

Arundel Comprehensive Plan Review Committee Minutes
Tuesday - January 6, 2015

Present: Tad Redway, Town Planner; Members Donna derKinderen, John Bell, Diane Robbins, Shawn Hayes, Dorothy Gregoire

Attending: Robert Drew (Map 35 Lot 21 – 22 acres) & (Map 35 Lot 4 – 27.8 acres)

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Donna derKinderen at 7:10 pm at the ML Day School library.

2. Approval of agenda

Motion was made by John Bell and seconded by Shawn Hayes to approve the agenda as presented with all in favor.

3. New Business

a. Workshop with property owners with split lots [R1/R4] along Limerick Road south of the Eastern Trail

Donna gave an overview of the committee's work. In the past, district lines were set with strait lines with no regard to property lines. One of the committee's recommendations is to have districts follow property lines. Another issue is large lots of 10 acres or more located who were located in R1 (1 acre lots) & R2 (2 acre lots) areas may have been restricted in what they could do with their properties. The committee is trying to address both of these issues. She explained that the Comprehensive Plan lays the ground work for what the Planning Board adopts for zoning.

Mr. Drew stated that the only things that could go on his property is to build houses or put industry in there as it is not visible from the road for businesses.

The list of "Permitted Uses" and "Conditional Uses" in the R4 & R1 were reviewed. The DB2 were also reviewed. A copy of the Rural Conservation (R4) Permitted & Conditional Uses was available. A copy of the DB2 Permitted & Conditional Uses will be mailed to Mr. Drew so that he can make an informed choice as to what district he would like to locate his lots.

Tree Growth was briefly discussed along with the costs for withdrawing from Tree Growth.

Discussion on how to get responses from other landowners: A letter can be mailed to each landowner. Tad mentioned he can include a copy of the map and ask them to respond by mail or email. A mailing list will be maintained.

4. Approval of minutes

Minutes not available.

5. Old Business

a. Rural Conservation District [R-4] description review – revised

Composite description of R4 from sections B & C of the comp plan. First Draft – Italics are words or phrases added from previous discussion; the rest is from the original language.

Discussion:

Diane – Did not like it the 1st time and doesn't like it now – town appears to penalize people who own property. Does not like having to preserve 50%, but it is 50% of the developable land. Wet areas can be just as valuable in regards to preservation. Does not apply 50% in other areas and growth is not going into those other areas. 50% of the entire lot would be easier to accept or reduced percentage. Arundel should allow 10 acre or greater lot splits rather than only cluster subdivision.

Shawn – Change to “a reasonable amount to maintain open space” – Too difficult to leave up to Planning Board on an individual basis.

John – Both paragraphs end with “preserving open space”

Donna – Would like “personal responsibility” to do what you want with your land; however, that's not practical in this world... so what is reasonable control. Great part of land in R4 is somewhat “self-restricting” due to wetland, blue clay, ledge, etc. Should be careful on how you “loosen up” as you could lose the entire concept.

Tad R- Increase to 5 acre lot minimum would be less restrictive than the 50% or 10 acre lots that can be less acreage if clustered and open space preserved.

Donna D – Much of the current “openness” is due to the nature of the land – original agricultural area, wetlands, soils. No good answer, but need to arrive at a “better” answer.

John – Better accepted if no change in acreage

Tad – Not currently using 50% - using “Net residential density” - most of conservation is set in back of development. The 50% was never implemented.

Diane – Why should the 50% remain in the Comp Plan if it is not being done? Delete it from the comp plan if it is not enforced. Restricting one district that is not applied to other district.

Donna - The opportunity to take something that is currently in the plan but never been implemented and a) be creative to come up (carrots) with something that can work as it is designed to work and b) is acceptable and will be implemented. Positive options that are easily understandable and workable. Requested Tad to come out with two or three possible options/scenarios for the committee to review.

Past surveys as well as the current EDC – Chesapeake poll found that “rural character” remains one of its principal attributes. Rural character discussed - Multiple definitions for “rural character” - visual vistas – open space with barns – animals – habitat – part scenery, part history, part attitude that is part of a large mosaic.

Tad – most of the “cutting” of lots has been single lot cuts or family subdivision of land that is not under Planning Board review which is not required to be clustered. Want to meet the needs of the landowners as well as preserve the rural character –

Donna - perhaps use term open space rather than rural character, since rural character has so many different meanings to different people.

6. Next meeting date – February 3, 2014

7. Adjourn

Motion made by Diane Robbins and seconded by John Bell to adjourn at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Simone Boissonneault
Secretary