

**BRUNSWICK ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE COMMITTEE WORK SESSION  
MEETING**

**JANUARY 8, 2015**

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

**CONSULTANT PRESENT:** Don Elliott via ZOOM

Chair Frizzle opened the meeting and stated that the purpose of the meeting was to continue to go over comments and questions pertaining to the proposed draft zoning ordinance. He then opened the meeting to anyone with general comments on subject matters not covered on today's agenda.

**Richard Fisco, 2 Lincoln Street,** asked if the missing sections were completed, and Mr. Frizzle answered that some, but not all, of the sections were completed, and all of the sections would be completed for the next draft publication. Ms. Breinich added that the next draft should be available at the end of January. Mr. Fisco objects to the presentation of the incomplete draft and to the time of day the meetings are held.

Mr. Frizzle stated that this meeting has been properly noticed.

**Jane Millett, 2 Franklin Street,** has asked for a meeting specific to downtown district changes. Ms. Breinich explained that they would like to get the public comments dealt with, rewrites finished, and mapping done to provide the information to the consultant by the end of January or beginning of February, and then meet with the public in smaller area meetings with a full draft document.

**Carol Liscovitz, 11 Berry Street,** asked a question about public input, and Ms. Breinich replied that she was still compiling and adding public comments to the spreadsheet.

Mr. Frizzle closed the general public comment session.

**Review and acceptance of meeting summary from December 17, 2014:**

Ms. Wilson noted on page 6, under the last bulleted item, a statement that a denied permit would go to the ZBA. She would like this line removed because that is not the case. Mr. Hutchinson clarified his actions and possible consequences, and the summary will be updated to reflect the Committee's discussion. She also mentioned that these meeting summaries are called minutes online, and wondered if Ms. Breinich could change that. Ms. Breinich agreed. Ms. Wilson also asked to insert a word on page 2, to read "*too close to the property line*".

**Catherine Ferdinand, Bowdoin College**, asked for a correction in her comments on page 4.

**Margaret Wilson moved, Jeff Hutchinson seconded, approval of the December 17, 2014, meeting summary. The motion was approved unanimously by those present.**

**Residence Halls setbacks discussion:**

Ms. Breinich made available to the public copies of a memo by Catherine Ferdinand of Bowdoin College detailing current residence hall setback requirements. Questions were raised regarding the setbacks instituted through discussions with Bowdoin and carried forward within the zoning ordinance itself. In the existing ordinance, the CU district dimensional standards has a whole page of notes, with additional requirements, and those setbacks are part of the additional requirements. The question was whether the Committee should be eliminating the setbacks where they no longer apply, and whether or not all the abutting residential districts have the same setbacks from residence halls.

**Catherine Ferdinand, Bowdoin College**, said the college responded to a very specific request for information on residence halls currently abutting residential districts, and she explained their information in detail. The information encompassed recently constructed residence halls, and they included the residence hall, the year it was built, the district it is in, the abutting residential district, the required setback at time of construction, and their best estimation of the actual setback as built. These were not measured on the ground; if they had a survey, they used that information, if not, they used the town GIS and its measurements. The most recently constructed dorms are Osher and West, which are on the corner of South Street and Coffin Street. The required setback is 15 feet front, side and rear in CU-1. Those are the underlying setbacks for most of the CU districts, but does not include the supplemental restrictions. The dorms border South Street, which abuts CU-1 and R-1. These were measured from the street curb to the building. Ms. Ferdinand gave measurements for the other dorms. They didn't measure the dorms on campus that didn't abut any residential districts. They have also purchased properties as residence halls, and Ms. Ferdinand does not know what the required setback was at the time of construction. She detailed these properties and the setbacks they currently have. Ms. Breinich stated for the Committee that the question was whether the Committee needed to keep the setbacks that are in place now, and they were also to take a look at the existing setbacks. Ms. Wilson pointed out that the setbacks were 15 feet, which put all of Bowdoin's residence halls in compliance except for 52 Harpswell. Ms. Breinich mentioned that there were additional setbacks for Longfellow of 80 feet on the northern boundary of CU-2, a 125-foot setback along R-8 and 125 feet along R-2.

