Planning Board Members,

Thank you for organizing and conducting the meeting on Saturday Morning. I wanted to restate my personal thoughts on your questions (as I understood them) after thinking over the workshop discussions.

1. One-Zone: The BoS has an important decision on our playlist; Sunset or Stone Wharf. Based on the Planning Boards discussion there may be no difference in developing one over the other, at the outset of the process. In order to have a land-use perspective in the decision process we might have to go through a full design and approval process for both sites to weigh the options. On the other hand, if one was in a commercial or marine specific zone and one were not it would be clear from the outside what the vision was.

   The question then becomes is the island truly homogenous with respect to commercial development. From a land-use perspective is there a difference between developing Sunset and Stone Wharf? That might help inform the question of which is the appropriate tool (zones & performance Standards, performance standards alone, something else?) to encourage one site or the other (and similar future development decisions).

2. Subdivision and open space: See the discussion below about an open-space plan. One question that occurred to me after I left was is open-space on a private subdivision an aesthetic or functional advantage to the community?

3. Impact Fees to preserve open-space: This would probably only be effective as part of a bigger program implemented town-wide. I’d invite the Planning Board to consider developing an Open-space plan that would answer the questions: how much open space do we have? How much would be appropriate? and how do we manage the gap? This would be a great supplemental document to the Capital Plan to guide the BoS in managing the ‘Land Acquisition’ reserve fund. There is little guidance for this fund and it tends to be opportunistic and therefore probably underfunded.

Thank you again for your efforts,
Regards,
H.
Potential ordinance changes in support of “preservation of Great Chebeague as a viable, age and income diverse, year-round community.”

1. Change zoning from IR and IB to “Island” (ie, one zone and one table of allowed uses)
   a. Review and enhance, as needed, the performance standards

2. Change lot size and setback requirements in identified “villages” so that further development of an appropriate nature can be pursued in those areas
   a. Reduce setbacks to better fit the existing neighborhood
   b. Reduce lot size required, but only with enhanced septic requirements (focus: engineered septic systems)

3. Create an option for Conservation Subdivision within our Subdivision ordinance
   a. See page 80 of current ordinance for 406.2 Clustered Residential Development; 1.37ac lot size per house; reduce?
   b. See Cumberland’s new Conservation Subdivision ordinance

4. Make accessory dwelling units easier as part of existing homes
   a. See page 89 of current ordinance for Accessory Apartments; currently max 1 bedroom
      i. Change # of bedrooms to 2?
      ii. Reduce requirement re: minimum lot size, subject to septic design and function as appropriate for that land and usage patterns

5. Change back lot size requirement from “double” to “same as” (mostly, from 3 acre to 1.5 acre)
   a. Strengthen driveway / private way / road requirements to fit the needs of such lots

6. Other steps to consider:

   1. Work with Land Trust to define and identify “open space” on Chebeague, as part of developing a proposed Open Space Plan.
      a. Consider including Trails Plan as part of Open Space Plan.
      b. After a plan is developed, then consider funding mechanisms: grants, fundraising, impact fees, Town budget...
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