace of growth in <u>residential</u> areas of town, overall?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. For this question, please refer to the “Commercial & Mixed Use Areas of Town” map located on the reverse side of the Official Zoning Map. How would you rate the pace of commercial growth in each of the following areas of town?

	Too Fast	Just About Right	Too Slow
Area 1 - West Cumberland (Route 100)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Area 2 - Upper Main Street	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Area 3 - Lower Main Street (Route 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Area 4 - Route 1 – North	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Area 5 - Route 1 - South	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. Do you have anything else you would like to share with the Committee about land use regulations or growth?

Next, please consider two issues that are currently facing the town.

I. Rural Residential Zoning

The first issue is about lot size requirements in the rural residential zones. Please refer to the Official Zoning Map and you will see that there are two large areas zoned for Rural Residential uses. The Rural Residential 1 (“RR 1” as shown in light blue) requires 4 acres for a single family house lot. However, if a lot in the RR1 zone is served by sewer then the minimum lot size is 2 acres. The Rural Residential 2 (“RR 2” as shown in yellow) requires 2 acres for all single family house lots.

Background: According to Cumberland’s 2009 Comprehensive Plan, fully 79% of the town’s total acreage lies within the two Rural Residential zones. In addition, nearly 93% of vacant land within all residential areas is located in the Rural Residential zones.

Cumberland’s Zoning Ordinance provides that the two Rural Residential zones “primarily allow agriculture, low-density residential and other low-density uses with the intent of maintaining significant amounts of open space and a generally rural character.” The zones were created in 1989 and a larger

minimum lot size was established for the Rural Residential 1 zone based upon the results of the Community Groundwater Study commissioned by the town and completed in 1988. In the years since there have been technological improvements in the design and capacity of waste disposal systems for individual house lots, and public water has been extended to some areas of town that were not previously served.

The following questions focus upon our two Rural Residential zones and seek input on the issue of maintaining or modifying current minimum lot size requirements.

10. How strongly do you agree or disagree that...

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
There should be only one "rural residential" zoning district.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There should be one Rural Residential zone with a 2 acre lot size minimum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There should be one Rural Residential zone with a 4 acre lot size minimum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The current RR1 and RR2 zones should be retained	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Yes	No	Unsure
11. Do you think the Town should consider other minimum lot sizes in the RR1 and RR2 areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. IF YES, what should the lot sizes be?

The next few questions are about growth and rural character in the rural residential zones.

	Yes	No	Unsure
13. Do you think there should be specific areas in the rural residential zones where residential growth should be encouraged?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Mr. Maloney asked what it means to encourage residential growth.

Mr. Brian Robertson, Consultant stated this is not a policy question, but a very high level view of what should or shouldn't happen.

Mr. Moriarty stated we know growth can and will occur.

Mr. Neagle asked if we could ask neighborhoods instead of areas.

Mr. Franklin agreed with the wording area.

Mr. Robertson stated we will have a catch all question at the bottom.

14. IF YES, where? (Please check all that apply)

Blanchard Rd. Area	Greely Rd. Area	Greely Rd. Ext. Area	Harris Rd. Area	Orchard Rd. Area	Pleasant Valley Rd. Area	Range Rd. Area	Tuttle Rd. Area	Skillin Rd. Area	Other Areas (specify below)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Committee discussed wording for # 15 with preservation, conservation or protection of the rural character. It was agreed to use the word protection.

	Yes	No	Unsure
15. Do you think there should be specific areas in the rural residential zones where the protection of the rural character (such as forestry, farming, habitat and open space) should be encouraged?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

16. IF YES, where? (Please check all that apply)

The Committee agreed to add Greely Road Extension to the list as Greely Road is long and these are two distinct areas.

Blanchard Rd. Area	Greely Rd. Area	Greely Rd. Ext. Area	Harris Rd. Area	Orchard Rd. Area	Pleasant Valley Rd. Area	Range Rd. Area	Tuttle Rd. Area	Skillin Rd. Area	Other Areas (specify below)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17. Do you wish to share any other thoughts with the Committee on the rural residential issue?

Mr. Moriarty stated changes to page 7 were not substantive only stylistic.

Mr. Waterhouse pointed out that restaurants and retail are not currently allowed this was added.

II. Route One Area

The second issue is whether to allow stores and/or restaurants along Route 1.

