TOWN OF BRUNSWICK

ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE COMMITTEE

85 Union Street, Brunswick, ME 04011-1583

WORK SESSION AGENDA

TOWN HALL, ROOM 206
85 UNION STREET
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2014
3:00 – 6:00 PM

1. Review and acceptance of meeting summaries

2. Update regarding document *"Zoning Ordinance Correlation With Key Actions of the 2008 Comprehensive Plan"*

3. Continue review of public draft general comments/questions

4. ZORC work session meeting schedule

November 5, 2014 (3-6pm; ZORC *Work Session*; Town Hall Room 206)
November 12, 2014 (1pm; *ZORC Work Session;* Town Hall Room 206)
November 20, 2014 (2-5pm; *ZORC Work Session;* Town Hall Room 206)
December 3, 2014 (7pm; *ZORC Work Session*; Town Council Chambers)
December 9, 2014 (3-6pm; *ZORC Work Session;* Town Hall Room 206)
December 17, 2014 (3-6pm; *ZORC Work Session;* Town Hall Room 206)
January 8, 2014 (2-5pm; *ZORC Work Session;* Town Hall Room 206)

5. 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 REWRITE COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 29, 2014

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

DON ELLIOT OF CLARION ASSOCIATES JOINED VIA ZOOM

The Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee held a work session Wednesday, October 29, 2014 at Town Council Chambers, 85 Union Street.

Mr. Frizzle opened the meeting to the public for comments; seeing none, he closed the meeting to public comments.

Administrative Items:

Review and acceptance of Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee meeting summaries:

- August 7, 2014 — Public Draft Introduction meeting with Staff Review Committee
- August 19, 2014 — Public Draft Introduction meeting with MRRA, Bowdoin College, B/T Water District, and Brunswick Sewer District
- October 1, 2014 — Zoning Ordinance Town wide Public Forum
- October 9, 2014 — Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee Public Work Session

MOTION BY MARGARET WILSON TO APPROVE MINUTES OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE COMMITTEE MEETINGS HELD AUGUST 7, 2014, AUGUST 19, 2014, OCTOBER 1, 2014, AND OCTOBER 9, 2014, SECONDED BY JEFF HUTCHINSON. VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS.

Consultant contract extension update:

The contract extension was presented to the Town Council a few weeks ago, and they asked for additional information. The extension has been authorized by Town Manager John Eldridge, and the contract has been signed by Clarion and the Town Manager. This extends the contract with Clarion until June 2015.

Scheduling of joint workshops with Village Review Board and Town Council:

Ms. Breinich said the Village Review Board would like to postpone their joint workshop with ZORC until after they have their own work session, sometime after November 18, 2014. Nothing has been scheduled with the Town Council to date.

Next ZORC work sessions:

- November 12, 2014
- December 3, 2014

Reviewing the Zoning Ordinance Correlation with Key Actions of the 2008 Comprehensive Plan:

Ms. Wilson has developed an extensive document that goes through the Comprehensive Plan, highlighting those key action items that have some relationship with the zoning ordinance, and then indicates what has been done with the zoning ordinance rewrite to address those key actions in the Comprehensive Plan. After discussion, it was decided to insert the Comprehensive Plan's Vision statement into this document. Ms. Wilson explained that most of the relevant changes came from the Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan, and she explained that the importance of this document was to know what the Comprehensive Plan says.

Jane Millett, 10 Franklin Street, said livability is not defined; the denser growth in the downtown area encroaches upon people who would like to keep their neighborhood the same.

Carol Liscovitz, 11 Berry Street, asked if the draft zoning ordinance was not increasing density to the extent that the Comprehensive Plan was suggesting, and this was affirmed by the Board.

A discussion was held about lot sizes and density.

Catherine Ferdinand, Bowdoin College, asked if particular section of the ordinance concerning the area around Bowdoin, was located in the proposed draft. After discussion, it was decided the Committee would try to find where this specific language was located. The general intention of the language is to be more lenient with growth inside campus, and more buffering required as growth encroached on the neighborhood.

Jane Millett, 10 Franklin Street, asked if the standard was not in the ordinance, then who makes sure it is met? Ms. Wilson replied that no one would; that is the reason they need to make sure it is included. Mr. Frizzle added that there were also Neighborhood Protection Standards that dealt with this issue.

