

**Arundel Comprehensive Plan Review Committee
Minutes
Tuesday – December 2, 2014**

Present: Tad Redway, Town Planner; Members Donna derKinderen, John Bell, Diane Robbins, Shawn Hayes, Dorothy Gregoire; arrived later -Tom Danylik and Simone Boissonneault

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Donna derKinderen at 7:23 pm at the ML Day conference room – meeting start delayed due to lack of quorum.

2. Approval of agenda

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

3. Approval of minutes

Minutes of October 7, 2014 – Motion was made by John Bell seconded by Dorothy Gregoire to approve the minutes of October 7, 2014 as written. Motion carried with all in favor.

Minutes of October 28, 2014 – Motion was made by John Bell seconded by Shawn Hayes to approve the minutes of October 28, 2014 as written. Motion carried with all in favor.

4. Old business

a. Final review of R1, R2, R3 descriptions and revision of district boundaries

The Chairman distributed the 10/28/14 draft of R1, R2 districts descriptions as discussed at the last meeting. Currently the only difference between the two districts is acreage minimums of 1 and 2 acres. R3 district recommendation is to eliminate that district.

The Planner stated maps distributed also reflected those changes.

Discussion:

Eastern Trail

- John Bell – Raised question regarding the Eastern Trail in the R1 District. John stated that it is an asset to the community and it would be detrimental to limit the area around the trail to residential only.
- Tad Redway, Planner, presented a concept that would create a “neighborhood commercial district” to service the Urban Residential District (R1 & R2 districts) and to provide services for Eastern Trail users as trail grows. Small commercial and specialty businesses would be allowed. This has been considered by the Planning Board. The BI district borders one side of the ET and is difficult to access from that district. District would have access to Limerick Rd and is on the west side of the pipeline. Types of services/general categories: small convenience store, small retail or specialty shops, small restaurant/food service increase potential for bed & breakfast.
- Diane cautioned that size should be limited since this is primarily a residential district.
- Donna – centrally located within the current district. Business depends on availability of land and availability of profit. Need to separate it out as a mixed use district. Name: Trailhead district

(Continued) Final review of R1, R2, R3 descriptions and revision of district boundaries

The map was reviewed along with the corrections going by written descriptions of the districts in the ordinance. No boundaries were changed in the R3 as they are definitely defined by the railroad and the Old Post Road.

Areas that split lots into two or more districts were reviewed and discussion to allow landowners the option to choose what district they would like to be located and to follow lot lines in the R1/R4 area.

b. Plan meeting date/agenda for property owners/abutters affected by proposed changes to R1, R2 and R3

It was agreed to schedule landowner input for the first meeting in January. Notices will be sent to landowners.

c. Review materials for joint meeting with Planning Board [Dec. 11]

Donna distributed a draft of *Comp Plan - Intent of proposed revisions to districts* to update the Planning Board on the work done to date. Draft of R1, R2 & R3 (10/28/14 Draft). The Trailside district will be worked on and presented at a later date.

- Contractor yard in R2 locations. Contractor yard 1 or 2 – Planning Board will be working on this at the Dec 11th meeting.

5. New business**a. Rural Conservation District [R-4] description review**

Descriptions combined from both sections – B6 is in regular font and C7 is in italics.

Suggested conditional uses at bottom as reminder notes.

District in not a residential zone in intent – rural conservation zone – minimum acreage it 3 acres – subdivisions allowed with restrictions.

Last paragraph: The Town should work with land trusts and state agencies ~~and should establish and fund a program for acquisition of the development rights from willing sellers to~~ permanently restrict their land from development. *The Town should work with landowners within these areas to permanently restrict their land from development. To accomplish this, the Town will work with land trusts and state agencies and should establish and fund a program for acquisition of the development rights from willing sellers.*

TDR – Transfer of Development Rights proposal – Discussion: Transaction strictly between buyer & seller –If the town has any say in the TDR (review if worthwhile) ... town is aware of transaction and is the enforcement position - should be part of “deed” or “record” so that CEO can be aware (e.g. building permit) Town should be included in negotiations or in the mix – does it meet qualifications – town should be included in negotiations – objective standards must be set – town has no financial interest. Town could have list of approved parcels – predetermined areas – fairness to landowners.

- Shawn suggested that the members review it and send Donna suggestions for possible revisions for the next meeting.
- Donna – R4 not working – rural has more subdivisions than the other districts as well as family divisions.

- Tad – Some landowners would like to create a subdivision with large lots, but the ordinance mandates cluster subdivisions; prevents large lot divisions such as equestrian development for example. Allow more flexibility in design. Possibly creating density bonuses for preserving the rural vista. Cluster development does not reward other than reducing the frontage requirements, location of “open space” and “donut spaces” not working; easier to encourage larger “open space” this by incentives. 5 acres failed because there was no reward.
- Donna – since 2005 or 2000 could we obtain data on how many family /or cluster divisions we have had in the R4 district. Other districts were set at 1 and 2 acres and the 5 acres area appeared to be more restrictive and a loss of value to those landowners in R4. R4 is in many places in town and is a large portion of town.
- Diane – agrees large lot options for divisions should be allowed; private road for large lots appears rural
- Tom – Take the input from the R4 residents to see how they feel about current plan and offer other options for their review
- Donna – another point to review data; mixed use districts were created to shift the tax burden off of residences; how have subdivisions affected population; would large lot subdivisions create fewer homes and less children in the district as opposed to cluster subdivisions.
Demographics
- Cluster subdivision established in 1990’s
- Simone – setbacks also need to be reviewed; 100 ft setback is creating the “donut” by setting the house in the center of a lot rather than buffering or other options for the house and drive.
- Are too many roads listed as “arterial” roads
- Tad – relative threshold set by planner/board; other standards could be set to determine arterial /rural roads

b. Proposed additional uses

Congregate care facilities

6. Next meeting date

January 6, 2015

7. Adjourn

Motion made by Shawn Hayes and seconded by Diane Robbins to adjourn at 8:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Simone Boissonneault
Secretary