Background: Along Route 1 in Cumberland there are two commercial zones, designated as the Office Commercial North (OC-N) and Office Commercial South (OC South). Current zoning allows a mix of commercial uses in these zones (such as offices, commercial health and recreation facilities, hotels and motels) but restaurant and retail uses are not allowed currently.

18. Which of the following types of retail, if any, would you support?
(Please check all that apply.)

Small independent stores, such as the Book Review in Falmouth.	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------

Medium size independent stores such as Allen, Sterling & Lothrop Garden Store in Falmouth.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Medium size chain stores such as Rite Aid in Yarmouth or Falmouth.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Large (Big Box) stores such as Wal-Mart or Target.	<input type="checkbox"/>
None of the above.	<input type="checkbox"/>

**19. Which of the following types of restaurants, if any, would you support?
(Please check all that apply.)**

Small, independently owned/operated restaurants such as Louie's Grille or Doc's Café in Cumberland.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Medium-sized independent restaurants such as Ricetta's in Falmouth.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Franchise restaurants such as Olive Garden or Applebee's.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fast Food restaurants such as Dunkin Donuts or McDonald's.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Large, independent restaurants such as Cole Farms in Gray.	<input type="checkbox"/>
None of the above.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Route One Area (continued)

Currently, Route 100 in west Cumberland has mandatory design "standards" that dictate the form and function of non-residential developments. However, Route 1 has only recommended "guidelines" that are not enforceable by the Town. One way to avoid creating strip-type development (such as Rt. 1 in Brunswick) is to require each new development to meet certain requirements. These requirements include (but would not be limited to) the following:

- The design of the building;
- The size and location of parking areas;
- Restrictions on the size, design and illumination of signs;
- Limiting the number of single entrances by requiring internal connector roads;
- Limiting hours of operation;
- Establishing buffering requirements;
- Establishing lighting requirements.

The Photos below were changed and are better examples.

Below are examples of newer retail and restaurant buildings that reflect the New England style of architecture



Land Use Committee Minutes 9-25-14



20. In general, do you think there should be mandatory design requirements that specify how the building and parking areas should look and function in the Route 1 area?

Yes	No	Unsure
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

21. If retail and restaurant uses become allowed on Route 1, do you think there should be other limitations on them?

Yes	No	Unsure
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

22. **IF YES:** What types of limitations?

Mr. Robertson stated these questions on page 9 of the survey are catch all questions, to give people a chance to voice their opinion on anything.

23. Do you wish to share any other thoughts with the Committee on the Route 1 corridor issue?

III. Conclusion

24. Is there anything else you would like the Committee to consider?

That's it! We thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Results will be posted in several weeks. Check the Town's website at www.Cumberlandmaine.com

Mr. Ted Chadbourne of 10 Stockholm Drive voiced concern that his area on south Main Street is in the existing growth area, but he is required to have a four acre minimum lot size. And the Doane property across the street has lots as small as .8 acres.

Mr. Sherr agreed it would be valuable to see where the public would like to see growth. Mr. Sherr stated a Comprehensive Plan survey gives the town a snapshot in time.

Mr. Moriarty reviewed the current growth areas as described in the 2009 Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Chadbourne asked if at the next meeting the Committee would discuss a zoning appeal for the revision of four acre lots.

Mr. Moriarty stated the Committee does not deal with zoning appeals, any resident can propose a zoning change at any time, or the Town Council or Planning Board can initiate the process to hold a public hearing to recommend to the Town Council a zoning change.

Mr. Neagle stated re-zoning one lot would be spot zoning which is illegal.

Mr. Neagle moved approval of the survey as amended and discussed and thanked the survey committee for their work.

Mr. Franklin seconded.

VOTE: 10 in favor

1 opposed (Jensen)

Mr. Moriarty stated Mr. Robertson would send the final revisions to Ms. Nixon and the town would compile the list of people to send the Survey which should be mailed at the beginning of October.

V. Presentation and Discussion of Conservation (vs. clustered) subdivisions

Mr. Moriarty stated the two extra maps are showing the water and sewer lines for the town. Cumberland is part owner in the Falmouth sewer treatment plant, there is currently room for future capacity and there are no plans to expand the sewer. The Rural Residential One zoning district gives a density bonus if the property is serviced by sewer. The current RR1 requires a four acre minimum lot size; but if the property is served by sewer the lot size requirement is two acres.

The second map shows the water lines in town there is no limit to expansion of water lines other than cost.

Mr. Neagle asked about water pressure and expansion of water lines.

Mr. Sherr stated the pressure can be down to 30 PSI and run anything required.






