

**City of Hallowell
Comprehensive Planning Committee (CPC)**

City Hall
Room: Auditorium
Tuesday, November 18, 2008
6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

AGENDA

- | | |
|----|------------------------------------|
| 1. | Welcome: Housekeeping |
| 2. | Hallowell Land Use Policies |
| 3. | Schedule: Agenda for next meetings |
| 4. | Public Comments |
| 5. | Adjourn |

The meeting will focus on drafting land use policies based on the comprehensive plan vision and the joint CPC, ORC, and PB discussion held on October 21.

Topics will include the Downtown; the Water Street Gateways; Urban Neighborhoods; The Transition Area; and Rural Neighborhoods.

Below is a memo outlining the process for this meeting.

November 14, 2008
To: Hallowell CPC
From: Antje Kablitz
RE: Future Land Use

At our recent joint Ordinance Review Committee ORC (ORC) and the Planning Board (PB) session, we discussed how the CPC should address Hallowell's Future Land Use Policies. Mark Eyerman provided us with some guidelines for policy development that will help the ORC and PB with policy implementation.

Mark urged the CPC to be **generally specific**, to provide enough detail to guide the ORC and PB without being so precise as to limit interpretation. He suggested that the CPC clearly define the areas under discussion and provide detail as to the desired character of future development. The level of detail provided by the CPC will set the direction of implementation. Where the CPC feels strongly about the type of use or character, the committee should be explicit. Where the CPC wants to leave room for flexibility, the policy should provide a framework indicating guidelines for the ORC and PB to consider.

Mark also suggested that the CPC keep in mind the tone of the recommendations. Is the policy a **requirement** explicitly mandated through zoning regulations or is it a **recommendation**, something allowed, even encouraged, under zoning but not required of all property owners. The following two examples help to clarify the tone.

Example A – Requiring:

In the heart of downtown Hallowell, the CPC wants all new and renovated buildings to maintain the look and feel of adjacent buildings. The downtown land use policy should *require* developers to mimic/reflect the current pattern. The CPC should define the character of development including uses (retail, upper floor residential) and site design (mimic existing pattern, provide parking, incorporate river access/views).

Example B – Recommending:

The committee would like to allow rural landowner the option to develop cluster and townhouse style developments. The CPC is not looking to require landowners to develop townhouses; rather it is *recommending* that this type of development be a permitted option. The CPC can include language that defines the character of multi-family developments including overall style and site design (lot size, setbacks, access, height, number or units).

Based on Mark's comments, Frank and I have revised the land use policies provided at the last meeting. To better define the discussion areas, I have created a map of Future Land Use Areas based on the current and proposed patterns of development. Attached is the new table with an added column to reference the attached maps of the Future Land Use Areas.

At the November 18 meeting, we will continue our discussion using the maps and table as guides. We will begin with a review of the downtown and the gateways to clarify our edits, make changes, and add/remove policies. Then we will discuss the urban neighborhoods followed by the transition and rural areas.

It is our hope that the committee can review the proposed policies and come to the meeting prepared with comments and suggestions. If you have a chance, look at the maps and go over each area, asking the following questions:

1. What is the current development pattern? What is the character of the buildings (scale, relationship to neighboring buildings, materials used)? Are there buildings that reflect what you like? What you don't like?
2. What types of uses dominate? Is it residential or commercial? Are the uses compatible with what you would like to see there in the future?
3. Should the area remain as it is? Is there a specific character or use you would like to preserve? What could be improved? Is there a character or use you would like to see that is currently not found in the area?