

approved
Town of Raymond
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE MINUTES
Monday, September 9, 2002

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Stephenson, Chairman; Brad McCurtain Co-chairman (arrived at 7:30); Priscilla Rand; Ben Levy; Charlie Turner; Charlie Leavitt; Harold Burnham; Jean Carter; Greg Foster

STAFF PRESENT: Rich Rothe, Planner; Amanda L. Simpson, Secretary

1. **Call to Order:** Jim Stephenson called the meeting to order at 7:15 PM
2. **Vision Statement:** Harold Burnham read the revised vision statement he and Brad had worked on over the weekend. It is different than the version written by Charlie Leavitt and distributed in the packets. General comments were that the statement needed to be shortened. Jean Carter presented a modified version of Charlie's statement as follows:

VISIONING STATEMENT
Jean Carter version, 9-09-02

Raymond, Maine is a unique community in that our citizens, environment, history and culture all converge on these 26,602 acres of geography like no other place on Earth.

It is our mission to identify and incorporate, to the best of our ability, the traditional values of previous generations in our ongoing efforts to preserve our heritage while at the same time facing and meeting present and future challenges with integrity and compassion.

It is important also to remember that just as we are neighbors within our own community, we too are neighbors to our region, county, state, country and planet. At no time can we lose sight of our responsibility to be consistent in our relations to one another and to the world around us.

Raymond, Maine will grow; of this we can be certain. Our population will expand and with it our housing stock, our roads, our schools, our businesses, our diversity, our families, our goals, our ambitions, our responsibilities and our character. In this age of hyper speed, cyberspace and virtual realities we must act expeditiously and decisively before the very essence of our community is lost. To this end we endeavor to create this Comprehensive Plan.

G. Foster moved to table the discussion until all committee members received copies of the presented versions. With a second by H. Burnham and discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

3. Approved the Minutes of August 26, 2002 as written with minor grammatical edits. Vote was made by B. Levy, seconded by J. Carter and unanimous in favor.

J. Stephenson turned the floor over to Rich Rothe to review the housing strategy. R. Rothe discussed the packet materials pertaining to the review of the 1991 housing strategies. He re-inserted the 10% affordability goal as it is mandated by the state. The sub-committee comments are included in the document.

H. Burnham indicated that the sub-committee did not make any conclusions. J. Stephenson feels like there was a general direction indicated.

R. Rothe asked if we need to revisit the 1991 strategies. #1 talks about a survey for affordability. R. Rothe believes the new census data will provide the information that we need.

B. McCurtain asked if we could address affordability by local property tax relief, address the relief locally.

R. Rothe answered that the state’s mandate addresses new housing, not existing housing. He continued that the plan has to address the 10% as a goal. The 1991 plan had strategies, but he has a sense that they didn’t work.

J. Carter would like to see the percentage increase to 20% for every five lots so that some units get produced, as the town has had no ten lot subdivisions in the last ten years. R. Rothe responded that we should re-visit the vote taken on July 22th. Discussion continued among members regarding various alternatives to meeting the goal, including having a real estate person review the town’s housing and determining if we have met our affordability, having every 10th building permit be required to be for an affordable unit, density bonuses, and requiring developers to pay a fee toward affordable housing development.

J. Stephenson went back to a list of tools Rich had presented the committee that could serve the town such as multi-family housing, duplexes, manufactured housing, smaller lot sizes, and the mobile home overlay.

Item #2 talks about growth districts. R. Rothe stated that we don’t really have a growth district when minimum acreage is 60,000 square feet in one and 3 acres in the other. We need at least one district with smaller lots. J. Carter asked if this wasn’t a zoning issue. A long discussion followed regarding the back lot provisions currently in the ordinance and whether or not it helps meet the 10% goal. C. Leavitt reminded the committee that the state says “seeking to achieve” rather than requiring that it occur. The discussion regarding the pros and cons of back lots continued at length with no conclusions.

R. Rothe suggested that the committee vote on the current strategy as discussed on July 22nd. Discussion continued about additional alternatives such as multi-family/townhouses and the fee system, would that satisfy the state. Then the discussion turned to in-law/accessory apartments. Jim asked the committee if they would pursue multi-family and duplex housing. B. McCurtain asked if we shouldn’t be looking at this as part of the big plan and the effect of growth on the tax rate. He suggested that housing should be addressed regionally. Discussion continued regarding the difference limiting growth in the community and managing growth.

C. Turner stated that he opposed any increase in density. We should stay with larger lot sizes to protect our aquifers. H. Burnham stated that he would like to see larger lots and to keep the population from increasing. He would like to see models of towns that have maintained large lot sizes.

P. Rand wondered if business growth in Windham will put pressure on land owners to subdivide. J. Carter offered the concept of creating 10 acre lots in the rural district and allow cluster development within that 10 acres up to four homes on lots up to one acre provided the remainder of the 10 acres is required to remain with the original property owner. The remaining acreage must be adjacent to the clustered homes, meet the frontage requirement of the rural district and be forever restricted from building development.

R. Rothe asked the committee to direct their attention to the chart from the July 22nd meeting to revisit the voting. The following votes were taken (8 voting members):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1) Back Lots | 7 |
| 2) Accessory Apartments | |
| a. Modify to allow non-family apts | 6 |
| b. Only in growth districts | 6 |
| c. small square footage | 7 |
| 3) 10% requirement | |
| a. as written | 4 |
| b. lots off site | 1 (scratch) |
| 4) density bonus | scratch |
| 5) duplexes | |
| a. as written | 5 |
| 6) multi-family | |

- a. as written 2 (scratch)
- 7) combined dwelling 2 (scratch)

C. Turner asked about zoning maps and a summary of zoning requirements. A. Simpson will bring copies of the maps and the summary sheet to the next meeting as well as the current land use ordinances.

P. Rand remarked that there might be alternative ways to addressing community plans. She is aware of a program called CEPAC.

Other related meetings were related to the committee: Windham Comp Plan Public Hearing Oct. 7th, with the regular meeting on Sept. 12th; Central Corridors Coalition on Oct 12th in New Gloucester at the Highland Lake Center at 6:30 p.m.

B. McCurtain brought up his frustration with the process and recommended that the committee consider breaking out into sub-committee to research the various topics of the plan and reporting back to the main group. His concern is that there is a lot of round robin discussion that doesn't lead to conclusions. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the process and no conclusion was made.

The next meeting will be September 23, 2002 in Town Hall at 7:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.