Mr. Moriarty stated John Sevee of Sevee & Maher has conducted ground water studies and the aquifer in Cumberland is enormous and could serve the entire town.

Mr. Bingham stated the second aquifer is at Val Halla.

Mr. Moriarty stated chapter 13 of the 2009 Comprehensive Plan encouraged the adoption of the conservation subdivision it was not adopted. The third charge of this Committee is to consider

under current zoning the three types of subdivision, clustered, traditional and dispersed and discuss whether to recommend only conservation and clustered subdivisions.

Ms. Nixon reviewed subdivisions as follows:

<p>Conservation Subdivisions</p> <p>August 28, 2014 September 25, 2014</p>	<p>Current Subdivision Ordinance</p> <p>Permits 3 types of subdivisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional • Dispersed • Clustered <p>All 3 types were amended/added on 4/12/99, likely as part of the implementation of the 1998 Comp Plan.</p>	<p>Traditional Subdivision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots conform to minimum lot size of zone. • No open space requirement. 
<p>Dispersed Style</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60,000 sf min lot size. • Buffer between development and adjacent land and any existing streets, but not specified as in cluster (75') • 25% Open Space Requirement (can be low value land) 	<p>Clustered Style</p> <p><u>Min lot size:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No water & sewer: 60,000 sf. • Water & sewer: 30,000 sf. • Water, but no sewer: 45,000 sf. • 75' buffer between the development & adjacent properties and between existing streets and the development. • 25% open space requirement. (see sketch next slide) 	<p>An illustration....</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>traditional</p>  </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>clustered</p>  </div> </div>
<p>Conservation Style</p> <p>A housing development where homes are clustered together on smaller lots to preserve the surrounding natural area or farm land, which is often then owned and managed by the community.</p> <p>This open area is high-value land....</p>		<p>Why Add Conservation Type?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Called for in 2009 Comprehensive Plan 2. Protect prime agricultural land from development 3. Preserve desirable open space area 4. Provide a way to link existing trails and open space 5. Preserve wildlife corridors 6. Lessen visual impact 7. Involve all interested parties (developer, Town, abutters, committees) earlier in the process before significant money is spent on design engineering.
<p>4 Step Design Process</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Determine open space areas (based on town inventory of potential conservation land) 2. Select house locations (positioned to maximize the value of the protected land) 3. Align streets and trails to serve the new homes 4. Draw in lot lines. 	<p>What are the steps?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Require a detailed <i>Existing Resources and Site Analysis Map</i> of the property and a <i>Context Map</i> of the immediate area. 2. Site walk with all officials, staff and abutters 3. Require an inexpensive conceptual sketch plan as the first layout document 4. Require that the sketch plan development involve a landscape architect or physical planner (design, then engineer) 	

The Committee discussed the differences between Traditional, Dispersed, and Clustered.

- Traditional – no public open space and no requirements as to where the houses are placed on the lot.
- Dispersed – houses are dispersed on the lot, there is no open space requirement.
- Clustered – to allow a density bonus of 60,000 square foot lots and require 25% open space.

Ms. Nixon stated the Planning Board conducts a sketch plan review in which developers bring in a plan for the Board to review and discuss existing resources such as soils, wetlands, and farmland and tree growth.

Mr. Bingham stated Falmouth is an example of success and their highest square foot lot is 80,000 square feet in the farm and forest district which is approximately 1.75 acres; why is this not done in Cumberland?

Ms. Stockwell stated this is a tool that is being applied, Standish has adopted a conservation subdivision relatively early in the process; this type of subdivision can be paired with existing ordinances. Standish conservation subdivision is the standard tool in rural areas.

Mr. Bingham stated in theory conservation subdivisions are excellent and preserve land and rights of landowners.

Ms. Storey-King asked about lot sizes and percentage of open space.

Mr. Franklin stated basically it is a clustered subdivision that looks at high value land first such as agricultural lands, and making a district incentivized with density bonus.

Mr. Nixon stated on page 23 §D it states 40%, which is a higher amount of open space.

Ms. Nixon stated in reality the developer is to present two concept plans; most developers prefer clustered development, houses can be closer together and have open space, it is positive with less development cost such as road lengths. The Planning board has found almost every subdivision plan submitted in the last several years is clustered.

Mr. Neagle stated Cider Mill on Orchard Road had low land value and was best developed as a traditional with no internal roads. He supports conservation subdivision to add to the tool box.