Carol Liscovitz, 11 Berry Street, would like examples included with concepts, because once the ordinance is accepted, any push against building standards by neighborhoods are uphill battles.

Ms. Wilson agreed with Ms. Liscovitz, and Ms. Breinich asked Don Elliot to obtain examples of neighborhood protection with regard to a college area, and images of density to include in the zoning ordinance, in order to show residents the difference between the current ordinance and the proposed ordinance. Ms. Wilson also talked about having a discussion on Neighborhood Protection Standards, and whether the Board is satisfied the way they are now, or do they need to be more specific?

The Board agreed to release Ms. Wilson's document to the public as a draft with the inclusion of the Comprehensive Plan's vision statement.

Ms. Breinich let the Committee know that they now had a list of acronyms to add to the proposed zoning ordinance. Mr. Elliot explained the best way to add this and check for

accuracy, as terms may change. **Alison Harris** suggested adding abbreviations of administrative titles, and to possibly change the title to glossary. Ms. Breinich found that the abbreviated title was defined in the definitions.

Review general comments on public draft:

Ms. Breinich mentioned that comments were received from Bowdoin College in an easy to use matrix that included location, section, and comment. Ms. Breinich then added three columns; one for an easy to tackle comment with recommendation to staff and follow up, one with staff recommendations, which was requested by ZORC, for ZORC consideration through a discussion like today, and a column for the actual ZORC response, which will be filled in as they work through the items. There are 23 pages, but it is not just college-related. As they continue working through the ordinance, Ms. Breinich will continue adding text in order to cover all comments received.

Dustin Slocum, property owner in Brunswick, asked if the Board could tell him what has changed in the TC-1 district downtown and Bath Road. The Board will give him a copy of the dimensional changes to that district, and explained that very little had changed in those districts. More uses are permitted in the proposed draft ordinance, and minimum lot sizes have been reduced along Bath Road. Ms. Breinich explained that they combined districts so that Bath Road and outer Pleasant Street are the same district, and they took the most conservative standards between the ordinance and the proposed draft ordinance.

Mr. Frizzle explained the steps he'd like to take to address the comments. The staff recommendations requiring clarity and follow up are generally typos, duplicative language, etc., and generally do not need discussion, but they will stop and discuss if necessary. The Committee worked through comments without voting, unless there was a significant policy issue. The items discussed were concentrated on the ZORC response column:

- Section 1.7.2. definitions; Ms. Wilson proposed as a policy issue that all uses be defined, so Mr. Elliot will add definitions for bank, hospital, and vehicle sales, rental and service
- Section 1.7.2 car wash -decided the use was part of fleet maintenance and doesn't need to be listed even as accessory; college facility- Don explained that these were structures associated with the operation of a college, and they would never be able to list them all. After a lengthy discussion, this item will be researched by Ms. Breinich and will be brought back for further review. Ms. Breinich requested Ms. Ferdinand to identify all potential uses for the College before further staff review. The committee will expand and list the definition of college uses to the best of their ability, giving the college as much flexibility as possible, but anything not defined will go through the Special Permit process.
- Page 1 – character-defining feature; this needs to be defined for historic district and historic integrity to align with the Village Review Zone standards, need a definition of historic structure to be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's standards, and a definition of historic resources needs to be provided by the consultant.
- Lot/parcel definition – an area of land with ascertainable boundaries, all parts of which are owned by the same person, persons, or entities; a lot or parcel shall include both

sections of a lot separated by a public or private way if under the same ownership. The committee is proposing taking out the second sentence.

