TOWN OF BRUNSWICK

ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE COMMITTEE

85 Union Street, Brunswick, ME 04011-1583

WORK SESSION AGENDA

TOWN HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS
85 UNION STREET
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2014
9:00 AM

1. Review and acceptance of meeting summaries
2. Consultant contract extension update
3. Scheduling of joint workshops with VRB and Town Council updates
4. Review document *"Zoning Ordinance Correlation With Key Actions of the 2008 Comprehensive Plan"*
5. Review general comments on public draft
6. Review ZORC work session meeting schedule
7. Other business

Please note that this is a Committee work session. The public is invited to attend with public comment allowed regarding discussion topics.
Please call the Brunswick Department of Planning and Development (725-6660) with questions or comments. Individuals needing auxiliary aids for effective communications please call 725-6659 or TDD 725-5521.

BRUNSWICK ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE COMMITTEE
PUBLIC DRAFT INTRODUCTION MEETING WITH STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE
AUGUST 7, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE COMMITTEE: Charlie Frizzle, Chair; Vice Chair Margaret Wilson; Richard Visser Anna Breinich; Jeff Hutchinson; and Jeremy Doxsee

ATTENDEES: Jeff Emerson (Fire Department); John Foster (Public Works Department)

An informal presentation of the public draft was given by members of the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee as only two department representatives on the Town's Staff Review Committee (SRC) were in attendance. *Note: SRC members representing the Brunswick-Topsham Water District and the Brunswick Sewer District offered comments at a later meeting of stakeholders. Additional review comments and ordinance drafting is being completed by the Parks and Recreation Department (Recreation Impact Fees and Landscaping Standards)*

Two comments were offered:

- Include the minimum parking lot design standards now included in the existing zoning ordinance.
- Need consistency between the street acceptance ordinance and proposed public street standards.

BRUNSWICK ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE COMMITTEE PUBLIC DRAFT INTRODUCTION MEETING WITH THE MIDCOAST REGIONAL REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, BOWDOIN COLLEGE, THE BRUNSWICK-TOPSHAM WATER DISTRICT AND THE BRUNSWICK SEWER DISTRICT AUGUST 19, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE COMMITTEE: Charlie Frizzle, Chair; Margaret Wilson, Vice Chair; Richard Visser; Anna Breinich and Jeremy Doxsee

ATTENDEES: Leonard Blanchette (Brunswick Sewer District); Alan Frasier and Craig Douglas (Brunswick-Topsham Water District); Bob Rocheleau (MRRA); Don Borkowski, Katy Longley, and Catherine Ferdinand (Bowdoin College). Invited but unable to attend: Brunswick-Topsham Land Trust.

Discussions

Brunswick-Topsham Water District (BTWD)

- Protection of aquifers without Aquifer Protection Zones attached
    - Yes or no on protection? To review further
- Geothermal – DEP jurisdiction
    - BTWD has no issues
- Contamination/water withdrawal standards – Brunswick Area Citizens for a Safe Environment (BACSE) letter also forwarded to Bowdoin, BTWD; Planning staff working with US Navy and EPA in developing additional zoning ordinance language.
- BTWD advocates the provision of public water outside the growth area for fire protection. ZORC noted that Comprehensive Plan recommends no extension of public water or sewer into the rural area.

Brunswick Sewer District (BSD)

- Anna handed out earlier comments provided by BSD.
- BSD recommends requiring all development within growth zone to hook into public sewer; State regulations require connecting if within 200 feet.
    - Policy and funding issue at Town Council level
- Discussed whether if a new development located on a parcel in the rural area directly adjacent to growth area could hook into public water and sewer if already within access to the development. Both Districts have no issue with connecting into their systems in a situation as described.
- Requested the inclusion of a vehicle fueling station as an accessory use and/or retail use for compressed natural gas to serve municipal needs, possibly retail sale of fuel.

Bowdoin College

- Questions raised regarding mapping of Brunswick Executive Airport approach zone overlay as to whether there would be any impact on future development of Bowdoin west side parcels – Jeremy and Sitelines (Bowdoin consulting engineer) to verify location for zoning map.

BRUNSWICK ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 1, 2014

ZONING ORDINANCE TOWNWIDE PUBLIC FORUM

ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Charlie Frizzle, Chair; Margaret Wilson, Vice Chair; Richard Visser, Anna Breinich, Jeff Hutchinson, and Jeremy Doxsee

The Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee held a Public Zoning Forum on Wednesday, October 1, 2014 at SMCC Auditorium, Brunswick Landing.

This is the last in a series of public meetings that have been held in the past few months. Following this meeting, a series of workshops will be held to compile and discuss all of the comments that the committee has received to date. After that has occurred, a revised draft of the zoning ordinance will be prepared, and the committee will begin another series of public forums to receive more feedback.

Ms. Breinich gave a presentation on the structure and major changes of the proposed zoning ordinance. The next scheduled meeting of the committee is a work session scheduled for October 9, 2014, in Room 206 at Town Hall at 1:00 pm. Public comments will be taken at this work session. The work session will be recorded for later broadcast.

Mr. Frizzle opened the meeting to comments, and asked citizens to also provide their comments in paper form to Ms. Breinich at the Planning and Development Department at Town Hall.

Jane Millett, Franklin Street, would have liked to have a list of acronyms early on, so reading the draft document would have been easier. She also suggests making the blue and magenta colors lighter so the writing underneath them can be more easily seen. She asks who oversees the Town's integrity to the Comprehensive Plan and the zoning ordinance. She cited several examples of decisions she felt violated the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Millett had questions on many specific sections; she provided those in writing.

Robert Morrison, 37 Bouchard Drive, hopes there is an extended amount of time to study this document, which is complicated and difficult to comprehend. He said he would like to echo a citizen's comments from last meeting, when it was said "I'd really just like to preserve my neighborhood", and he doesn't feel this draft does that in terms of increasing density. He feels the expected train layover facility changes the quality and character of his neighborhood. He doesn't understand how a railroad corridor allows a maintenance layover facility to be characterized as a motor vehicle repair service. Who decided on a lot density increase? He believes this should come from the people. He is concerned about power of the staff to be able to make decisions that were formally handled by planning and zoning. He's concerned about places in the draft that say "to be provided in the future". He is confused that his street and another street are listed in 3 different zoning districts.

Lisa Fink, 33 MacMillan Drive, urged the committee to take a step back, push back the date for the next draft, and have a GR-9 neighborhood meeting. She believes the definition for GR-9 contrasts dramatically with the proposed change that would lop off the ends of MacMillan Drive and Peary Drive, and would place them in the growth district. Her next concern is the new growth district that replaces the medical use district. Looking at the chart, it seems like other major uses are to be allowed in this area, like retail or hotels, and that would dramatically change the nature of what is now GR-9 district.

Carol O'Donnell, 305 Maine Street, asks about a note in GC-1 and GC-2 that states "current ordinance also disallows construction of new roadways or driveways for motor vehicles which connect Meadowbrook Road, Whittier Street, Brackett Road, Atwood Lane, Bowdoin Street or Berry Street; proposed ordinance"? She would encourage the committee to keep that language due to the presence of Snowflake Preserve at the end of Bowdoin Street and Atwood Lane, and the fact that a road could cut through the preserve. She would encourage more neighborhood meetings after incorporating changes into the draft.

Joe Ciarrocca, 532 Harpswell Road, says he doesn't understand any of this and asks why Brunswick is being rezoned. He asked if the zoning ordinance was promoting development. Mr. Frizzle responded. He believes Brunswick is dense enough.

Jeremy Doxsee, Town Planner, said the ordinance neither promotes nor discourages development; it merely directs it according to the 2008 Comprehensive Plan.

Robert Morrison, 37 Bouchard Drive, asked if there were any studies that back up information stated by Mr. Doxsee that Brunswick is going to be a growth area, and the Comprehensive Plan is just a guide. He'd like to see the downtown grow, but not at the expense of the citizens.

Jeremy Doxsee replied that every community should be prepared for possible growth pressures, with future population growth as predicted by the U. S. Census Bureau.

Ms. Wilson responded that as Chair of the Comprehensive Plan Committee, the Committee had substantial amounts of information from the U. S. Census Bureau, from which to base their assumptions and recommendations.

Carol O'Donnell, 305 Maine Street, mentioned the State requires updates of the Comprehensive Plan periodically. She suggested an executive summary of only the changes in the proposed document.

Ms. Wilson also mentioned that the State requires the Zoning Ordinance be in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Richard Fisco, Lincoln Street, has many unanswered questions.

- Why are we doing this?
- Who wants this and why?
- Who were the developers in the unpublicized developers group?

Mr. Frizzle responded that all developers were documented and available at the Town Hall.

- What is the rush?
- What actually is it that the State is requiring of us?
- What would be the minimum changes that would satisfy the State?

Dan Harris, 1 Mountain Ash Avenue, would like the committee to know that he believes you are all acting in the best of faith for the citizens of Brunswick, and he knows it is for the people and the Town. He knows occasionally there have been some disagreements; he's expressed some himself. He knows you are not under any influence from outside forces of any sort and he is satisfied that what you're doing is the best that you can, and he hates to see people acting in good faith for the Town subject to a suggestion that you're acting otherwise. He thanks the committee for the work they've done, and he will continue to disagree as needed.

Kathy Wilson, 144 Pleasant Street, says she's been to all but one of these meetings, and admits it's difficult to comprehend everything. She's been here all her life, and when she was a kid, Pleasant Street was a lot more rural. It changed, and she doesn't believe her father expected it to be what it is today. Growth happens, whether we put some control on it or not. We need to welcome some of that, but have guidelines. She has seen the Committee take comments and change items; she encourages all to give the committee comments and suggestions.

Richard Fisco, Lincoln Street, said this town belongs to everyone; don't sell our homes.

Mr. Frizzle thanked the crowd for their participation. The committee will now take 3 or 4 weeks to address all comments that have been presented. There is no deadline for comments. They will use these to create another draft and have another round of public hearings.

The next meeting time is as follows:

Thursday, October 9, 2014, 1:00 pm, Room 206 in Town Hall, 85 Union Street.

The meeting was adjourned.

Attest

Debra Blum
Recording Secretary

BRUNSWICK ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 9, 2014

ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Charlie Frizzle, Chair; Margaret Wilson, Vice Chair; Richard Visser, Anna Breinich, Director of Planning and Development; Jeff Hutchinson, Codes Officer; and Jeremy Doxsee, Town Planner

TOWN STAFF PRESENT: John Eldridge, Finance Director and Interim Town Manager

The Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee held a meeting on Thursday, October 9, 2014 at Town Hall, 85 Union Street, in conference room 206.