Ms. Nixon stated the 2009 Comp Plan recommended the traditional design be removed and consider adding conservation subdivisions.

Mr. Neagle stated we need to focus on the big picture and if 80% of people want to preserve rural character then we want to encourage clustering.

Mr. Waterhouse stated historically cluster and conservation have been very different; if the 2009 Comp Plan recommended conservation why was it not implemented.

Ms. Nixon referred to draft definitions.

Mr. Bingham stated the reason the conservation subdivision was tossed previously when reviewed by the sub-committee is as it was presented it was too highly restrictive and impacted personal property rights.

Ms. Nixon referred to the definitions on pages 8 and 9:

Primary Conservation Area: *The portion of a site that is unsuitable for development and/or intensive use including the areas that are required to be deducted from the Net Developable Area of the site.*

Secondary Conservation Area: *The portion of a site that has open space, recreational, natural resource, scenic, cultural, historic, or archeological value and should be considered for inclusion within the common open space of a conservation subdivision but is not within the Primary Conservation Area.*

Mr. Neagle voiced concern regarding having only Clustered, and Conservation subdivisions and not traditional.

Ms. Nixon stated the 2009 Comp Plan recommended the elimination of the traditional subdivision, but a recent project showed it is useful in some cases.

Ms. Storey-King asked about the process if we were to write the conservation subdivision, would it look like a clustered subdivision with layered on process regarding preserving the valuable land features of the property.

Mr. Sherr emphasized the charge to establish minimum lot sizes, and we still have the tool of contract zoning.

Ms. Storey-King stated a key feature of contract zoning is a public benefit.

Mr. Sherr stated the directive is with lot sizes and setbacks.

Mr. Moriarty stated conservation subdivisions would add a 4th option for subdivisions.

Mr. Bingham stated theoretically if Val Halla was sold it may make sense to have a dispersed subdivision verses a clustered or it may be some version of Falmouth Country Club.

Ms. Nixon asked the Committee to focus on page 25, the open space required would be 40% and what direction and how would the Planning Board apply this Ordinance.

Mr. Neagle stated a developer would come in with inventory of primary and secondary areas, he is not married to this, and maybe we don't need primary and secondary areas.

Ms. Nixon stated Randall Aaron wrote the book on conservation subdivisions. If this were to be adopted the Planning Board would need know where and how to apply it. Would it only be in the RR1 and RR2 districts, or to lots that exceed a certain size?

Mr. Franklin stated the 2009 Comp Plan goal was to require conservation as an optional version it won't be used if a developer is restricted with the total number of lots allowed. Falmouth has an overlay district.

Ms. Storey-King asked how Falmouth determined its overlay district.

Ms. Stockwell stated the process for a conservation subdivision would include looking at two things;

1. Remove unbuildable land, steep slopes, etc.
2. To review the high value areas of the parcel such as conservation, scenic, habitat, forest and farm; and to concentrate on locating houses with the least impact to these features of the property. To look at Habitat Maps, and Open Space etc., so that conservation subdivisions are meaningful and connect adjacent trails etc.

Ms. Stockwell stated we would need to determine minimum lots, lengths of road and density bonus and or where applied; and whether conservation subdivision would be required in the Rural Residential (RR) zones, to allow growth and protect rural character. Standish requires conservation subdivisions. Falmouth has an overlay, one of Falmouth's subdivisions Country Estates has big lots and is a conservation subdivision.

The Committee discussed the mechanics of a conservation subdivision.

Mr. Moriarty stated we would wait for survey results to discuss logistics of lot sizes and locations.

Mr. Bingham stated this has been a healthy discussion providing information, cautioning to not disenfranchise landowners and voiced concern of fairness.

Ms. Stockwell stated it would be very helpful to have someone from other towns who work with conservation subdivisions to explain how it works for their Towns.

Mr. Franklin agreed the conservation has been very helpful but disagreed on politics; he felt the planning should be what is best for the town and purely from a land use process.

VI. Upcoming Meetings:

Mr. Moriarty suggested holding two meetings a month as we are delayed due the late mailing of the survey.

The next meeting will be October 16, 2014 at 6:00 p.m. The Committee will continue to discuss the Conservation Subdivision.

The meeting on October 30th may have some survey results and we can go back and adopt the Route One Standards which were not adopted.

Ms. Nixon asked the Committee to review the draft Ordinance and she would check to see if there was anyone available to speak to the Committee.

VII. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Pam Bosarge, Administrative Assistant