- Outdoor sales – staff's recommendation was excluding GC-1 district in addition to GM-6 district restricting outdoor sales. They are permitting outdoor sales in these districts, and it will be rewritten to reflect the inclusion. A discussion about large retail stores using impervious surface for extra retail space was held, and Mr. Elliot replied that language could be added for a time limit or by defining the use categories.
- Outdoor storage – staff is questioning whether the definition is adequate. A discussion was held about possible concerns with storage in the setback area, and clarifying the language. Mr. Elliot warned about any changes made now; this is a very sensitive topic, and he predicts they would receive a lot of feedback whether they restrict or liberalize this section. Mr. Hutchinson will prepare a draft proposal for this item which ZORC will consider in the future. Catherine Ferdinand, Bowdoin College, had specific questions about storing crew gear at their property on Federal Street, of particular concern being GC-4, and this discussion brought questions about the definitions of parking, vehicles and storage. The proposed ordinance disallows storage in most zones, which is a change. Ms. Breinich read the next paragraph of the proposed ordinance, 1.7.2., addresses the vehicle sales and storage, but there is no definition for it. Ms. Breinich has proposed a definition, and the committee may want to consider renaming this use to avoid the confusion with an automobile dealership. Mr. Frizzle told Mr. Elliot what they wanted to achieve, which was allowing vehicle storage for a primary or secondary use, for example, by Bowdoin College, and Mr. Elliot responded that they could separate outdoor storage from the vehicle component. A discussion ensued with audience members about parking vs. storage, which Mr. Hutchinson and Ms. Breinich will look at for further review.

It was determined by the committee that they would probably need more time or more meetings to go over all of the questions, suggestions and comments. They have not even touched on the big policy questions. Mr. Elliot suggested that on questions where Clarion was going to make a change, or questions Mr. Hutchinson and Ms. Breinich think they've taken care of, to move those into review rather than into discussion, to narrow down the right-hand column.

Review ZORC meeting schedule:

The meeting schedule was discussed, and a mid-afternoon to early evening starting time was thought to give more citizens a chance to attend.

- Meeting for next week; time and day to be determined.
- Meeting November 12, 2014, from 1:00 – 4:00 pm as previously scheduled, then try to move the meetings to the late-afternoon, early evening time.

Attest

Debra Blum
Recording Secretary

Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Comments/Responses – 10/23/14; updated 10/31/14

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
10/23	1.6.5.B.	Typos – second sentence is incomplete or should be combined with next sentence.	Deleted duplicative text.		
10/23	1.6.7. and 1.6.9	These sections appear duplicative.	Agree. Delete 1.6.9.		
10/23	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.		
10/23	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.	**10/29: Agreed with staff and further stated definitions must be provided for all uses. Clarion to add definitions as needed.**
10/23	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.	**10/29: Agreed with staff.**
10/23	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.		

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
10/23	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.	**10/29: Bowdoin College requested to review permitted use table and identify what uses could be considered at some point in the future. Staff will then recommend uses as either permitted or conditional uses. "College Facility – not listed" deleted from use table. Any "not listed" college use will follow same special permit process as for any other "omitted" or "not listed" use in Town.**
10/23	1.7.2	**Final Plan** – the definition is not included.		Staff to draft for inclusion in interim draft.	**10/29: Agreed.**
10/23	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 *Variance in SPO and FPO Districts*	Agree. Current definition must remain as is for compliance with NFIP 44 CFR 59.1.		**10/29: Agreed.**

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
		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.	**10/29: Staff/Clarion to develop definition of Historic Resource.**
10/23	1.7.2	**In-Kind Replacement** – this definition is part of the current ordinance in	Agree. Insert current definition from Section		

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
		Section 216.12 but is omitted in the definitions of the new draft.	216.12.		
10/23	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."*	**10/29: Agreed.**

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
10/23	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 recommend including this with other sign definitions on page 1-26 (i.e., Sign, Off-Premise Advertising).**	Agree. Move to Sign definitions.		
10/23	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.)	**10/29: Agreed to permit outdoor sales in GC1 and GM6 districts (Sec.3.4.2.E.)**
10/23	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.		Discuss with Clarion in the context of definition and use.	**10/29: Staff to rework outdoor storage definition/potential standards and include on next agenda. Will also define "vehicle areas".**

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
		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 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)		Possible Definition: Any business establishment that sells or leases new or used automobiles, trucks, 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 Automobile Dealership; combined Motor Vehicle Sales and Vehicle Sales, Rental or Storage. Don't agree that a separate accessory use is necessary.	**10/29: Keep name as is. Definition acceptable.**