**Carol Liscovitz, 11 Berry Street**, brought up some of the neighborhood protection standards which limit building height, and wondered why a greater height was taken into consideration in the draft.

Ms. Breinich responded that their intent was to allow for more density in the core of the college districts, but for the Neighborhood Protection Standards and the additional setbacks to kick in on the outer edges of the district where it meets residential.

Mr. Elliott agrees with Ms. Breinich that the general approach has been as she said, but he would like to see the setbacks be uniform, so there was a common understanding as to how the campus edges were treated. His understanding is that this discussion is occurring because of some

significant feeling that regardless of his desire for uniformity, people wanted to keep in place what they had. He believes this is a great opportunity to generalize those things, and Ms. Breinich's summary of the approach is exactly right. They wanted to stay away from the intensity regulations in the middle and near the edge there is a common expectation as to how those kick in, and they are as uniform as we can make them.

**Catherine Ferdinand, Bowdoin College**, mentioned that current setback standard in CU-3, where it abuts RU-7, the college could build any building at a height of 45 feet within 15 feet of the boundary. If they wanted to go back 5 or 10 additional feet, they could build up to a height of 55 feet. The Neighborhood Protection Standards in the current draft actually offers more protection because it says unless you want to go back 30 feet; your structure is limited to a height of 30 feet.

Mr. Frizzle is not in favor of creating separate standards for residence halls throughout the ordinance. He'd like to stick with the existing setbacks as they exist for every other use, within whatever zone being discussed. Where residence halls are to be constructed next to a residential district, then the Neighborhood Protection Standards as written, 30 feet back to go up to 35 feet, and beyond that, you can go up higher. He believes it is a relatively conservative standard compared to what's allowed now, and offers an adequate level of protection for neighborhood residents.

Ms. Breinich added that it's for structures within 30 feet of lot line shared with a growth residential district lot containing a one or two family dwelling. If there is not a one or two family dwelling on that lot, then the Neighborhood Protection Standards do not apply.

**An audience member** thought that the Neighborhood Protection Standard was 50 feet. Ms. Breinich responded that it's different for CU-2, and that is what they're discussing now.

Mr. Frizzle replied that there are some circumstances where long-negotiated, settled setbacks that have been established in various areas, and those have been continued as supplementary standards. Ms. Breinich asked if it was fair to continue them and exempt others when they have the same concerns and the same situation as other areas. Mr. Frizzle stated that some of the negotiated setbacks extend to 80 and 100 feet, and it's unfair to the college to make those setbacks universal throughout the town. It's maybe unfair to some of the residences that somebody else has a bigger setback than they do, but those setbacks that exist now were negotiated in good faith by both parties, and who are we to tear them up?

**Catherine Ferdinand, Bowdoin College**, added that the negotiation of setbacks was linked to the preservation of that trail, not necessarily to the neighborhood. They run along the existing trail that links to the Town Commons, and the no timber harvesting piece of it was all part of that package. They were uniquely linked for a reason that may not apply to other places.

**Carol Liscovitz, 11 Berry Street**, says despite the desire to simplify things, there are unique elements, and if the ordinance has to recognize that with unique standards, so be it. Mr. Frizzle agreed, and said that wherever there are previously negotiated, unique standards, they should be carried over to the new ordinance in supplementary use standards for the future. Mr. Visser added it would be like grandfathering in the old standards, and Mr. Frizzle replied that it would.

**An audience member** from Harpswell Place said he does not want a residence hall built in a lot where a fraternity house was taken down. He is relying on the Committee for the protection of his property and neighborhood. Mr. Frizzle responded to questions about the Neighborhood Protection Standards and height limit. After Ms. Breinich responded that in this audience member's district, buildings could be up to 70 feet in the proposed ordinance, Mr. Frizzle

suggested the Neighborhood Protection Standards could be expanded to provide steps before one gets up to 70 feet.