Mr. Frizzle began the meeting by apologizing to people who came to the meeting today expecting the Committee to be tackling responses to the draft zoning ordinance. The Committee will be postponing that process until a future meeting, due to the volume of work needed in the Zoning Ordinance Review Committee and keeping up with the normal functions of the Planning and Development Department. The Committee today will be reviewing previous meeting summaries for approval, talking about the Committee's public engagements to date, finding out what other informational materials are needed, discussing feedback regarding format of the zoning ordinance implementation of the Comprehensive Plan draft, planning a work schedule and setting the next meeting date, and discussing scheduling a joint workshop with the Village Review Board and a workshop with the Town Council.

Reviewing and accepting meeting summaries: Mr. Frizzle said that he had read through the meeting summaries and found some minor typos, but nothing that changed the substantive material in the drafts, and if the rest of the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee would be willing to approve them based on that, then the committee could approve them as a block. The Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee meeting list for approval is as follows:

- **August 5, 2014** meeting; introductory session with the Planning Board, Village Review Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals
- **August 11, 2014** meeting; introductory session with the Downtown and Outer Pleasant Street Master Plan Implementation Committee and the Brunswick Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- **August 12, 2014** meeting; introductory session with the Conservation Commission, Marine Resource Committee, Recreation Commission, and the Rivers & Coastal Waters Committee
- **August 21, 2014** meeting; introductory session with the development community
- **September 11, 2014** meeting; Town Core Zoning Public Forum
- **September 17, 2014** meeting; New Meadows Zoning Public Forum
- **September 18, 2014** meeting; College Abutters Zoning Public Forum
- **September 24, 2014** meeting; Town wide Zoning Public Forum

Margaret Wilson moved, Richard Visser seconded, approval of the summaries of the meetings from the dates listed above. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Visser asked members for corrections to be given to Ms. Breinich.

Ms. Breinich listed the remaining Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee meetings, for which summaries are being completed, as follows:

- **July 31, 2014** meeting; roll out of the proposed draft ordinance
- **August 7, 2014** meeting; introductory meeting with Staff Review Committee
- **August 19, 2014** meeting; introductory meeting with stakeholder groups, including MRRA, Bowdoin, Water District and Sewer District
- **October 1, 2014** meeting; final Town wide Zoning Public Forum

Mr. Frizzle opened the meeting for public comment, and asked if anyone would like to provide comments or make statements.

Richard Fisco, 2 Lincoln Street, asked if the meeting summaries would be available, and Mr. Frizzle responded that they would be online, and they would provide a copy at this time.

Mr. Frizzle, seeing no one else with questions, then closed public comment.

Mr. Frizzle then introduced John Eldridge, the Finance Director and Interim Town Manager, who Ms. Breinich had asked to attend this meeting.

Public engagement to date/lessons learned:

Ms. Breinich mentioned that she gave a brief update to Council at their October 6, 2014, meeting, and summarized her comments today.

Ms. Breinich stated that as of October 6, 2014, the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee had held approximately 38 meetings, including public sessions and forums, Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee meetings, and meetings with other entities. The project began last October, when the Town contracted with Clarion Associates. Of those 38 meetings, 15 of them were held since July 31, 2014. Ms. Breinich said through listening at the public forums, the staff recommendation was to go ahead and include another interim draft, which was not in the original contract. Clarion was asked for a six month amendment on their contract, which would give the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee until June of 2015, since the original contract would have expired in December. Council wanted to see a layout of next steps, so Ms. Breinich has prepared a project timetable and tried to show the original scope of the project, and the amended scope of the project. Ms. Breinich presented a timetable as follows:

- On October 1st, the draft public forums and sessions were completed. These were part of the original contract.
- Today, October 9, the Committee was due to begin deliberating on the comments received, however, the Committee needs to take some time getting the comments online and the meetings summarized and to provide the timetable and scope of services.
- The Committee is proposing a tentative date of January 15, 2015, to submit revisions to Clarion for incorporation into the interim draft zoning ordinance, which would be an amended scope, should they be able to sign the amended agreement with Clarion. Clarion has indicated they would need a minimum of 3 weeks to revise and prepare the second draft.

- February of 2015 – Clarion would prepare and provide to ZORC the interim draft for release, and two weeks later, ZORC would present it in its first public form. Mr. Frizzle mentioned that with previous meetings, the Committee had scheduled meetings the day of the draft arrival, without the public having had a chance to see the draft. Now they are building in a few weeks extra time for a chance to read through it.
- 2/15/15 – 3/15/15 – ZORC would hold area-focused public forums, the number and locations to be determined, and meeting with boards, committees and stakeholders as needed, rather than conduct another round of specific stakeholder meetings. During this time, ZORC would be providing regular updates to the Town Council.
- 4/15/15 – ZORC reviews the comments and deliberates, holds a public review session on its deliberations, submits the revisions to Clarion, and a final draft will be prepared by Clarion. With this final draft, an adoption process would be started.
- 5/15 – ZORC releases the recommended final draft; two weeks later it is presented to the Planning Board for their consideration and action. At that time, there will be a presentation by Clarion, and that is part of the original scope.
- 6/15 – Planning Board presents their recommended zoning ordinance to Town Council for their consideration and action. Clarion will also be presenting at that time as part of the original scope.

Mr. Frizzle mentioned that this timeline is tentative and flexible.

Mr. Visser commented on the public forums and a question raised that asked the Committee to go to each zoning district to hold a separate public forum. It is not possible to do with 31 zones, and they will try the best we can to publicize these. Mr. Frizzle added that the pink hand-outs in the tax bills were the most helpful, but any time they send the postcards, it is a lot of money. He would like to discuss effective notification within the budget restraints. He believes even TV3 doesn't have a large percentage of viewing. Ms. Wilson responded that the Committee had done a number of "pop-ups", where they showed up at the Farmer's Market, etc., with maps and information. The little interactions with people are valuable, but it takes a lot of work and time to reach twenty people, and their comments are not in the public record. Some comments are able to be easily answered; others need committee discussion because they are either lengthy or have ramifications for other areas in the proposed zoning ordinance.

Ms. Breinich responded that with the emails and comments she is receiving, she is giving an answer when it is a brief, clear answer; otherwise it will need to come to the Committee for deliberation. She has a binder with all the questions, comments, and newspaper articles that have been generated so far, and the public is welcome to come in and view it. Mr. Frizzle discussed setting up the public forums differently; for the first hour, the Committee members could mingle and answer some questions, after that they could offer questions and suggestions at the microphone to the entire committee in a public hearing.

Mr. Eldridge is hearing different expectations from the committee and the citizens.

Richard Fisco, 2 Lincoln Street, believes the document was too much, too fast, and had too many acronyms and places marked "to be inserted".

Jeff Hutchinson stated that regardless of what the Committee does, this ordinance will be a complicated document. Hopefully it will be a better document than it is now. He also rarely answers questions without researching, because it is a complicated document and his job is to provide correct information.

Carol Liscovitz, asked about the amendment to Clarion, and if they would budget a communications allotment. She also mentioned that the outlets used to reach the public were all something they had to initiate, like TV3 and the Times Record. She suggested going to places people attend, like the grocery store, but the Committee answered that they were not allowed.

Jeff Hutchinson also tried to borrow the electronic board from the Police Department, but it was not working. Banners are also cost prohibitive.

The committee discussed other current methods of getting information to the public, such as a Facebook page and zoning maps displayed at Senter Place.

Helen Cafferty, 12 Whittier Street, commented that with the meetings coming up it is very important to start from scratch and state the goals again, as new citizens may be coming forward.

Richard Fisco, 2 Lincoln Street, says the purpose statement in the rewrite needs to be elaborated on and clarified.

John Eldridge said by answering the questions that have been received, and by letting people know when they are going to be answered, they will understand the process better.

Ms. Breinich said Mr. Elliott of Clarion Associates recommended they produce a two page Executive Summary. She mentioned that it will also include what has not been changed. The complexity of the footnotes was discussed, and Mr. Frizzle reminded everyone that there is a version without footnotes.

Helen Cafferty, 12 Whittier Street, mentioned that she was recently doing some outreach in her neighborhood about the proposed zoning ordinance, and many “plugged-in” citizens were in shock or knew nothing about it. She said it seemed to help people to know what the comprehensive plan was and what it meant for the proposed zoning ordinance.

Carol Liscovitz, suggested a short letter or flyer with a simple message that could direct people to the website so people could start with the beginning; simple explanations of the Comprehensive Plan and why the zoning ordinance is being rewritten. Frame the message in a positive manner, like how it’s going to be better, rather than concentrate on the changes, which sound negative.

Jeremy Doxsee thinks that compared to other towns he’s seen, Brunswick’s participation is significantly better. He believes there is a lot of apathy out there, and they have done a good job to date of getting the word out, but will redouble their efforts.

Mr. Frizzle would like feedback on Ms. Wilson's 20+ page document, which outlines how various aspects of the Comprehensive Plan have been implemented. Ms. Wilson explained her document, which is not yet finished. She is hoping to incorporate her comments into Ms. Breinich's chart. Mr. Frizzle is satisfied with the format.

Ms. Wilson reminded the public that comments are accepted throughout this process.

Ms. Breinich discussed scheduling of the work sessions; may need to have open public review sessions on comments that they have deliberated on previously, possibly chapter by chapter. The Committee will see how this process meets expectations, and may change formats if needed. Mr. Frizzle suggested publishing the list of questions they will address in a particular meeting, so citizens may attend when their specific concerns are going to be addressed. Meetings will be scheduled with any groups, committees or stakeholders that requests one.

An audience member compared the ordinance to a technical manual that's difficult to understand.

Jeremy Doxsee and Ms. Breinich responded, and asked for examples of other ordinances from citizens.

John Eldridge and Ms. Breinich will present the rewrite timeline to the Council.

Set the ZORC meeting schedule: The Committee discussed setting various dates and times for the next meetings, and how to discuss responses to public comments. Mr. Frizzle suggested that staff and Clarion provide a draft response to each of the questions that will be addressed in the next meeting. The Committee will collectively review, change and finalize the draft by chapter. It was agreed to begin with the comments that were provided by chapter and section. Mr. Frizzle stated that he would make an opportunity available at the beginning of the meeting for general comments and broad-based questions. The Committee will take specific questions related only to the area they are reviewing.

- **Next meeting:** Mr. Frizzle asked Ms. Breinich to take a few weeks and work on the Comprehensive plan and the Executive summary documents, then send some dates out to the Committee via email for the next meeting. Ms. Breinich is tentatively planning one meeting every other week at varying times.
- **Scheduling workshops with the VRB and the Town Council:** Mr. Frizzle suggested that the groups propose dates to the ZORC committee.