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
10/23	1.7.2 1-24	**Renewable Energy Generating Facility**: - typo; delete either "through" or "from" in first part of sentence.	Delete "from"		
10/23	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 subject to all dimensional requirements. Please confirm if this is the correct interpretation.	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.**	
10/23	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-		**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.**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
		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.**			
10/23	2.2.1.B 2-3	GR2 district is Town Residential in the 2008 Comp Plan – the statement that "District regulations are intended to 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		**All purpose statements and planning area descriptions are being revised by staff for inclusion in interim draft.** **ZORC discussion necessary regarding inconsistency with GR2 and Comp Plan vision.**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
		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.**			
10/23	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.**	
10/23	2.2.3.A Growth Special Purpose Districts 2-6	We do not believe that Growth Special Purpose Districts were contemplated by the 2008 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		**Although, not contemplated as worded (Special Purpose Districts), the 2008 Comp Plan 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.**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
		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.**		**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.**	
10/23	2.2.3.C 2-6	Longfellow Street should be changed to Longfellow Avenue.	Change Longfellow Street to Longfellow Avenue throughout.		
10/23	2.4.9.B.1.a.i.(D) VRO District 2-53 Appendix C	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. "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		**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 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**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	C-1-2	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.**		**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 Properties" and be further described as those properties outside of historic districts but within the VRZ.**	
10/23	3.1	The second sentence of the		**Recommend GNR use and**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	A-3-1	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.**		**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.**	
10/23	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 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		**See earlier response regarding Residence Hall use.**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
		for CU6 which is inconsistent with the use table. (Bowdoin August 19 memo to ZORC.)			
10/23	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 GM2.** (Bowdoin August 19, 2014 memo)		**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.**	
10/23	3.2 Use Table	**Office** – this use is now prohibited in GC2. Please note that several college	Recommend Office be a Permitted Use in GC2 with		

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
		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.**	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.**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
10/23	3.2 Use Table	**Car Wash, Outdoor Sales, Special Events** – see previous notes 5, 13 and 17.		**See earlier response.**	
10/23	3.4.1.B.2. Supplementary Use Standards 3-18	Typo – Longfellow Street should be Longfellow Avenue.	See earlier response.		
10/23	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 include MU1 in respective columns.		
10/23	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.	Please include all additional setbacks in interim draft.	**Agree. Boundary "D" no longer exists.**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
		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 prohibition in interim draft.		
10/23	4.1.2 Dimensional Standards 4-5	**Footnote #470 under Building Footprint in GC1** refers to TC1, TC2, 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.**	Please review and revise as necessary. Table Footnote [17] deals with existing MU1 area, not TC Districts. Also #470 does not apply as referenced.	**Agree that GC1 should not have a footprint restriction.**	
10/23	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.**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
10/23	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 modifying the footnote to indicate that new standards have been incorporated and explain why the new standards are included (see also next comment).**	Please revise note to address substantive revision of standards by staff/Board.	**As noted in Footnote #536, the Landscaping Section was revised earlier by staff and Planning Board. With the exception of minor reformatting by Clarion, the proposed staff/Board standards are intact as developed in 2012.** **The 2012 revisions provide specifics to an applicant as to what is required for consideration when developing a landscaping design/plan. Such standards provide more consistency in reviewing a proposal and predictability for the applicant. The standards were developed in consultation with the Town Arborist who is responsible for all reviews of landscaping plans.**	
10/23	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		**Recommended by staff since it appears that this is a general practice. For further ZORC discussion.**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
		practical issues for efficient snow removal. **Recommend deletion or modification of this standard.**			
10/23	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 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	Please clean up	**The intent is to provide consistency and predictability in what is required as screening materials. However, as raised in this comment, at times it is highly appropriate to work with neighboring property owners to develop acceptable buffering/screening. Recommend Clarion to address language that would provide for such situations.**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
		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.**	discrepancies between Sections 4.7.3 (Parking Lot Landscaping), 4.5.2 (Landscaping) and 4.13.2 (Landscape Maintenance). Recommend that ALL landscaping requirements be in section 4.5.2.	**Agree. Recommend requesting Clarion for examples/images of acceptable screening/buffering. For ZORC discussion: if using opacity as a measure, should we reference percent opacity? Not finding many examples or definitions. A definition of opacity is as follows: *The screening effectiveness of a bufferyard or fence expressed as the percentage of vision that the screen blocks.*** **Recommend requesting further advice from Clarion.**	
10/23	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 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.**		**Agree. Recommend deleting maintenance section and incorporating each subsection in related standards section.** **Further ZORC discussion needed regarding Section 4.5.2.E.2.**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
10/23	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.**		**Recommend further discussion with Clarion. Agree that maintenance agreement should not be required if properties in same ownership. However, should there be some type of assurance that would apply if properties are no longer owned by same entity?** **Footnote states Section 513.7 is from Town staff and Planning Board revisions to Chapter 5, not current ordinance.**	
10/23	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 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		**Recommend Sec. 4.6.4 is revised to read, "Developments shall comply with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards" as a general standard. Recommended Specific Standards are: "If the development is located with the VRO, is a property listed on the National Register of Historic Places or located within a National Register Historic District, ADA compliance shall be compatible with Brunswick's historic architecture."** **"When required, plans shall**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
		applied. **Recommend qualifying the statement in Section 4.6.4 by adding "where applicable" to the sentence.**		**indicate the location and type of access for persons with disabilities to parking areas, entrances and exits."**	
10/23	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**	Agreed.		
10/23	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)**		**Discuss with Clarion to increase walking distance for campus-type facilities and include definition of campus or include GC districts and GM6 in exemptions, and/or increase walking distance to 750 feet. Is shuttle service realistic?**	
10/23	4.10.1 4.10.2.C Neighborhood Protection Standards 4-45	As drafted, these protection standards 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		**Agree with basic recommendation. However, we also need to ensure that existing setbacks from residential neighborhoods as well as to include Harpswell Place neighborhood, be included.**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
		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 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		**As per ZORC discussions, Neighborhood Protection Standards would appear to apply to all Group Living Residential Uses. Need to confirm.**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
		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.**			
10/23	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.**		**Confirm that intent is to allow for administrative adjustments at any review authority (staff, Staff Review Committee, Planning Board) during development review process. Staff recommends that Sec. 4.14.1.B. (Applicability) clearly state "as part of development review process." Additional questions. Should admin adjustment also apply to building permit approvals? Should the Ordinance provide for both admin adjustments and alternative compliance?**	
10/23	4.14.2 A-B Alternative Equivalent Compliance	There is inconsistency between paragraphs A and B. Paragraph A states "the Staff Review Committee may grant" and		**Agree with inconsistency present. Further discussion with Clarion needed per comment above.**	