**Richard Fisco, 2 Lincoln Street**, wondered if there was any mention about the shape of the building being constructed, and Mr. Frizzle responded. There is no restriction on the architecture, but **Catherine Ferdinand** added that the college's projects were subject to Development Review, and the college attempts to work with the neighbors and will continue to do so.

Ms. Wilson agrees with the step-up progression for height, and would like to sometime discuss the adequacy of the Neighborhood Protection Standards. She agrees with Mr. Frizzle that all of the negotiated items must continue in the proposed new ordinance. She'd like to look at the setbacks at the edges of the districts, not just by the college, to make sure they have the protections meant for the neighborhoods. She asked Mr. Elliott if there were any protections for property owners across the street, as it's more than 30 feet, and Mr. Elliott replied that, for the most part, Neighborhood Protection Standards would not apply due to the right-of-way adding more footage, plus the setback on the residence side, plus the setback on the building side. It would be more complex, and Mr. Elliott said he would not advocate doing that.

**Carol Liscovitz, 11 Berry Street**, said it is too complicated to combine some of these districts, as they are unique and some already contain additional protection standards and supplemental provisions, and they should leave these as separate districts.

Mr. Frizzle asked if the Committee had a general consensus to maintain the underlying setbacks for all uses, that the Neighborhood Protection Standards be revamped to include a sliding scale, and that the existing negotiated setbacks be carried forward as supplemental use standards whatever the best way is to carry them forward.

**An audience member** asked if Mr. Elliott could provide some information on how a sliding scale would look. Ms. Wilson explained that the current ordinance provides an extra 5 feet in height for every 10 feet of additional setback, and they would be proposing something similar.

**Catherine Ferdinand, Bowdoin College**, asked that they factor in the geography of the area. The area that has been discussed today, as well as the Stevens Home, is narrow lots. They are not opposed to the step process.

Ms. Wilson asked the Committee for a time to discuss Carol's opposition to the general philosophy of the combination of some unique districts, and thought it should be an agenda item, unless the Committee wanted to discuss it at this meeting. Ms. Breinich replied that CU-1 and CU-2 would be discussed today.

Mr. Elliott responded to a question about sliding height scales by saying that the norm is what is in the draft currently, but it would not be unusual to have a scale if height is of concern. Ms. Wilson reminded people that this is not just a college protection. It could apply in any commercial application where it directly abuts a residential unit.

**Richard Fisco, 2 Lincoln Street**, spoke about the college's continued expansion and the possible problems that may follow.

#### **Continue review of public draft general comments/questions:**

- **Historic Resources** – The Village Review Board reviewed this at the December 16, 2014, meeting, and they would like staff to rework contributing resource definitions and ordinance placement of contributing resources of local and regional significance criteria

for consistency in standards. The Committee agrees with this action. Ms. Breinich mentioned that the VRB will be holding another workshop on January 16, 2015.

- **1.7.2. – Outdoor Storage** – Staff to revise definition to include motorized craft as a motor vehicle and define “seasonal” as 10 months or less. The Committee agrees with this action. Mr. Hutchinson has completed language for this item, which he will hand out to the Committee, and this will be discussed at the next meeting.
- **2.1 – District Summary Table** – The staff recommendation is that all previously negotiated agreements between the college and the adjacent neighborhoods will remain in the ordinance, in response to a comment opposing the consolidation of CU-1 and CU-2. Ms. Breinich added that when this had been discussed earlier, regarding the proposed permitted use “College Facility Not Listed”, the recommendation was that such a use should be treated as a Special Permit, which would not be a blanket approval. The Committee agrees with this action.

**Carol Liscovitz, 11 Berry Street**, voiced her concern over CU-1 and CU-2 combining to form GC-1, and Ms. Wilson reviewed the protection standards that would still be in place, and would like to know specifically what she feels is inadequate in the ordinance.