An audience member asked about the sign ordinance, and since the language is still being worked on, should comments be held. Response from Ms. Breinich was yes to hold comments, and mentioned that the other section not ready for comments is the nonconformity section.

Mr. Frizzle, seeing no other comments, adjourned the meeting.

Attest

Debra Blum
Recording Secretary

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION ONLY – 10-18-14

How the Proposed Brunswick Zoning Ordinance Implements the Town's 2008 Comprehensive Plan

Insert Vision from Comp Plan?

Part B Policies - Chapter 5: Proposed Major Policies, Objectives and Actions

Policy Area 1: Quality Public Schools
Policy Area 2: Municipal Facilities Planning

These policies are outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance rewrite.

In the sections that follow, only Key Objectives and Key Actions are correlated with the Proposed Zoning Ordinance.

Policy Area 3: Promote the Desired Growth/Rural Pattern of Development

Key Objective # and Text	Key Action # and Text	Implementation of Key Actions in Proposed Zoning Ordinance
1. Ensure the BNAS rezoning occurs through the evaluation of potential opportunities as well as on and off-site impacts of redevelopment that integrates new and existing uses	1. Elected officials & Town staff continue to participate in the MRRA planning & implementation process.	Implemented in BNAS reuse Master Plan prior to Zoning Ordinance Rewrite
	2. Obtain natural resource inventories that exist for BNAS land. Identify & plan to ensure protection of significant natural resources and open space.	Implemented in BNAS reuse Master Plan prior to Zoning Ordinance Rewrite
	3. Participate in the evaluation of infrastructure needs for redevelopment of roads, storm water, sewer & water & other services.	Implemented in BNAS reuse Master Plan prior to Zoning Ordinance Rewrite
	4. Using the information gathered from Key Actions 2 & 3 above confirm the proposed Rural/Growth Boundary & develop associated zoning consistent with Brunswick overall development policies	The Growth Area boundary was established by the Reuse Master Plan. All areas in Brunswick Landing merge into the overall zoning of the Town and use the same organization and language as all the other zoning districts in Town.

Policy Area 3: Promote the Desired Growth/Rural Pattern of Development, cont.

2. Encourage dense new development in the Growth Area and limit development in the rural area.	1. Allow denser development in designated Growth Areas (particularly where water, sewer, & storm water systems exist) by drafting & adopting zoning ordinance amendments to permit increased housing density at all price levels. Denser development should be compatible with the existing, livable neighborhoods in the Growth Area.	Minimum lot sizes have been reduced in most zoning districts to encourage infill development where appropriate. Densities increase in MU 2,3; CU 2, 3, 4, and 6. (Note densities decrease slightly in 1 1,4 and R 6 due to consolidation of districts). Brunswick Landing presents a substantial opportunity to encourage dense residential development in the Growth Area and limit it in the Rural Area. No residential development is allowed on Brunswick Landing outside of the growth area. R-CMU will allow multifamily housing at a density of 24 units/acre, with no minimum lot size. R-R will allow both 1-2 family and multi-family dwellings at a density of 8 units/acre, and a minimum lot area of 4,000 sq. ft. Both will encourage new residential, dense development. The revised Common Development Plan changes allow for flexibility that can increase density. Neighborhood protection standards [4.10] specify protection required where residential neighborhoods abut more intensive uses. ~~Brunswick Landing presents the most substantial opportunity for in-fill development and the Common Development Plan changes allow for flexibility that can increase density.~~
	2. Limit the number of residential building permits issued for new dwelling units in the Rural Area to no more than one-third of total permits issued each year.	

Comment [amb1]: Should we also note where densities have decreased due to consolidations of Residential Districts, for example, R-6, 8 down to 5 per acre? Actually, that may be the only decrease.

Policy Area 3: Promote the Desired Growth/Rural Pattern of Development, cont.

3. Maintain the character of the rural area.	1. Continue implementation of the management strategies recommended in the 2003 Rural Brunswick Smart Growth Study Adopted by the Town Council	Rural Brunswick Smart Growth overlay renamed Wildlife Protection Overlay (2.4.5). The Overlay is rewritten to make it easier for the Town to monitor development within Unfragmented Forest Blocks and corridors. The Open Space development section (4.1.4.C) sets specific minimum standards for the amount and conservation of land that must be set aside in an Open Space Development and then grants increased density bonuses and allows for dimensional standard modifications to encourage this type of development in rural areas.
	2. Continue to work toward the implementation of the strategies recommended in the 2002 Parks, Recreation & Open Space Plan as adopted by the Town Council.	
	3. Promote ways to protect important open space & habitats in the Rural Area through Open Space Developments, Rural Brunswick Smart Growth Developments or other mechanisms that protect important open space & habitat.	

Policy Area 4: Support the Development and Maintenance of Infrastructure That Promotes Livable Neighborhoods and the Desired Pattern of Residential and Commercial Growth.

Key Objective # and Text	Key Action # and Text	Implementation of Key Actions in Proposed Zoning Ordinance
1. Utilize the water, sewer, and storm water systems to promote the desired pattern of growth	1. Align BTWD & BSD & Town planning efforts to achieve the Town's broad planning objectives.	The Water and Sewer Districts have actively participated in drafting the Proposed Zoning Ordinance. Unfortunately, capitalization issues lie outside the scope of the zoning ordinance.

Policy Area 4: Support the Development and Maintenance of Infrastructure That Promotes Livable Neighborhoods and the Desired Pattern of Residential and Commercial Growth, cont.

	2. Actively plan for, & explore the capitalization of water & sewer extensions into areas where the Town is particularly encouraging development (as defined in the Future Land Use Plan).	
	3. Implement zoning changes that encourage denser, infill development in the Growth Area where water, sewer, and storm water systems exist.	Where denser development is recommended, both water and sewer service is available.
	4. Implement zoning on BNAS property that is consistent with overall Town policies encouraging denser development in Growth Areas with appropriate infrastructure, & preserving the rural character outside of Growth Areas.	~~No residential development is allowed on Brunswick Landing out growth area.~~ Brunswick Landing presents a substantial opportuni encourage dense residential development in the Growth Area and limit it in the Rural Area. No residential development is allowed on Brunswick Landing outside of the growth area. ~~In the Growth Area,~~ R-CMU will allow multifamily housing at a density of 24 units/acre, with no minimum lot size. R-R will allow both 1-2 family and multi-family dwellings at a density of 8 units/acre, and a minimum lot area of 4,000 sq. ft. Both will encourage new residential, dense development and both water and sewer service is available. (True in R-R?] The initial re-occupancy of existing buildings at Brunswick Landing will not require Development Review for most projects.

Policy Area 4: Support the Development and Maintenance of Infrastructure That Promotes Livable Neighborhoods and the Desired Pattern of Residential and Commercial Growth, cont.

2. Use Initiatives in dealing with the Town's roads, sidewalks, pathways, and public transportation to promote Brunswick's desired pattern of growth and safely carry automobile, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic.	1. Develop a Master Traffic Plan & prioritize solutions for the most congested & least safe areas. In particular, plan for changes required by the reuse of BNAS.	No traffic master plan has yet been undertaken and outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance. The Downtown Brunswick and Outer Pleasant Street Corridor Master Plan contains many specifics relating to these issues. There is a new requirement in the Zoning Ordinance that requires any public or private street receiving ME DOT funding to comply with the ME DOT Complete Streets Policy that specifies bicycle and pedestrian planning. Issues of public transport lie outside the applicability of the zoning ordinance.

Policy Area 5: Encourage a Diversity of Housing Types in the Designated Growth Area and Facilitate the Preservation and Development of Affordable and Workforce Housing

Key Objective # and Text	Key Action # and Text	Implementation of Key Actions in Proposed Zoning Ordinance
1. Support the transition of BNAS associated housing to meet the workforce and affordable housing needs of the community	1. Research federal regulations relating to affordable housing of decommissioned Navy housing & position Town to ensure the availability & affordability of those units.	The Town in cooperation with Tedford Housing completed this during the transfer of title to BNAS lands to the MRRA outside the scope of the Proposed Zoning Ordinance.
	2. Create zoning for BNAS property that allows for increased density & flexibility to promote private development of affordable & workforce housing.	Former McKeen Street Navy housing absorbed into neighboring residential District (GR 4) allowing 5 dwelling units/acre and a minimum lot size of 7,500 sq. ft. Former Navy housing off Gurnet Road is its own zoning district (R-R), with 8 dwelling units allowed per acre and a minimum lot size of 4,000 sq. ft. R-CMU will allow multifamily housing at a density of 24 units/acre, with no minimum lot size.

Policy Area 5: Encourage a Diversity of Housing Types in the Designated Growth Area and Facilitate the Preservation and Development of Affordable and Workforce Housing, cont.

2. Preserve the current stock of affordable and rental housing	1. Actively pursue state & federal housing subsidy programs, such as Community Development Block Grant (CDGB) housing rehabilitation funds, Federal Home Loan Bank subsidies, & Maine State Housing Authority Home Rehabilitation program funds. Explore reuse of no-longer needed municipal and school facilities as sites for redevelopment.	These Key actions are both outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance.
3. Create an environment that supports the development of new affordable housing by both the public and private sectors	1. Allow denser development in the Growth Area by drafting & adopting zoning ordinance revisions to permit increased housing density at all price levels. This same action appears in Policy 3, Objective 2, Action 1 serving both objectives.	Apply the strong provisions of the current Zoning Ordinance. They contain adequate provisions to support this key objective. The Proposed Ordinance has decreased minimum lot sizes throughout much of the Growth Area. Densities increase in MU 2, 3; CU 2, 3, 4, and 6.

Policy Area 6: Protect Significant Open Space and Natural Resources and Provide Outdoor Recreational Opportunities

Key Objective # and Text	Key Action # and Text	Implementation of Key Actions in Proposed Zoning Ordinance
1. Ensure that the reuse of BNAS is consistent with Brunswick's overall natural resource values	1. Work with Redevelopment Authority & Navy-hired environmental consultants to identify & inventory natural resources on BNAS property to coordinated the protection of significant local & regional natural resources.	The Town has worked with the Midcoast Regional Redevelopment Authority and environmental consultants to identify and inventory some of the natural resources on BNAS property. The existing protections of natural resources for all developments in Brunswick shall be equally applied to new development in Brunswick Landing.
2. Limit growth outside the growth boundary relative to inside the boundary	1. Limit the number of residential building permits issued for new dwelling units in the Rural Area to one-third of total permits issued town-wide. This same action appears in Policy 3, Obj 1, Action 2, serving both objectives.	The proposed Ordinance does not limit the number of building permits allowed in the rural area but proposes higher densities in parts of the growth area and further encourages open space developments where possible in the rural area. No residential development is permitted outside the Growth Area Boundary on Brunswick Landing.
3. Improve mechanisms for protecting high value open space and natural resources	1. Provide assistance to the newly established Land for Brunswick's Future Board to oversee identification & prioritization of high value open space & natural resources to be protected.	The Land for Brunswick's Future Board is no longer active and has never been funded by the Town Council.