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
	4-56	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.**			
10/23	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.)**	Agreed.		
10/23	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 provision or narrowing its applicability. (Bowdoin August 19, 2014 memo)**	This section was removed by staff/Planning Board in 2010 during the Chapter 5 rewrite. Not sure why this is back in?		

*Date comment added to table.

Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
10/23	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)	Agreed. Planning Board reviews and approves Conditional Use and Special Permits. Delete from ZBA Powers and Duties and move to Planning Board Powers and Duties.		
10/23	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.**	Agreed.		
10/23	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…"**	Agreed.		
10/23	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".**	Agreed.		

*Date comment added to table.

November 4, 2014

Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee Information Sheet #1

How the July 2014 Public Draft Brunswick Zoning Ordinance Implements the Town's 2008 Comprehensive Plan

Introduction and Vision ***(Excerpt from the Town of Brunswick 2008 Comprehensive Plan. Full version available online at www.brunswickme.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/Comp-Plan-Final-for-State-Review-091508rev.pdf)***

Updating the Comprehensive Plan presents a unique opportunity to look at Brunswick's values of over ten years ago, examine how the Town has changed since the last Plan, ask about the community's values now, and look at how the Town can work to guide the inevitable ongoing changes.

It is Brunswick's values and vision as a community that have guided this Plan's major initiatives. As it grows and changes, Brunswick should continue to be a highly desirable community that facilitates the work and play of its diverse people -- the young and old, the working and retired, the well-off and those of lesser means.

This vision resulted in the eight policy areas found in the Plan, highlighting the essential elements of the community that require continuing attention. Brunswick needs strong schools, a vibrant downtown, a robust economy providing good jobs, protected natural resources, quality public facilities, and affordable housing.

