

DRAFT  
**Town of Raymond**  
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE MINUTES  
Monday, July 14, 2003

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Stephenson, Co-Chair; Harold Burnham; Ben Levy; Charlie Turner; Jean Carter; Louise Lester; Brad McCurtain; John Rand; Greg Foster and Chris McClellan

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

**1. Call to Order:** Jim Stephenson called the meeting to order at 7:04.

**2. Minutes:** no minutes to approve

R. Rothe noted that it would be good to focus discussion on the growth districts and possible lot size changes in the rural districts.

**3. Rural District Discussion:**

R. Rothe gave his thoughts on zoning considerations:

- a. A change from 3 to 4 or 5 acres is not that big of a change and would have little effect on the type of development occurring presently. A change to 10 acres would most likely have an impact but be more controversial.
- b. Areas bounded by public roads, interior areas could go to 10 acres
- c. Setbacks could be increased to 100 or 150 feet mainly for window dressing, so that development would not be as visible from the roads.
- d. Frontage could be increased from 225 to 300 to lessen density.
- e. Other policies could include a growth cap as previously discussed, an open space fund.

J. Stephenson reviewed that the committee was discussing policies under land use. If current ordinance requirements are left alone the issue of sprawl will not be addressed.

G. Foster stated that his take on sprawl is different. He feels that increasing lot sizes will cause sprawl as more land per home is consumed. The committee reviewed the state definition of sprawl: "unplanned, uncontrolled inefficient use of land."

H. Burnham stated that large lots could be an attraction but that the growth would be self limiting as fewer lots could be created. He suggested that 50 acre lots might be attractive for some owners.

J. Rand remarked that if growth is limited by lot size, more sprawl will be created but ultimate development will be less. He has looked at numbers of lots in town by acreage:

325	between 2 and 3 acres
232	between 3 and 4
92	between 4 and 5
138	5
64	6
50	7
65	between 7 and 10 acres
20	100 acres or more

Most lots being created are by splits and are at the minimum acreage. John believes if the zoning minimums are increased the market will respond.

C. Turner discussed what direction Raymond is heading in and that he is in favor of increasing lot sizes, perhaps LRR1 from 2 to 3, RR from 2 to 4, and R from 3 to 5. C. Turner continued that with development pressure reducing density would be a good idea.

B. McCurtain arrived at 7:40 p.m.

C. McClellan suggested going to LRR1 at 3, RR at 5 and R at 10. H. Burnham noted that perhaps then we would attract owners who desire large lots. A. Simpson noted that with the development pressure as it is now, as long as lot prices are reasonable within the regional market, growth in Raymond will not slow down no matter what occurs with lot sizing. Raising density will affect the total number of lots able to be developed, not the rate in which it occurs.

Preserving land for park use was discussed. J. Carter noted that cities preserve small tracts. J. Stephenson stated that without an aggressive plan to protect desired tracts the town will lose the battle.

R. Rothe asked to focus back on the rural districts. J. Stephenson noted that it would make sense to focus on changes that would maintain rural character such as increased frontage and setbacks, require buffers and shared driveways.

B. McCurtain stated that he agrees that increasing lot size will have an overall effect but will not limit the number of new dwellings in the short term. Maybe the town should look at ways to make subdivision easier so owners would not do individual splits but rather a comprehensive subdivision plan for their property. Cluster subdivision was discussed regarding the attractiveness of it for planning and land use but it not being favored in the market.

Continued discussion of changes included increasing the frontage to 300 feet in R and LRR2. Also discussed was the likeliness of certain changes to be passed at town meeting. H. Burnham noted the importance of a good public relations campaign for any changes.

C. McClellan moved to recommend the lot sizes be increased in LRR1 from 2 to 3 acres, in RR from 2 to 5 acres, and in R from 3 to 10 acres. All existing lots would be permitted to use current acreage for density application only if a cluster subdivision was approved through the Planning Board. C. Turner seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-2 with 1 abstention.

**4. Next Meeting:** The next meeting will be July 28 at the Public Safety Building if available.

**5. Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Amanda L. Simpson, AICP