Policy Area 6: Protect Significant Open Space and Natural Resources and Provide Outdoor Recreational Opportunities, cont.

	2. Promote ways to protect important open space & habitats in the Rural Area through Open Space Developments, Rural Brunswick Smart Growth developments or other mechanisms that protect important open space & habitat.	The Open Space Development section of the Ordinance is substantially revised (4.1.4.C). It increases the density bonus currently in the Ordinance from 15% to 25% in the Rural Area and now requires that if they exist on land proposed for an open space development, floodplains, moderate and high quality wetlands, significant vernal pools, wildlife habitat and corridors, steep slopes, rock outcroppings or other unique topographic features, stands of mature trees, or areas of rare plant communities must be part of the conserved land. 4.1.4.C.4.a.iii requires that preserved areas be contiguous to other protected areas if they exist on or next to a parcel. The Rural Brunswick Smart Growth provisions are now contained in the Wildlife Protection Overlay (2.4.5). They require the applicant to show the history of fragmentation before any disturbance is permitted to better track the development of an area.
	3. Revise the zoning ordinance to ensure that land with high resource value is preserved in the development process.	In addition to the revisions to the Open Space Development and Wildlife Habitat Blocks and Corridors described in the box above, section 4.2 is rewritten to incorporate stronger protections for natural vegetation, significant plant and animal habitat, and surface waters, wetlands and marine resources. Protections currently contained in section 209.3 that apply in the Coastal Protection zones 1 and 2 to protect Middle and Maquoit Bays are extended to the area along the New Meadows River.

Policy Area 6: Protect Significant Open Space and Natural Resources and Provide Outdoor Recreational Opportunities, cont.

4. Protect natural resources from harmful development activities	1. Continue to monitor the quality of waters – rivers, streams, coastal, & aquifers. Consider adding additional water quality monitoring as necessary to assess the drinking water & marine resource condition of these waters & adopt polices to ensure their protection.	The Town has created a new Rivers and Coastal Waters Commission who along with the Marine Resources Committee work outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance to monitor and protect coastal water quality. Protections currently contained in section 209.3 that apply in the Coastal Protection zones 1 and 2 to protect Middle and Maquoit Bays are extended to the area along the New Meadows River.
5. Provide adequate recreational facilities for current and future needs	1. Amend the existing recreation impact fee methodology for new residential development that reflects the impact of such development & costs associated with providing additional recreational facilities.	The current recreation impact fee is under study and will be revised as a part of the new zoning ordinance when complete.
	2. Identify & obtain facilities for recreation on BNAS property that can best meet the needs of the community. Update the 2004 Bruns Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvement Plan to incorporate access to BNAS.	The recreation facilities on former BNAS land are underway and those decisions fall outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance. An update to the 2004 Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Plan is under development by the Brunswick Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee which will contain recommendations for the new zoning ordinance.

Policy Area 7: Promote an Economically Viable, Attractive Downtown

Key Objective # and Text	Key Action # and Text	Implementation of Key Actions in Proposed Zoning Ordinance
1. Use the redevelopment of Maine St. Station site as a catalyst for Downtown improvements	1. Ensure that the design of the Maine St. Station site & the proposed uses, including passenger rail service by Amtrak & Maine Eastern Railroad, complement the mixed-use nature of the existing downtown.	The design of Maine Street Station is largely complete and outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. Make the Downtown District safer and more pedestrian friendly.	1. Evaluate & implement measures & physical improvements including traffic calming mechanisms, for improving pedestrian safety & comfort on Maine St.	These are largely issues outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance. New 4.6.A.4. does require new streets to comply with the ME DOT Complete Streets Policy, but this applies only to street projects receiving ME DOT funding. New objective bicycle parking requirements are established to encourage bicycle use.
	2. Continue implementing the improvements listed in the 2004 Bruns Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvement Plan relating to Downtown, particularly regarding crosswalks & sidewalks, on a regular basis.	

[Type a quote from the document or the summary of an interesting point. You can position the text box an

Policy Area 7: Promote an Economically Viable, Attractive Downtown, cont.

3. Increase the number of housing options in the Downtown District	1. Re-evaluate dimensional standards & conduct an inventory of neighborhood features as part of a revision of the Town's zoning ordinance to allow denser residential infill development throughout the downtown with preserving valued features.	The Planning Dept. has done an inventory of contributing structures as part of the evaluation of the VRB district expansion. ~~[Anna: more detail here?]~~ Consolidation of the current TC districts into GM 6 applies a uniform, form-based zoning approach to the Downtown that seeks to allow flexibility of both size and uses in the Downtown and thus increase residential density where possible. The minimum lot size is decreased to 7,500 sq. ft. in existing TR 3 (west and north to Union and Noble Streets) to preserve valued features. The Village Review Board will retain its authority over construction in the village area in Downtown. Overall changes to the Permitted Use Table in Residential Uses section allow more flexibility of residential uses throughout Brunswick.
4. In partnership with local organizations, make the Downtown more attractive, inviting and the "hub" of community activity.	1. Develop a new Master Plan for the downtown relating economic, housing & infrastructure improvements. Considerations for such a plan include traffic, bicycle & pedestrian patterns, alternatives to diverting thru-traffic away from Maine St, enhancing use of upper story space, preserving historic architecture, and making new construction & renovation fit the character of the historic downtown.	The Town Council adopted a new Master Plan for Downtown Brunswick and Outer Pleasant Street in 2011, developed outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance.

Comment [MW2]: I would leave in reference to inventory of contributing structures since it is logically connected to the request that we inventory "neighborhood features".

Comment [amb3]: The inventory was of contributing structures to the Village Review Zone, not to evaluate dimensional standards. Should delete this sentence.

Policy Area 7: Promote an Economically Viable, Attractive Downtown, cont.

	2. Expand the geographic limits of the Village Review Zone to include an area west of Maine St to Union St from the Androscoggin River to the Joshua L. Chamberlain Museum. Consider the development & application of commercial design standards.	The Village Review Zone is extended west and north to Union and Noble Streets to preserve valued features. The updating of the Village Review Zone Design Guidelines is outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance.

Policy Area 8: Preserve a Diverse and Healthy Local Economy

Key Objective # and Text	Key Action # and Text	Implementation of Key Actions in Proposed Zoning Ordinance
1. Redevelop in-fill sites within the Growth Area	1. Prepare & implement a feasibilit analysis, that includes a fiscal analysis, details the costs necessary to make the sites attractive to prospective businesses outlines anticipated business interest, & models an analysis of th number & types of jobs potentially created.	This analysis is outside the scope of the Proposed Zoning Ordinance.
	2. Explore & actively pursue 3rd party funding and/or transitional funding made available through BNAS closure process to support in-fill.	This process is outside the scope of the Proposed Zoning Ordinance.

Policy Area 8: Preserve a Diverse and Healthy Local Economy, cont.

	3. Promote the development of in-fill sites that are financially feasible, beneficial to the community, & have the potential to bring commercial development & jobs paying a living wage to a currently underutilized site. Identify the needs of specifically targeted businesses & provide incentives to attract them to Brunswick.	__The economic analysis of this Action is outside the scope of the Proposed Zoning Ordinance. __The new Ordinance does try to allow more in-fill by proposing smaller lot sizes, allowance for "artisanal manufacturing" in areas in the Town Core, flexibility regarding parking and loading. __ Since Brunswick Landing presents the greatest opportunity in the Growth Area for in-fill development, the Common Development section has been substantially revised to allow flexibility in the dimensional standards of new development to maximize the potential reuse of that area. The initial re-occupancy of existing buildings at Brunswick Landing will not require Development Review for most projects.
2. Ensure that BNAS rezoning occurs through an evaluation of potential opportunities as well as on and off-site impacts of redevelopment that integrates new and existing uses	1. Elected officials & staff of Town participate in MRRA planning process. 2. The Town encourages MRRA to actively explore the potential for early transfer of NBAS land suitable for businesses, developed cost effectively to the Town & attracts the types of business & jobs identified as being beneficial to the Town as in Key Objective 1 above.	This process has happened outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance.

Comment [amb4]: Also note flexibility in initial reuse of structures?

Comment [MW5]: How does this look, Anna? Same sentence inserted below.

Policy Area 8: Preserve a Diverse and Healthy Local Economy, cont.

3. Prior to the closure of BNAS, the Town shall develop and implement opportunities to attract businesses to Brunswick that will provide jobs paying a livable wage to help offset the anticipated loss of jobs leading up the closure of the base.	1. Identify the types and number of jobs the Town wants to attract & use available zoning, tax incentives, & third-party mechanisms to draw identified businesses and jobs.	The jobs analysis of this Action is outside the scope of the Proposed Zoning Ordinance. Since Brunswick Landing presents the greatest opportunity in the Growth Area for in-fill development, the Common Development section has been substantially revised to allow flexibility in the dimensional standards of new development to maximize the potential reuse of that area. The initial re-occupancy of an existing building at Brunswick Landing will not require Development Review for most projects.
4. Ensure that as Bowdoin College grows and changes, its facilities fit into the community.	1. Facilitate communication between the College and town citizens & businesses especially when the College needs to add new buildings, parking areas or other improvements.	This Action is largely outside the scope of the Proposed Zoning Ordinance. It does carry over the current provisions encouraging applicants to have a Pre-Application meeting with Town Staff and/or the Review Authority to discuss anticipated construction. (5.1.2)
5. Enhance the economic viability of small, locally owned businesses	1. Develop a marketing plan & strategy for the "new economy" businesses to encourage locating in Brunswick	The marketing plan is outside the scope of the Proposed Zoning Ordinance.

Comment [amb6]: Same as above.