To implement these policies, the Plan establishes several goals. First, overall, the Plan strengthens the Town's growth boundary. This is in response to the pattern of recent development, in which approximately half of all residential units have been built in the Rural Area on relatively large lots. This has resulted in the incremental loss of some of the community's highly valued habitats and natural resources, as well as the aesthetic and recreational value of this land. This Plan encourages policies to avoid sprawl and limits total new residential building permits in the Rural Area. Within the Town's Growth Area, this Plan articulates changes in zoning that will allow greater density to occur. Overall, this will encourage future growth to concentrate in the Growth Area, while preserving the Town's highly valued rural character.

An essential component of Brunswick's character is its gateways Like many Maine communities, Brunswick is fortunate to still have a distinct sense of arrival and departure from this town to the next. Protecting the identity of Brunswick means acknowledging and maintaining these visually attractive transitions. A recommendation for a new overlay district for these gateways is included in the Plan.

Brunswick's downtown, located between the Androscoggin River and Bowdoin College, is the heart of this community. The vision for Brunswick is to maintain, enhance, and invest in the downtown and the surrounding core, to strengthen its presence as the community's social and cultural hub.

The community's investment in public education comprises the single greatest annual budget expenditure. Maine has identified attracting and retaining young adults as an urgent need in growing the state's economy and creating a high quality of life. Providing a superior public education enhances Brunswick's ability to attract young adults and families, creating a balanced community.

Attracting young people is an essential element in Brunswick's future economic growth. As technology has allowed jobs to become more portable, communities offering a high quality of life benefit from the mobility of young entrepreneurs who create economic opportunities. The Plan includes support of Brunswick's growing "creative economy" along with other essential actions to ensure a diverse and healthy local economy.

A healthy local economy includes the resiliency to weather short-term economic impacts. The unexpected closure of the Brunswick Naval Air Station (BNAS) creates substantial economic and social impacts, but also offers a tremendous opportunity to set the course for the community's future. As Brunswick will suffer the primary impacts from the scheduled September 2011 closure, with BNAS occupying the center of the community, the more than 3200-acre BNAS site must be redeveloped with Brunswick's public benefit as the main priority.

The Comprehensive Planning process has provided an opportunity to evaluate the community's current needs in a changing environment, within which the BNAS closure is particularly significant. Given an environment of change, long range planning continues to allow the community to remain focused on its goals. Brunswick's investment in planning for its future will reap benefits in achieving its vision of the future. This Comprehensive Plan seeks to provide a clear list of strategies with associated actions and designated entities responsible to the Town for their implementation, and offers the opportunity to measure the community's progress in achieving these goals.

The Update builds on and refines the policy directions of the 1993 Comprehensive Plan and the subsequent planning that the Town has undertaken in response to that plan.

2008 Comprehensive 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

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 proposed zoning of the Town.