**An audience member** said she thought it made more sense to keep two zones when you have reasons to have two zones, and there were a whole list of things including trees, streets, and residential surroundings, that were the logical groundwork for making them two zones in the first place. Ms. Wilson replied that if the zones were kept separate, both the dimensional standards and the use table would need to be reviewed, but there is not necessarily a reason to make those very different between the two districts. Ms. Liscovitz said the zone is a small, residential area with little impact, and she doesn’t understand why it needs to be combined for a perceived convenience. Ms. Breinich reviewed the dimensional and density table for CU-1 and CU-2, in addition to the special requirements being carried over to the proposed ordinance, and stated the only significant difference is building height. If that is going to be dealt with on a sliding scale basis, that would seem to make the two zones even more compatible. Mr. Frizzle stated that he’s not inclined to undo the zone consolidations that have been proposed thus far, but would like Ms. Breinich as part of her review to revisit the arguments for and against consolidation, specifically CU-1 and CU-2, and come back next week with either reinforcement of the current recommendation or an agreement that it doesn’t make sense. Ms. Breinich agreed and will consult with Mr. Elliott. Mr. Elliott stated that he feels this is a strategically important consolidation for the Town of Brunswick and the college, and he is happy to revisit it with an open mind, but this was not a casual decision in the first place.

**Jane Millett, 10 Franklin Street**, requested that the Committee look at the zoning of lower Federal Street, which was changed a few years ago, because the owners there do not like it, and she feels it disrespects the historic nature of the area.

**Carol Liscovitz, 11 Berry Street**, stated that the significant difference between the CU-1 and CU-2 zones is that in existing CU-2 residence halls are Special Permit, not a permitted use. There are some other changes of language that she does not agree with.

- **2.4.5. Wildlife Protection Overlay** – this was a general comment supporting the portions of the proposed zoning ordinance that provide for wildlife protection in the RP-1 zones. The Committee responded that there were no changes proposed to lessen any of the existing protections to the wildlife habitat.

- **2.4.9.A. – Village Review Overlay** – Mr. Frizzle asked why the VRB was considering restricting the combining of abutting lots within the Village Review Zone, and Ms. Breinich stated they did not want to end up with larger, out-of-scale buildings. The Committee will expect more details from the VRB on this item.
- **2.4.9.A.2.** - The Committee will expect more details from the VRB on this item.
- **2.4.9.B.1.a.i. (D)** – The VRB will be discussing this item at their next workshop, and they will be receiving the requested information about required notification of property owners from staff.
- **Footnotes 208 and 210** – In progress.
- **3.2 Use Table, 4.1 Dimensional Standards** – Some residents of Katherine Street were unhappy with the rezoning of their area. Ms. Wilson explained that there are very little changes in existing uses and they’ve maintained the residential character of their neighborhood, essentially in its entirety, with the exception being a reduction in lot size from 10,000 sq. ft. to 7,500 sq. ft., which is generally the same proposed throughout the town. ZORC agrees with staff’s response.
- **3.2 Use Table** – This comment proposed that aviation operations, aviation-related businesses and ultra light airparks should be removed from GC1 as Conditional Uses because it’s incompatible with adjoining residential uses. Staff’s recommendation confirmed removing those as Conditional Uses in GC-1, as well as GC-2 and GC-3. Helipads were combined with aviation operations, but will be separated and continue to be permitted as an accessory use with neighborhood protections. The Committee agrees. Ms. Breinich stated that helipads are mentioned in the current ordinance under Medical Use Overlay, but need to be added to the proposed draft as an accessory use in GC-1. **Catherine Ferdinand, Bowdoin College**, said the college has no desire for a helipad. Ms. Wilson asked why would they encourage helipad usage, but Mr. Frizzle said he could envision some of the industries on the base desiring one. Ms. Breinich said that would be considered aviation as well, so it would be allowed. Ms. Wilson said do not put them all around town. This is allowed only as an accessory in the GM-8 district, and as a permitted use in the GA district at the base, and the Committee agreed.
- **3.2 Use Table** – This item was discussed earlier.
- **3.4 – Supplementary Use Standards** – ZORC confirmed their agreement to include a map referencing existing CU districts within an appendix in the final ordinance.
- **4.1.2 - Dimensional Standards** – ZORC confirmed their agreement to further review as part of the interim draft.
- **4.1.2 – Dimensional Standards, 4-3/4-4** – This was agreed to by ZORC and will be discussed with an upcoming dimensional and density requirement review.
- **Table 4.1.2. – Dimensional Standards** – Ms. Breinich explained that the elimination of a maximum building footprint was in error. She researched lot sizes for that area of lower Pleasant Street, between Union and Stanwood Streets, and stressed that this is not about development in that area, but rather taking care of residents’ needs. Many of these properties have no setback. Staff is proposing a 10 ft. side yard setback, or they could use the distance between structures, which would help an owner who is almost up against a property line and has no other recourse to make exterior changes. This includes porches and decks, which cannot be in the setback. Impervious coverage exceeding 50% is also prevalent in this area, and staff was proposing a 70 or 75% maximum. Even if they could get another 10% impervious coverage added for this area, that would help out.