Chapter 7: Land Use Plan

Planning Area (location)	Comp Plan Vision	Comp Plan Permitted Uses	Comp Plan Development Standards	Proposed Zoning Ordinance Changes Implementing Comp Plan Development Standards
Growth Area:				
Town Core All TC and TR zones except part of TR 5; part of Water St; CU 1,3,4,6; in-town MU 2. (Downtown and immediately adjacent neighborhoods, including Bowdoin Core Campus)	Community center with greatest development density/intensity; anchored by Fort Andross and Bowdoin College (serves as transition to residential neighborhoods). Maintains pedestrian scale and orientation. Infill and redevelopment increases density/intensity w/commercial use expanding where currently permitted.	Reflect existing development pattern; any type of residential, mixed use; small to moderate scale non-residential; college related residential and non-residential.	Density consistent with mature character of Town Core and adjacent neighborhoods; protect and enhance existing character; require pedestrian and bicycle facilities; flexibility in parking requirements; limit drive-throughs; stringent landscaping standards; VRZ design review.	1. Three Town Center Districts (TC 1,2,3) combined into single GM 6 district to help define central Town Core from Ft Andross to Bowdoin College. 2. Neighborhood Protection Standards Proposed (sec. 4.10) to protect existing residential neighborhoods where they adjoin non-residential uses 3. Artisan Manufacturing proposed permitted use in GM 6 (TC 1,2,3) as a way to allow small and moderate scale manufacturing uses with storefront retail combined. 4. Form-based type controls will encourage flexibility of in-fill or redevelopment and re-use of existing structures 5. Propose increased intensity of use for lots fronting Inner Pleasant St to allow small/moderate scale non-

				residential development in the area 6. Stringent landscaping standards are proposed [4.5.2], including obligation to maintain any planting as part of development review. 7. Fee-in-lieu of required parking proposed (4.7.1.B) as discussion item. This will give residents options to meet ordinance parking requirements. Will this flexibility encourage residential and small/moderate non-residential uses downtown? 8. Exempt lots under 10,000 sq. ' from parking and loading standards to encourage downtown development 9. Adopt recent text and mapping changes to Village Review Overlay from current Ordinance to maintain character of Downtown. 10. Water Street and Jordan Ave Residential Districts (TR 3 and TR 4) combined into single GR 8 district 11. I 1 district proposed to be a mixed use district to reflect potential for redevelopment of the area close to downtown and residential areas

Comment [amb7]: Will give options to meet ordinance parking requirements.

Town Residential R 1,7,8; pts of TR 5, CU 2,5; MU 3,6 (Older neighborhoods adjacent to Town Core; newer Bowdoin campus area; typically 5-10 minute walk from Town Core edge.)	Residential and educational community area, maintains pedestrian scale. Bowdoin grows, minimizes impact on surrounding neighborhoods. Existing single-family neighborhoods maintained; limited infill and accessory apts allowed to increase density. Limited small-scale commercial permitted.	Reflect existing development pattern; range of residential including small-scale multi-family and accessory apts; very limited compatible small-scale commercial and home-based businesses; college related residential and non-residential; mixed uses continuing in those areas.	Maintain existing single-family neighborhoods while allowing infill at reasonably high density where feasible (3-24 du/acre). Reduce/eliminate lot size. Other standards reflect existing conditions. MU and CU standards should remain same.	1. Neighborhood Protection Standards Proposed (sec. 4.10) to protect existing residential neighborhoods where they adjoin non-residential uses 2. Propose simplifying CU districts: existing 6 districts reduced to 4 in hopes of allowing Bowdoin flexibility in its core campus, but protecting existing residential neighborhoods from both existing and expanded college uses through restrictions on height, massing or scale in areas the campus adjoins those neighborhoods. 3. Limit number of cars that can be parked on properties in single family areas that rent rooms to protect character of abutting single family neighborhoods 4. Require that new college dorms or other college buildings with outdoor activities be designed to direct impacts toward the inner campus to protect character of abutting single family neighborhoods. 5. Propose carrying forward existing restrictions on through streets,

				multi-family residential, residence hall, restaurant and dining facilities in CU districts to protect character of existing single-family neighborhoods. 6. Minimum lot sizes reduced: TR 5 from 10,000 sq. ft. to 7,500; R 2 from 15,000 to 7,500. 7. Most dimensional standards unchanged to reflect existing conditions. 8. Dimensional standards to MU 3 and 6 to reflect changing conditions in the area and to encourage compatible uses there.
Town Extended Residential R 2,3,4 and MUOZ (Established neighborhoods beyond normal walking distance to Town Core, medical Use areas)	New development is compatible and is relatively dense, tight-knit, ped-oriented; medical uses/offices present; non-residential limited.	Wide range of residential and medical uses; very limited non-residential and home-based businesses; recreational facilities.	Moderate density maximizing residential development; establish minimum and maximum densities (1.5-12 du/acre); Reduced lot size; promote planned development.	1. R3, R4, R5, R6, and CR 2 within Growth Area combined. Minimum lot size reduced to 7,500 sq. ft. in all districts to allow in-fill at a reasonably high density. Residential density allowed is unchanged – still 5 units per acre with the exception of R-6, (reduced density from 8 to 5 units/acre.) ~~1.~~2. Use table shows wide range of residential uses and associated small scale uses only.

Cooks Corner Commercial Hub CC area w/in ½ mile of Gurnet Rd/Bath Rd intersection	Evolves into mixed-use area per Master Plan; regional commercial center with added residential.	Wide range of mixed uses	Maximize development potential (15 du/acre); min. lot size 7,500 sf; develop Bath Rd. gateway standards; require ped/bike improvements.	1. Neighborhood Protection Standards Proposed (sec. 4.10) to protect existing residential neighborhoods where they adjoin non-residential uses 2. Minimum lot size reduced from 15,000 sq. ft. to 7,500 3. Objective bicycle parking standard proposed (p 4-39) ~~3.~~4. Only 7 of 60 possible uses are prohibited in the zone.
Cooks Corner Extended Area Medical Use Overlay, R 6, CC zone outside hub (Almost completely surrounds CC Commercial Hub area, incl Mid-Coast Hospital area, excluding Meadow Rd area)	Evolves into mixed-use area per Master Plan, including additional retail, medical related uses and planned residential neighborhood, with new connector roads constructed.	Wide range of mixed uses with focus on residential, professional and medical office/research and low intensity non-residential uses	Maximize development potential (2-15 du/acre); min. lot size 7,500 sf; similar setbacks for medical uses; encourage Master Plans for large parcels; develop Bath Rd. gateway standards; new development primarily at Brunswick Landing.	1. Minimum lot size reduced from 15,000 sq. ft. to 7,500 2. Need density for GM 8. Anna recommends 5 du/acre. Density remains at 15 d u/acre in CC. Minimum lot size in CC and R 6 is reduced to 7,500 sq. ft. ~~2.~~3. CC north of Route 1 restricted to smaller footprint and less impervious coverage. ~~3.~~4. Location of new development will be market driven.

Brunswick Landing (BNAS)	**Note: Rezoning adopted 2009. Recommend development of Common Development Plan for Reuse District to replace all or most existing sub districts**	1. Improved Common Development Plan standards proposed to encourage flexibility of new development depending on market conditions while maintaining the development standards applicable throughout the rest of Brunswick. 2. R—B&TI merged with I 2 & 3 for consistency 3. Development standards for R-AR, R-CMU, R-R&OS and R-R remain individualized as they were envisioned in the Reuse Master Plan.

Commercial Connectors HC 1 and 2 (Two areas: Outer Pleasant Street and Bath Road to Cook's Corner)	Attractive efficient commercial gateways to Brunswick; streetscape and access to businesses improved as redevelopment and infill occur; residential not encouraged except in Cook's Corner (DMP now recommends mixed use for Pleasant Street); alternative connectors encouraged.	Wide range of non-residential uses; industrial uses as currently permitted. Residential only as part of mixed use development.	Focus on improving function and appearance. Maximum density 5du/acre; minimum lot size 7500 sf. Develop gateway overlay provisions.	1. Two Existing Connectors (HC 1 and HC 2) combined into single GM 5 district 2. Artisan Manufacturing is proposed as new Permitted Use to allow combined small and moderate scale manufacturing with associated retail uses 3. Propose lowering min lot size from 20,000 sq. ft. to 7,500 sq. ft. to allow wide range of non-residential uses 4. Propose lowering minimum lot width from 100' to 75' to allow wide range of non-residential uses 5. Note that no change is proposed to max building footprint 6. Density remains at 5 dwelling units/acre 7. Neighborhood Protection Standards Proposed (sec. 4.10) to protect existing residential neighborhoods where they adjoin non-residential uses 8. Stringent landscaping standards are proposed [4.5.2], including obligation to maintain any planting as part of development review.

Exit 28 Mixed-Use Area MU 4, R 5, I 4 (Areas east and west of Exit 28, directly south of I-295.)	Mix of "business park" and moderate/high density residential development. Natural buffer maintain along residential edges.	Mix of office, light industrial, business services, restaurants, residential as part of mixed use development, community and recreation facilities	Require master plans for large tracts, mixed use focus; reasonably intensive near Exit. Min. density 1.5-2, max. 5-15 du/acre; min lot size 7500 sf.; create I-295 natural buffer.	1. I 4 and MU 4 combined into GM 3 district with continuing emphasis on mixed use in the area. 2. Max Density R 4: 5 du/acre; I 4 and MU 4: 10 du/acre (no minimum density established) 3. Minimum lot size in all 3 districts will be 7,500 sq feet, a reduction from existing ordinance.
Industrial Areas I 1, 2, 3 (Industry Road, Church Road, and East Bath Road areas)	Areas for light industrial, office, service and similar uses with improved environmental and visual quality.	Limited range of light industrial, service and office uses, excluding retail, consumer services and residential uses.	Similar to current industrial district standards; maintain and/or enhance gateway corridors (Old Portland Road/Bath Road)	1. I 2 and 3 combined for consistency 2. I 1 becomes a mixed use area (GM3, consolidated with MU 4 and I 4 along Old Portland Road (Rt. 1 South) 3. Current industrial district standards are generally maintained. Exception is the reduction in minimum lot area and associated lot dimension standards to allow flexibility in these areas.

Comment [amb8]: Do we want to establish miniumum density?