Key Objective # and Text	Key Action # and Text	Implementation of Key Actions in Proposed Zoning Ordinance
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 former MU2,3; CU2, 3, 4, and 6. (Note densities decrease slightly in existing I1,4 and R6 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.
	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.	
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 public water, sewer, and storm water systems to promote the desired pattern of growth	1. Align Brunswick-Topsham Water District, Brunswick Sewer District and Town planning efforts to achieve the Town's broad planning objectives.	The Brunswick-Topsham Water District and Brunswick Sewer District are active participants in drafting the proposed Zoning Ordinance. Unfortunately, capitalization issues lie outside the scope of the zoning ordinance.
	2. Actively plan for, and explore the capitalization of public water and 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 public water, sewer, and storm water systems exist.	Where denser development is recommended, both public water and sewer service is available.
	4. Implement zoning on BNAS (Brunswick Landing) property that is consistent with overall Town policies encouraging denser development in Growth Areas with appropriate infrastructure, and preserving the rural character outside of Growth Areas.	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 outside of the growth area. R-CMU continues to allow multifamily housing at a density of 24 units/acre, with no minimum lot size. R-R continues to 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 with public water and sewer service available. In general, the initial re-occupancy of existing buildings at Brunswick Landing does not require Development Review.
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 and prioritize solutions for the most congested and least safe areas, in particular, plan for changes required by the reuse of BNAS (Brunswick Landing).	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 and the 2011 NASB Transportation Study contain many specific recommendations relating to these issues. There is a new requirement in the proposed Zoning Ordinance that requires any public or private street receiving ME DOT funding to comply with the recently adopted 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 and position Town to ensure the availability and affordability of those units.	The Town, in cooperation with Tedford Housing, completed this key action 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 and flexibility to promote private development of affordable and workforce housing.	Former McKeen Street Navy housing absorbed into neighboring Residential District (GR4) allowing 5 dwelling units/acre and a minimum lot size of 7,500 sq. ft. Former Navy housing abutting BNAS continues to be separately zoned (GR1), with 8 dwelling units allowed per acre and a minimum lot size of 4,000 sq. ft. R-CMU (GM7) continues to allow multifamily housing at a density of 24 units/acre, with no minimum lot size.
2. Preserve the current stock of affordable and rental housing.	1. Actively pursue state and federal housing subsidy programs, such as Community Development Block Grant (CDGB) housing rehabilitation funds, Federal Home Loan Bank subsidies, and 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 proposed 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 Zoning Ordinance has decreased minimum lot sizes throughout much of the Growth Area. Densities increase in MU2, 3; CU2, 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 the Midcoast Regional Redevelopment Authority and Navy-hired environmental consultants to identify and inventory natural resources on BNAS property to coordinate the protection of significant local and 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, Objective 1, Action 2, serving both objectives.	The proposed Zoning 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 within 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 and prioritization of high value open space and 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.
	2. Promote ways to protect important open space and habitats in the Rural Area through Open Space Developments, Rural Brunswick Smart Growth developments or other mechanisms that protect important open space and habitat.	The Open Space Development section of the Ordinance is substantially revised (4.1.4.C). Density bonus is increased from 15% to 25% in the Rural Area and now requires that any 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. Section 4.1.4.C.4.a.iii requires that preserved areas be contiguous to other protected areas if existing on or next to a parcel. The Rural Brunswick Smart Growth provisions are now renamed Wildlife Protection Overlay (2.4.5). An applicant is now required to show the history of fragmentation before any disturbance is permitted to better track prior development of the parcel.

Key Objective # and Text	Key Action # and Text	Implementation of Key Actions in Proposed Zoning Ordinance
	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 provisions 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 along the New Meadows River shoreline.
4. Protect natural resources from harmful development activities.	1. Continue to monitor the quality of waters – rivers, streams, coastal, and aquifers. Consider adding additional water quality monitoring as necessary to assess the drinking water and marine resource condition of these waters and 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 along the New Meadows River shoreline.
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 and costs associated with providing additional recreational facilities.	The current recreation impact fee formula 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 Brunswick 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.

<u>Policy Area 7: Promote an Economically Viable, Attractive Downtown</u>

Key Objective # and Text	Key Action # and Text	Implementation of Key Actions in Proposed Zoning Ordinance
1. Use the redevelopment of Maine Street Station site as a catalyst for Downtown improvements.	1. Ensure that the design of the Maine Street Station site and proposed uses, including passenger rail service by Amtrak & Maine Eastern Railroad, complement the mixed-use nature of the existing downtown.	The development of Maine Street Station, now known as Brunswick Station, is largely complete and outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance.

