

DRAFT
Town of Raymond
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE MINUTES
Monday, March 24, 2003

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Stephenson, Co-Chair; Harold Burnham; Greg Foster; Charlie Turner; Elizabeth Algeo; Charlotte Lester; Priscilla Rand; Jean Carter ; Charles Leavitt; Chris McClellan; and Brad McCurtain (7:25)

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

GUESTS: John Brennan, Building Committee

1. **Call to Order:** J. Stephenson called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM and turned the meeting over to R. Rothe to begin the discussion on land use.

2. **Discussion on Land Use:**

R. Rothe reviewed the map resources available to the Committee:

- ◆ Current and Future Growth Patterns by Bob Faunce
- ◆ Use by Acreage by Rick Seeley
- ◆ Zoning Map and Developed Parcels by Elisa Trepanier

R. Rothe went over the packet mailed out and focusing on the nine maps prepared by B. Faunce:

- ◆ Map 1 – Development as of 1892-1894, buildings are represented by red dots. E. Algeo commented at this time in history most of Raymond had been de-forested.
- ◆ Map 2 – Development as of 50 years ago, mostly summer camps on the waterfront along Panther Pond and Crescent Lake. Raymond Village was developed along then Route 302
- ◆ Map 3 – 1975, much more development on the Cape and Jordan Bay
- ◆ Map 4 – 1975-2000 construction, many along rural roads and commercial development along Route 302
- ◆ Map 5 – combines 1975-2000 construction with all past construction.
- ◆ Map 6 – compares growth to areas designated as growth areas in the Comprehensive Plan. Growth actually occurred mostly in areas slated for protection.
- ◆ Map 7 – current development compared to zoning districts. E. Algeo commented there is very little difference between zones other than lot size.
- ◆ Map 8 – shows projected growth for the next 25 years assuming that growth trends remain the same as the past several years and zoning remains the same
- ◆ Map 9 – combines projected growth with current growth, shows most growth taking place along existing roads. Right now nothing to focus growth in any particular area.

Committee comments:

- ◆ B. Levy – Is this right or wrong? R. Rothe responded that is the committee's job to determine if the status quo is acceptable or if something should change. The map is generalized without benefit from detailed soils and environmental analysis but is a likely scenario.

- ◆ E. Algeo – Aerial photos would add information regarding realistic development areas from an environmental point of view.
- ◆ J. Carter – can't stop growth, but you can say where it will happen. Feels housing is okay along roads if you can't see them
- ◆ E. Algeo – she grew up in town and wants to see greenbelts preserved, we should direct growth

A general discussion regarding current districts followed. It was noted that the current Land Use Ordinance promotes growth as it has occurred and that growth control is the key.

R. Rothe indicated that the growth districts currently are VR, VR1, C, and I. There has not been much regulation to encourage growth in these areas.

E. Algeo noted that the back lot provision had been added to reduce frontage. C. Lester explained the rules regarding back lot development, a 50 foot ROW is required and both lots must share a driveway. R. Rothe noted that this allowance encourages sprawl.

The state allowance of a split every five years was discussed.

J. Carter noted that perhaps the landowners with large lots should be consulted regarding their feelings about what is reasonable. R. Rothe responded that the committee needs to offer them something to comment on.

B. Levy asked about number of large lots (ten acres or more). H. Burnham stated that it would be good to interact with the property owners about their ideas.

R. Rothe explained that the state requires growth and rural areas to be identified. Right now the whole town is a growth area. E. Algeo expressed her concerns about the town becoming fragmented by new roads and that open spaces will become divided. The lakefronts will continue to be subdivided until there is no open space along the water.

J. Stephenson indicated that they were valid points to consider. R. Rothe stated that this is one way to start looking where to place growth areas.

J. Carter expressed her support of Map 9, that she would rather see the growth spread out. She also noted that they should get together with Gray and New Gloucester and match our districts with theirs.

C. McClellan stated that develop pressure on the Cape will continue. E. Algeo continued that there might be a way to create cheaper lots in one area, ways to motivate people to build in the denser areas.

Conversation about sprawl and its costs ensued. The more development is spread out the more costly it becomes to provide services.

C. Turner mentioned that the idea of concentric circles was an option. That around village areas development becomes more and more restrictive and less dense.

G. Foster stated that he thought the '91 plan encouraged wasted land. Current cluster provisions do not require that open space is useable.

C. McClellan noted that #9 is desirable. It uses existing roads and keeps the open space. She likes the idea of village centers but doesn't know if it would work. She is concerned that we do not become a bedroom community. More roads mean more public safety requirements.

B. Mc Curtain stated that he was in another place, asking himself why people are moving here and why are current owners selling their property. His thought on the questions are that:

- ◆ People want and can afford to be on the water
- ◆ Housing is more affordable here than other areas near Portland
- ◆ People want their "5 acre kingdom"
- ◆ Does not think they are moving here for cluster.
- ◆ Does not think there is a significant thought about tax impacts.
- ◆ Relatively cheap for commuting

He continued that the town will grow to the point where it is no longer attractive. Portland has reduced population now.

A. Simpson noted that Portland like Portsmouth, NH is losing population not because it is unattractive to live there, because it is too expensive and land is becoming more valuable for commercial growth.

C. Lester stated that she feels that there are people living here that have difficulty affording the taxes.

J. Stephenson redirected the conversation to the information distributed by R.Rothe. B. McCurtain stated that growth is coming and we have to plan for it. E. Algeo responded that she does not think it is inevitable. It was asked if a building cap could be challenged. R. Rothe answered that it could be but many have been upheld. A cap could reflect the long-term growth rate and be reasonable.

C. Turner questioned what would be considered reasonable 25 years from now. Last year there were about 60 units constructed. If that was reduced to 35 or 40 would that be reasonable. R. Rothe stated that another way to evaluate a rate would be to look at what absorption we should bear relative to the region. H. Burnham stated his desire to stop growth or diminish it in town. R. Rothe responded that a 0% growth rate would not be acceptable.

E. Algeo thought it would be important to discuss techniques that would affect the location and rate of growth, such as TDRs (Transfer Development Rights), impact fees, and exclusive zoning. The committee discussed the impact of land trusts and their role in affecting growth through purchase of land.

B. McCurtain will be working to schedule a regional workshop to address growth management techniques.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Amanda L. Simpson, AICP
Assessing/CEO Assistant