Planning Area (location)	Comp Plan Vision	Comp Plan Permitted Uses	Comp Plan Development Standards	Proposed Zoning Ordinance Changes Implementing Comprehensive Plan Development Standards
Rural Areas:				
Farm and Forest Conservation Areas FF1, CR 1 & 2	Remain rural; limited development conserves natural and scenic values.	Agriculture and forestry uses and businesses that support them; single and 2-family residential; small scale multi-fam residential; low intensity non-residential uses.	1 du per 2 acres; open space developments; protect scenic road assets; non-residential development protects natural resources and buffers existing residential uses; protect unfragmented habitat blocks and corridors; protect signif nat resources.	1. 1 du per 1.5 to 2 acres. 2. Strengthen provisions of Wildlife Protection Overlay (2.4.5) to better protect unfragmented habitat blocks and corridors. 3. Strengthen provisions of Open Space Development provisions (4.1.4.C) to include increased bonus density of 25%

Coastal Protection Areas CP 1 & 2, FF 3	Remain rural; well-managed land use and development protects bays from impacts of storm water & nutrient loading; encourage natural resource-based uses. Maintain public access to water.	Rural and nat resource based uses including ag, forestry and marine; single and 2-family residential; small scale multi-family residential away from water; low intensity non-residential uses.	1 du per 3.5 to 5 acres in existing CP zones; 1du per 2 ac in existing FF 3; protect water quality; open space developments; protect unfragmented habitat blocks and corridors; protect signif natural resources; protect coastal bays.	1. Propose combining FF3 and CR 1 to protect New Meadows watershed. Revised Proposed draft will apply the 20,000 sq. ft. lot as a minimum lot size in new combined zone, a reduction from current 2 acre min in FF 3. Density will change from current 1 dwelling unit (du)/2 acres to 1 du/4 acres in FF3. Note that the Comp Plan at p.56 says that density will remain at 1 du per 2 acres unless "new info or further study suggests otherwise". 2. Current protections in CP 1 contained in Section 209 regarding storm water, fertilizer use, and subsurface wastewater systems shall be applied in the current FF 3 zone along the New Meadows. 3. Strengthen provisions of Wildlife Protection Overlay (2.4.5) to better protect unfragmented habitat blocks and corridors. 4. Strengthen provisions of Open Space Development provisions (4.1.4.C) to include increase bonus density from 15% to 25% 5. New provision (4.6.5) specifically requiring maintenance of public access to shoreline.

Comment [amb9]: Waiting for additional info from Casco Bay Estuary Program.

Rt 1 Mixed Use Area MU 5	Remain rural; gateway to Brunswick with wooded road corridor and range of small, low intensity residential and non-residential uses.	Rural and nat resource based uses including ag, forestry; single and 2-family residential; small scale multi-fam residential; wide range of low intensity non-residential uses.	1 du per 2 acres; 10,000 sq ft max footprint for non-residential uses; maintain rural character with wooded buffer along Rt 1; minimize impact of non-residential development on residential uses; protect unfragmented wildlife habitats and corridors; protect signif nat resources	1. Maintain 1 du per 2 acres, 10,000 sq ft max footprint for non-residential uses; 2. Strengthen provisions of Wildlife Protection Overlay (2.4.5) to better protect unfragmented habitat blocks and corridors. 3. Strengthen provisions of Open Space Development provisions (4.1.4.C) to include increased bonus density of 25

ACRONYMS
Draft Zoning Ordinance

ACRONYM	DEFINITION
AAO	Airport Approach Overlay
AAZ	Airport Approach Zone
APO	Aquifer Protection Overlay
APO1	Aquifer Protection 1
APO2	Aquifer Protection 2
APO3	Aquifer Protection 3
BNAS	Brunswick Naval Air Station
CRI	Color Rendering Index
DU	Dwelling Unit
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FAR	Federal Aviation Regulation
FCC	Federal Communications Commission
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FPO	Flood Protection Overlay
FPO	Flight Path Overlay
GA	Growth Aviation
GC	Growth College
GI	Growth Industrial
GIS	Geographic Information System
GM	Growth Mixed Use
GN	Growth Natural Resources
GO	Growth Outdoor Recreation
GR	Growth Residential
IES	Illumination Engineering Society
ITE	Institute of Traffic Engineers
LID	Low Impact Development
MDIF&W	Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife
MEDEP	Maine Department of Environmental Protection
MHO	Mobile Home Park Overlay
MNAP	Maine Natural Areas Program
MSL	Mean Sea Level
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NGVD	National Geodetic Vertical Datum
NPO	Natural (Resource) Protection Overlay
RCMU	Reuse (District) Community Mixed Use
RF	Rural Farm and Forest
RM	Rural Mixed Use
RN	Rural Natural Resources
RP	Rural Protection
RPZ	Runway Protection Zone
RR	Rural Residential
SF	Square Foot

ACRONYMS
Draft Zoning Ordinance

ACRONYM	DEFINITION
SPO	Shoreland Protection Overlay
SWES	Small Wind Energy System
TCO	Telecommunications Overlay
UIS	Urban Impaired Stream
USEPA	U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
VFR	Visual Frame of Reference
VRO	Village Review Overlay
WPO	Wildlife Protection Overlay
ZBA	Zoning Board of Appeals

Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Comments/Responses – 10/23/14

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
1.6.5.B.	Typos – second sentence is incomplete or should be combined with next sentence.	Deleted duplicative text.		
1.6.7. and 1.6.9	These sections appear duplicative.	Agree. Delete 1.6.9.		
1.6.10 and 1.6.8	Duplicative of 1.6.8 on page 1-11 except that 1.6.10.B has one additional word at end of sentence.	Agree. Delete 1.6.8. Also confirm reference to 1.6.10. (first sentence). Doesn't make sense.		
1.7.2	**"Bank"** is listed in use table but no definition of Bank is provided.		**Possible definition: A financial institution, with or without drive-through services, that is open to the public and engaged in deposit banking, and that performs closely related functions such as making loans, investments, and other fiduciary activities.**	
1.7.2	**Car wash** – use is prohibited in all GC districts. The College's wash bay in the Facilities Management Garage, which is part of Rhodes Hall, meets this definition as drafted and this use is prohibited in all GC districts. The ability to wash the vehicle fleet is ancillary to College operations. **We recommend changing this to Accessory (A) for the GC districts.**		**Disagree. Car wash as part of fleet maintenance would be considered an accessory use to college use or any other use having a fleet maintenance facility. No need to include as an accessory use in table.**	
1.7.2	**Character-defining Feature** – this term was from 216.12, a definition specific to VRZ; **we recommend that the definition note "for purposes of Village Review Overlay" (as done with Contributing Resource).**	Agreed. Reference as stated.		

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
1.7.2	**College Facility – not listed**. Currently, this term is not defined. We want to make sure that the College understands the intent of this category and interprets its meaning in the same way that staff and Planning Board would interpret it. We assume this category would include any structure or use built or undertaken by the College unless that use is specifically included elsewhere in the Use Table in Section3.2. For example, if the College constructed an Alumni Center, a building associated with our educational mission not consisting primarily of classroom space, can we assume this meets the definition of "College Facility - not listed"?		**Recommend for discussion with Clarion for clarification.**	
1.7.2	**Final Plan** – the definition is not included.		**Staff to draft for inclusion in interim draft.**	
1.7.2	**Historic Structure** – this definition is qualified by "for floodplain management purposes" in the current ordinance and is used in Section 703.2.D.5 regarding Variances in the NRPZ. The term is now used in Section 5.2.5.F.2.g. - *Additional Criteria for Variances in the SPO and FPO Districts*. However, there is no language in the new definition linking the term to the FPO district. The term Historic Structure is not used in the ordinance outside of the	Agree. Current definition must remain as is for compliance with NFIP 44 CFR 59.1.		

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	Variance in SPO and FPO Districts section with the exception of in the VRO, where the term is used within the definition of Contributing Resource and limited to structures within the VRO. The definition has been significantly broadened to include structures individually listed on "a Town inventory of historically significant places". It is unclear what this Town inventory would be and what criteria would be used to construct it. The definition in the current ordinance includes structures listed on local inventories if those communities have *certified* historic preservation programs. Additionally, this broad definition is inconsistent with terms used in the development standard in section 4.2.7. The Development Standard (Sec 4.2.7) uses the term "Historic Resources" (not included in the definition section) which covers "structures on the National Register of Historic Places or identified by the Comprehensive Plan as being of historical importance". This definition is narrower than the definition of Historic Structure listed in Section 1.7.2. **We recommend including the appropriate section references to the definition and narrowing the definition to be consistent with the standard.**		**For discussion by ZORC.**	

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
1.7.2	**In-Kind Replacement** – this definition is part of the current ordinance in Section 216.12 but is omitted in the definitions of the new draft.	Agree. Insert current definition from Section 216.12.		
1.7.2	**Lot or Parcel** – While we are not familiar with the origin of this definition, included in the current ordinance, its practical application to College-owned lots could be problematic. Public ways (e.g., Maine Street, Coffin, Street, Bath Road, South Street, Federal Street, etc.) bisect College land in several locations. On tax maps, zoning maps, and deeds, the College owns individual and separate lots with ascertainable boundaries on both sides of public ways. Town staff has not interpreted this definition to suggest that individual and separate College lots on each side of a public way should be combined to become one new lot. This definition may be relevant in other circumstances, in which case **we recommend changing the word "shall" to "may" to address the issue.**		**Delete last sentence in proposed definition. Definition would then read *"An area of land with ascertainable boundaries, all parts of which are owned by the same person(s) or entities."***	
1.7.2	**Off-Premise Advertising** – definition refers to signs and section 4.11.7 which prohibits these signs. Definition might need clarification that 'activities' does not include events. Since the definition refers specifically to a 'sign' and the term is used in the sign section of the ordinance, **we**	Agree. Move to Sign definitions.		

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	recommend including this with other sign definitions on page 1-26 (i.e., Sign, Off-Premise Advertising).			
1.7.2 1-23	**Outdoor Sales** – with inclusion of the Supplementary Use Standard in section 3.4.2.E (p. 3-29), limiting outdoor sales to no more than 4 events per year and no more than 7 consecutive days, this could prevent many vendor sales at the College. Vendors come to campus frequently to sell products or disseminate information to students, faculty and staff. These outdoor sales have little impact on the general public, have minimal or no traffic/parking impact, and take place within the course of normal campus activities. **We recommend narrowing the definition to exclude this type of activity or limiting it to outdoor sales to the general public.**		Recommend excluding GC1 District, in addition to GM6 District, restricting outdoor sales. (Sec. 3.4.2.E.)	
1.7.2 1-23	**Outdoor Storage**- this definition includes boats and trucks if placed in a front, rear or side yard for more than 60 days. We need clarification if this definition would apply to Bowdoin's boat storage and/or vehicle fleets. Outdoor storage, while defined does not appear on the Use Table for the Growth Area Base Districts. However, there is a category in the Use Table for **Vehicle sales, rental, or storage** for which there is no		**Discuss with Clarion in the context of definition and use.** **Possible Definition: Any business establishment that sells or leases new or used automobiles, trucks,**	