Key Objective # and Text	Key Action # and Text	Implementation of Key Actions in Proposed Zoning Ordinance
2. Make the Downtown District safer and more pedestrian friendly.	1. Evaluate and implement measures and physical improvements including traffic calming mechanisms, for improving pedestrian safety and comfort on Maine Street.	These are largely issues outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance. New 4.6.A.4. requires new federal or state funded streets to comply with the ME DOT Complete Streets Policy. New objective bicycle parking requirements are established to encourage bicycle use.
	2. Continue implementing the improvements listed in the 2004 Brunswick Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvement Plan relating to Downtown, particularly regarding crosswalks and sidewalks, on a regular basis.	
3. Increase the number of housing options in the Downtown Districts.	1. Re-evaluate dimensional standards and conduct an inventory of neighborhood features as part of the zoning ordinance revision to allow denser residential infill development throughout the downtown with preserving valued features.	An inventory of contributing structures has been completed as part of the evaluation of the Village Review Zone district expansion. Consolidation of the current Town Center districts into GM6 applies a uniform, form-based-type zoning approach to the Downtown allowing flexibility in building size and uses, and thus increase residential density where possible. The minimum lot size is decreased to 7,500 sq. ft. in existing TR3 (proposed GM8). The Village Review Zone is extended 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 and infrastructure improvements. Considerations for such a plan include traffic, bicycle and pedestrian patterns, alternatives to diverting thru-traffic away from Maine Street, enhancing use of upper story space, preserving historic architecture, and making new construction and renovation fit the historic character of the 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.
	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 and implement a feasibility 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 the number and types of jobs potentially created.	This analysis is outside the scope of the proposed Zoning Ordinance.
	2. Explore and 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.
	3. Promote the development of in-fill sites that are financially feasible, beneficial to the community, and have the potential to bring commercial development and jobs paying a living wage to a currently underutilized site. Identify the needs of specifically targeted businesses and provide incentives to attract them to Brunswick.	The economic analysis of this action is outside the scope of the proposed Zoning Ordinance. The proposed Zoning Ordinance does try to allow more in-fill by proposing smaller lot sizes, permitting of for "artisanal manufacturing" in the downtown and outer Pleasant Street, and flexibility regarding downtown parking and loading. Since Brunswick Landing presents the greatest opportunity in the Growth Area for in-fill development, the Common Development Plan 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.	This process has happened outside the scope of the Zoning Ordinance.
	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 and jobs identified as being beneficial to the Town as in Key Objective 1 above.	

Key Objective # and Text	Key Action # and Text	Implementation of Key Actions in Proposed Zoning Ordinance
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 and use available zoning, tax incentives, and 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 and 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. However, the proposed zoning ordinance does carry over 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 and strategy for the "new economy" businesses to encourage locating in Brunswick.	The marketing plan/strategy is outside the scope of the proposed Zoning Ordinance.

Chapter 7: Land Use Plan

Planning Area (location)	Comprehensive Plan Vision	Comprehensive Plan Permitted Uses	Comprehensive Plan Development Standards	Proposed Zoning Ordinance Changes Implementing Comprehensive 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; Village Review Zone design review.	1. Three Town Center Districts (TC 1,2,3) combined into single GM6 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 adjoining 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 and encourage residential and small/moderate non-residential uses downtown. 8. Exempt lots under 10,000 sqft. from providing parking and loading areas 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. I1 district proposed to be a mixed use district to reflect potential for redevelopment of the area close to downtown and residential areas

Planning Area (location)	**Comprehensive Plan Vision**	**Comprehensive Plan Permitted Uses**	**Comprehensive Plan Development Standards**	**Proposed Zoning Ordinance Changes Implementing Comprehensive Plan Development Standards**
Growth Area:				
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.

Planning Area (location)	Comprehensive Plan Vision	Comprehensive Plan Permitted Uses	Comprehensive Plan Development Standards	Proposed Zoning Ordinance Changes Implementing Comprehensive Plan Development Standards
Growth Area:				
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.) 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) 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. GM8 density recommended at 5 units/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. 3. CC north of Route 1 restricted to smaller footprint and less impervious coverage. 4. Location of new development will be market driven.

Planning Area (location)	Comprehensive Plan Vision	Comprehensive Plan Permitted Uses	Comprehensive Plan Development Standards	Proposed Zoning Ordinance Changes Implementing Comprehensive Plan Development Standards
Growth Area:				
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 subdistrict consistency 3. Development standards for subdistricts 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.

Planning Area (location)	**Comprehensive Plan Vision**	**Comprehensive Plan Permitted Uses**	**Comprehensive Plan Development Standards**	**Proposed Zoning Ordinance Changes Implementing Comprehensive Plan Development Standards**
Growth Area:				
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.

Planning Area (location)	Comprehensive Plan Vision	Comprehensive Plan Permitted Uses	Comprehensive 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 is proposed to change from current 1 dwelling unit (du)/2 acres to 1 du/4 acres in FF3. 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.

Planning Area (location)	**Comprehensive Plan Vision**	**Comprehensive Plan Permitted Uses**	**Comprehensive Plan Development Standards**	**Proposed Zoning Ordinance Changes Implementing Comprehensive Plan Development Standards**
Rural Areas:				
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 natural resource based uses including ag, forestry; single and 2-family residential; small scale multi-family 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 significant 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