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	definition in Section 1.7.2. Footnote #267 on p. 3-8 states that Vehicle sales, rental, or storage has expanded the definition of Motor Vehicle Sales to include storage. We could not find a definition of "Motor Vehicle Sales" or "Vehicle Sales" in the current ordinance or in the new ordinance. These uses and definitions need clarification. As mentioned in Bowdoin's August 19 memo to the ZORC, the College currently stores vehicles, equipment, and boats in several CU districts. We also store boats during the winter at a private facility in MU6 (GM2) **Once there is a clear definition of use, the College would request permitting this type of storage as "A" in GC1-GC3, GM2, and "P" in GC4.**(See also Bowdoin August 19, 2014 memo to ZORC)		**vans, trailers, recreational vehicles, or motorcycles or other similar motorized transportation vehicles. The business establishment may maintain an inventory of the vehicles for sale or lease either on-site or at a nearby location and may provide on-site facilities for the repair and service of the vehicles sold or leased by the dealership.** **May want to consider renaming uses to <u>Automobile Dealership;</u> combined Motor Vehicle Sales and Vehicle Sales, Rental or Storage.** **Don't agree that a separate accessory use is necessary.**	
1.7.2 1-24	**Renewable Energy Generating Facility**: - typo; delete either "through" or "from" in first part of sentence.	Delete "from"		
1.7.2 1-24	**Residence Hall** – Given the new exclusion of residence halls from the definition of multi-dwelling unit, and reference to density applying to dwelling units only, it appears Residence Halls (which include any type of student housing owned by the College) would not be subject to density restrictions, but would be	Correct interpretation.	**Recommend definition of dwelling unit be revised to also exclude congregate care/assisted living facilities, nursing homes and residence halls. Currently excludes recreational vehicles.**	

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	subject to all dimensional requirements. Please confirm if this is the correct interpretation.			
1.7.2 1-26/27	**Special Event** – In the current ordinance, this definition applies only to the BNAS Reuse District. With the inclusion of 'Special Event' as a Temporary Use across the zoning districts, some clarification about the intent of this regulation is needed. As drafted, this definition would apply to events held on the campus outside of the normal academic calendar: i.e. BHS graduation, Coastal Challenge soccer tournament, MSMT productions, camps/international music festival if they are 'assembly type events for 200 people or more'. Additionally, the Permitted Use Table is unclear as this use is labeled both "C" and "T" for the GC districts (p.3-11) but no reference is made as to what circumstances would require a Conditional Use permit. Will conditional permits apply to Special Events that do not meet the definition of temporary, i.e. events that occur regularly on a weekly, monthly, or quarterly schedule? **We recommend either clarifying this definition and/or permitting this type of use in the GC districts.**		Remove **Special Event** definition and use. Will be working with Town Clerk to handle as a license similar to those issued for use of the Mall and Maine Street sidewalks.	
2.2.1.B 2-3	GR2 district is Town Residential in the 2008 Comp Plan – the statement that "District regulations are intended to		**All purpose statements and planning area descriptions are being revised by staff for**	

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	accommodate **new low-density** residential development and maintain the character of the established neighborhoods" is partially inconsistent with Comp Plan's statement that, "The focus of the development standards in the Town Residential neighborhoods should be on maintaining the single-family character of those streets that are currently predominantly single-family while allowing infill development **at reasonable high density where feasible**. New residential uses should be allowed at 3 to 24 units per acre depending on the location within the area." (2008 Comprehensive Plan p.62) The low density language may be a carry-over from the description of the planning areas in the current ordinance but it is inconsistent with the language of the Comp Plan for this area. **We recommend editing the description of Growth Residential District in section 2.2.1.B. to be consistent with the language of the 2008 Comp Plan.**		**inclusion in interim draft.** **ZORC discussion necessary regarding inconsistency with GR2 and Comp Plan vision.**	
2.2.2. A-C,F 2-4/5	Definitions are not included.		**All purpose statements and planning area descriptions are being revised by staff for inclusion in interim draft.**	
2.2.3.A Growth Special	We do not believe that Growth Special Purpose Districts were contemplated by the 2008		**Although, not contemplated as worded (Special Purpose Districts), the 2008 Comp Plan**	

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
Purpose Districts 2-6	Comprehensive Plan. Nor does the Comprehensive Plan discuss "restricting" more intense land uses to the north portion of the district or Town Residential area. The Comp Plan did envision that "college related residential and non-residential uses" be included as allowed uses in the Town Residential area (p. 62 2008 Comprehensive Plan). The description of the Growth College 1 District is inconsistent with the intent of the Comp Plan. While the College does not object to Residence Halls or Dining Facilities requiring a Conditional Use permit south of Longfellow Avenue as proposed in the redrafted Zoning Ordinance, stating that these uses are restricted to the area north of Longfellow Avenue is inaccurate. This is particularly concerning given the general statement in section 3.1 (see note 22). **We recommend substituting the word "restrict" with the word "focus" in this description.**		**does reference CU Districts. Special Purpose Districts is for organizational purposes of more specialized districts.** **Town Residential Planning Area (Comp Plan) does envision college related residential and nonresidential uses to be included as allowed uses. However, that does not mean within every district. We currently do not allow college uses in every district within the Town Residential planning area.** **Restricting residence halls in GC1 to only north of Longfellow was a result of public input. Footnote 224 regarding residence halls needs to be further clarified by ZORC as it is conflicting with the established CU notes that will be included in the next draft. Recommend that residence halls be prohibited in GC2 and 3 with the exceptions for current CU4 and 5 applied.**	
2.2.3.C 2-6	Longfellow Street should be changed to Longfellow Avenue.	Change Longfellow Street to Longfellow Avenue throughout.		
2.4.9.B.1.a.i.(D) VRO District 2-53	The properties currently listed in Appendix C on page C-1-2 meet the definitions in section 2.4.9.B.1.a.i.(A) – (C). The additional Category D (i.e.		**Since the adoption of the current VRZ standards (Section 216) last year, the contributing structures inventory has been completed. The inventory is presently used by staff for**	

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
Appendix C C-1-2	"deemed to be contributing resources of local and regional significance by the Town of Brunswick") implies that there may be some other criteria for amending Appendix C aside from listing or eligibility for listing on the National Register. This definition is ambiguous without some reference to the specific criteria that must be met in order for a property to be eligible and the process through which a resource would be assigned or denied such designation. **Recommend deleting this category of properties/resources or outlining clearly or incorporating by reference, the criteria and process for assigning or denying such designation.** In the Appendix C, table under section C.2 is labeled Table C.2C.1 – this appears to be a typo. The section heading for C.3 indicates that properties in the table are "Individually Listed Properties" but the table heading indicates these properties are in the Lincoln St Historic District. There is no reference to the Lincoln Street Historic District for these properties in the current ordinance. **Please clarify.**		**informational purposes since the listing is not incorporated into the zoning ordinance.** **Recommend that the inclusion of the listing be a topic of discussion for the VRB when they meet on 11/18 as well as the treatment of such structures.** **Note: 28-30 Federal Street structures were mistakenly listed as contributing to the Federal Street Historic District. As listed in the original request for designation, both were listed as "intrusions" to the District. This error has been administratively corrected in the current zoning ordinance. The new ordinance will delete references as well. Recommend C.3, be corrected to read "Individually Listed**	

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
			Properties" and be further described as those properties outside of historic districts but within the VRZ.	
3.1 A-3-1	The second sentence of the introductory paragraph states, "Additional *uses of property or restrictions on the use of property may be contained* in the description of that district in Section 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4." This general disclaimer seems overly broad as drafted. While there are additional specific use provisions/restrictions included in some sections within Chapter 2, one should not be able to interpret the general descriptions of the districts and overlays as suggesting specific uses or restricting uses. For example, the only additional use provisions in section 2.2 are found in section 2.2.H. **We recommend narrowing this reference to specifically site the sections where additional uses or restrictions are found.**		**Recommend GNR use and development standards be moved to Supplementary Use Standards. Reword statement to read: *Additional overlay standards regulating property use, contained in Section 2.4 may be applicable.*** **Reference other applicable supplementary standards in permitted use tables.**	
3.2 Use Table 3-2	**Residence Hall** – Conditional Use in GC-2 is a significant issue for the College. Residence Hall is currently permitted in CU5 but defined as having separate kitchen, etc. Footnote #224 does not address why this was changed to C for CU5. Residence Hall as a continued permitted use in CU5 is critically		**See earlier response regarding Residence Hall use.**	

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	important as it is likely that Brunswick Apartments will be rebuilt at some point in the future. Footnote #224 also states use is now P for CU6 which is inconsistent with the use table. (Bowdoin August 19 memo to ZORC.)			
3.2 Use Table 3-4	**Urban Agriculture** – The Bowdoin Organic Garden (BOG) currently occupies about a half-acre lot on the corner of Coffin and South Streets in CU3. This garden is the only thing occupying that lot and so meets the definition of Urban Agriculture in this draft. Additionally, the College plans to expand the BOG in GC4. While that property has not been subdivided into smaller lots at this time, we would want to preserve our ability to use this property for this purpose. It is not likely the area would be used solely as a 'farm'. **We recommend changing this to a Permitted use (P) in zones GC1 and GC4.** The BOG also currently occupies a portion of the site at 52 Harpswell (GM2). We believe the BOG is accessory to the Residence Hall use of that lot and we are assuming this would therefore not meet the definition of Urban Agriculture in this location. **If that assumption is incorrect we would request that Urban Agriculture be either P or A in**		**Recommend Urban Ag be listed as a permitted use in all Growth-Based Districts. Rural-Based Districts already permit farm use.** **Staff will revise Urban Ag Supplementary Use Standards to be consistent with Animal Control Ordinance regulating the keeping of chickens and other domesticated farm animals.**	

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	GM2. (Bowdoin August 19, 2014 memo)			
3.2 Use Table	**Office** – this use is now prohibited in GC2. Please note that several college offices are located in the proposed GC2 district, such as Rhodes Hall and Ham House. Prohibition of this use in this area would be very problematic for the College. (See August 19, 2014 memo to ZORC). The College has acquired 5 Noble Street, which is located between the College's new administration building on Maine Street and the Joshua Chamberlain Museum parking lot on Noble St. The building is across the street from the Brunswick Hotel's parking lot. The College envisions redeveloping this property for College use, most likely as an office building. The property is currently in the GR9 district (former TR5) and office space as a permitted use is still restricted to former fraternity buildings. **Given the non-residential nature of the abutting properties, the College would request the ZORC to consider during this redrafting of the ordinance, including this lot in the abutting GM6 zone.**	Recommend Office be a Permitted Use in GC2 with any existing exceptions/notes attached.	**GR9 already permits offices as a conditional use as is currently existing in TR5. Staff does not support office as a permitted use in this zoning district.**	
3.2 Use Table	**Car Wash, Outdoor Sales, Special Events** – see previous notes 5, 13 and 17.		**See earlier response.**	
3.4.1.B.2. Supplement	Typo – Longfellow Street should be Longfellow Avenue.	See earlier response.		

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
ary Use Standards 3-18				
4.1.2 Dimensional Standards 4-2/4-6	Column for MU1 is missing	MU1 has been incorporated into GM4 (Growth Area portion) and RR (Rural Area portion). Already noted to Clarion, the need to indicate in respective columns.		
4.1.2 Dimensional Standards 4-3/4-4	**Setbacks in GC1:** The College does not object to the inclusion of the additional setbacks associated with the trail near the Pickard fields. Those setbacks, included as Illustration 204.2A in the current ordinance, include 80 feet along the southern boundary of Longfellow Avenue (C), 125 feet along the eastern boundary of the Whittier, Bowdoin, Berry, and Breckan Streets, and Atwood Lane (B), and 125 feet along the northern boundary of Meadowbrook Road (A). Since the College now owns, and has developed the property along 'boundary D', we believe the 50 foot setback requirement is no longer necessary. The College also does not object to the prohibition on the construction of new roads connecting to Meadowbrook Road, Whittier, Berry and Bowdoin Streets, Atwood Lane and Breckan Road from GC1.	Please include all additional setbacks in interim draft. Please include prohibition in interim draft.	**Agree. Boundary "D" no longer exists.**	
4.1.2 Dimensional	**Footnote #470 under Building Footprint in GC1** refers to TC1, TC2,	Please review and revise as necessary. Table Footnote [17]	**Agree that GC1 should not have a footprint restriction.**	

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
Standards 4-5	and TC3 in the Park Row area. The CU districts are not in the Park Row area so we are unable to understand this footnote. The inclusion of a maximum building footprint in CU1 and CU2 is a significant change so it is important to understand the origin of this proposed restriction. There is also no explanation of the additional restriction of 10,000 s.f. for a multifamily dwelling unit**. Please provide basis for suggested standards.**	deals with existing MU1 area, not TC Districts. Also #470 does not apply as referenced.		
Table 4.1.2 Dimensional Standards 4-5	Footnote #6 – this footnote is incorrect. CU7 (the district between South and Grove Streets) density is 10 units per acre. Footnote says parcels between South and Grove St will be limited to 5 units per acre. The lower density should apply to CU4 area. **Recommend correcting the footnote.**	Please review and revise. Grove Street does not exist. All dimensional footnotes, both Table notes and Explanatory notes, need to be reviewed and cleaned up. Will provide marked up copy after going through all comments.	**Recommend keeping 5000 SF footprint max for area now CU4. Density of 4 units per acre for GC3 would be more compatible with surrounding residential districts.** **END HERE 10/27/14**	
4.5.2. Landscaping 4-29	Footnote #536 states that the Landscaping section is derived from staff and Planning Board revisions to Chapter 5, section 518. Based on the current ordinance available on line, it appears some of the language comes from Chapter 5, Section 515.3 but the revisions to this section are extensive. The footnote references 'reorganization' but the draft contains numerous new standards; for example, section 4.5.2.B. is all new. **Recommend**			

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	modifying the footnote to indicate that new standards have been incorporated and explain why the new standards are included (see also next comment).			
4.5.2.A.4 Landscaping General 4-29	Please explain Committee's intent for #4 regarding protection of planting areas from vehicular traffic and parking areas. Prescription of curbs, wheel stops, or other permanent barriers to any planting area seems excessive and could add considerable expense to a project. Additionally, curbs and barriers around planting areas, particularly near parking areas, present numerous practical issues for efficient snow removal. **Recommend deletion or modification of this standard.**			
4.5.2.C.3-4 Buffers 4-30	These standards are overly prescriptive and inconsistent with the intent of 4.5.2.C.1 which allows for some flexibility in accomplishing smooth transitions within a site plan. It is unclear where the provisions of #3 and #4 regarding year-round visual screens would be applicable. Requiring visual screening between properties does not always meet the wishes of abutters. For example, Bowdoin worked with neighbors of 52 Harpswell Road to determine appropriate screening along the property lines. Some neighbors wanted to view the Bowdoin Organic Garden, while others requested			

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	fencing. In addition, the requirement for evergreen trees, four to eight feet in height in section 4.5.2.C.3, is inconsistent with the Landscaping standards for parking areas in section 4.7.3.B.c. **Recommend either eliminating provisions in sections 4.5.2.C.2- 4 or qualifying the provisions in some way so as not to preempt creative solutions to buffering where appropriate.** Note on screening: screening is defined in section 1.7.2 but there are references in the draft ordinance to "opaque screen" (4.7.3.B.c) and "opaque fence" (4.10.2.C). "Opaque" is new terminology in the ordinance and it would be helpful to have a better understanding of what meets the definition of an opaque barrier. **Recommend adding a definition of "opaque screen" and "opaque fence" and include examples of what constitutes each type of opaque barrier.**			
4.5.2.E 4.13.2.A-B 4-30 4-54	These sections appear to be two separate and somewhat duplicative sets of standards for Landscape Maintenance. Section 4.5.2.E.2. does not appear to be a standard, but rather required			

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	demonstration of fiscal capacity. **Recommend this section be incorporated into section 5.1.7.** **Recommend consolidation of standards or reference to relevant sections so that applicants can easily understand which standards apply.**			
4.6.2.B.2 Common Driveways 4-34	Footnote #545 indicates this section was revised from Chapter 5, Section 513.7. Section 513 only has two sections. The requirement for a recorded maintenance agreement for a common driveway on adjoining lots should not apply when the adjoining lots are owned by the same person or entity (4.6.2.B.2). **Recommend exempting common driveways on adjoining lots owned by the same person or entity from the requirements of section 4.6.2.B.2.**			
4.6.4 Access for Persons with Disabilities 4-34	As drafted this standard would require compliance with ADA "in a manner compatible with Brunswick's historic architecture". Not all architecture in Brunswick is historic. Note: Footnote 547 references Ch.5 (520). The section on Access for Persons with Disabilities in the current ordinance is section 518. Section 411.18 (Review standards)of the current ordinance references the			

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	compatibility with historic structures and refers to the sections of the ordinance relating to historic structures (i.e. Village Review Zone, Preservation of Historic Structures standards, etc.). Without this cross reference, the standard is too broadly applied. **Recommend qualifying the statement in Section 4.6.4 by adding "where applicable" to the sentence.**			
4.7.3.A.4 -5 Design and Construction of Parking Areas 4-39	Item #5 is duplicative of the second sentence in #4. **Recommend deleting second sentence of #4**		.	
4.7.4 Parking Alternatives 4-41	**Sections A.2 and B.2:** The Shared Parking and Off-Site and Satellite Parking provisions require that parking be within 600 feet walking distance of the uses served, unless shuttle service is provided. Bowdon has several parking facilities that have allowed the College to move parking outside the core of the campus. A requirement to maintain a shuttle service may not be feasible and may be counterproductive to the goal of reducing traffic congestion. **We recommend deletion of this shuttle service requirement. (Bowdoin August 19, 2014 memo)**			
4.10.1	As drafted, these protection standards			

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
4.10.2.C Neighborhood Protection Standards 4-45	would apply to College development located on land that abuts or is across the street from a GR district lot with an existing dwelling. The wording of 4.10.1.A. suggests that the neighborhood protection standards would not apply to residential uses. Please note that Residence Hall is included with Residential Uses in the Use Table (Table 3.2). We believe, based on the discussions during ZORC meetings, the intent of the Committee is to have Neighborhood Protection standards apply to Group Living Residential Uses. **Please clarify.** The College is not opposed to the concept of the Neighborhood Protection Standards. The applicability as drafted may be problematic for areas of GC1 and GC4. For example, the existing CU2 is one lot. If the College were to locate some development in the center of this lot, would we be required by 4.10.2.C to fence the entire perimeter of the lot along GR2, GR3, and GR5, where there are abutting residences? Similarly, the properties in GC4 are currently two lots, one of which is 114 acres. This lot abuts GR5 and GR3 along its western boundary. We do not believe the intent of the protection			

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	standard would be to require fencing along an entire lot line if the development was not located near that lot line. Additionally, the requirement in 4.10.2.C. for an 'opaque fence' may be overly prescriptive. Please see comment #8 regarding buffers. A buffer would be appropriate but an abutter may or may not prefer some alternative screening to a fence. The standard should allow some flexibility to meet the buffering requirement. **Recommend revision of Section 4.10.2.C. so that buffering of development be limited to those shared lot lines impacted by the development footprint. Also recommend broadening the buffering option by substituting "screen" or "buffer" for "fence" and adding definition of "opaque" relative to these terms.**			
4.14.1 Administrative Adjustment 4-55	This section is a little vague as to what point in the development review process an applicant would request an administrative adjustment. Is the intent to grant, based on review thresholds, all reviewing authorities this power? **Recommend clarification of procedures in this section.**			

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
4.14.2 A-B Alternative Equivalent Complianc e 4-56	There is inconsistency between paragraphs A and B. Paragraph A states "the Staff Review Committee may grant" and Paragraph B states that a request for alternative equivalent compliance shall be approved only if the Town Council finds..." Additionally, section 4.12.2.B. is incomplete. We understand this section is under review and discussion but as drafted, it is unclear what reviewing authority would grant this provision. Would Town Council approve requests for alternate equivalent compliance for standards other than those in sections 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7? **Recommend clarification of procedures in this section.**			
5.1.D.1. Staff Review Committee 5-2	**We recommend changing reference to BNAS Reuse District to the appropriate new zoning districts (i.e. GR1, GM7, GA, GI, GO,GN etc.)**			
5.1.5.A.3 Community Facility Impact Analysis 5-4	Please clarify the intent of the new language in section 5.1.5.A.3 regarding the Community Facility Impact Analysis and the optional assessment of impact on traffic systems to adjacent towns. As drafted, development of a certain size within the GC districts could trigger a traffic analysis of adjacent towns. **We would recommend deleting this**			

Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	provision or narrowing its applicability. (Bowdoin August 19, 2014 memo)			
5.1.1.B.2. Zoning Board of Appeals A-5-1	As drafted, this section reads that the ZBA has power "to hear applications for Conditional Use Permits and Special Permits". This is in conflict with the process described in section 5.2.2.A.1.and 5.2.3.A.1 which states that applications for Conditional Use Permits/Special Use Permits shall go to the Planning Board. (p. 5-12). (Bowdoin August 19, 2014 memo)			
5.1.6.B.2 Fees Required 5-5	**We recommend the next to last sentence in the paragraph be moved to the end of the paragraph.**			
5.2.2.C Conditional Use Permit 5-13	Since Conditional Use permits do not apply to unclassified or omitted uses, **we recommend the last sentence in this section be amended to say "no application by the applicant or related entity for the same conditional use for the same parcel…"**			
5.2.8.B.1 Revisions to Approved Development Permits 5-44	**Recommend making the language in section 5.2.8.B.1. (Minor Modifications) consistent with wording of section 5.1.1.E.1.b. on page 5-3 by adding "Conditional Use Permit, or Special Permit or related materials".**			