There are a number of nonresidential and civic uses in this area. The parcels are comprised of eleven single-family homes, ten multi-family (between 2 and 5 units), and another ten parcels used for nonresidential purposes, excluding municipal uses. They are either churches, retail, banks or offices. There is a 7,500 foot square limit currently, and some of the buildings exceed that. Ms. Wilson would not like to go up to 10,000 sq. ft. in this area, but would consider giving some lots additional leeway. Mr. Frizzle would like to stay with the 7,500 square feet, but in terms of relaxing setbacks to give homeowners who are crowding the lot lines an opportunity to put a deck on, he's amenable to that. Ms. Wilson doesn't care for the idea of building to the lot line, as that seems to give the advantage to the first person who builds, but if anyone has any experience with this they would like to share; she would be willing to listen.

Mr. Elliott believed this was summarized well. It is not illegal to do, but there is some kind of a bias there. He said one could have a lot on which people have built first, leaving you with so little lot that you will have a really constrained building. He would only go that route if you have a compelling need to get people out of nonconformity status, and probably the better approach would be to go to the 10 foot setback if you can live with that. Mr. Frizzle agrees.

**Jane Millett, 10 Franklin Street**, asked why there is a need to get buildings out of nonconformity, rather than have them grandfathered. Mr. Frizzle replied that a person trying to do something with an already nonconforming structure has some huge hurdles to get over in order to do it. They are trying to eliminate as many of these nonconforming structures as possible, so as conforming structures, they are able to do whatever it is they want to do. A lot of these standards came along long after the buildings were there. Mr. Hutchinson discussed setbacks in response to a question from **Carol Liscovitz**, and continued the discussion with Ms. Breinich. Mr. Frizzle stated that he doesn't see any reason why they can't shrink the setbacks from 15 feet to 10 feet. Ms. Wilson recalled comments from other citizens on Pleasant Street wondering what differentiated them from the rest of the proposed GR-6. Ms. Breinich mentioned that this will all come up when they discuss dimensional requirements, and further analysis will be done of GR-6.

**An audience member** from GR-6 said she lives in a house that is nonconforming, but would also like to respect her neighbors' privacy, so this is an issue she and her neighbors are interested in. She feels if this is a concern for GR-6, she doesn't understand why other residential areas are not being considered for the same treatment. Mr. Frizzle believes there are reasons for differences in setbacks as you move further out into the rural area. The shrinking of the front and side setbacks to 10 feet makes sense given what exists now in GR-6, and giving a little more flexibility with respect to impervious surface probably makes sense as far as the existing GR-6 is concerned. The Committee is taking the staff recommended expansion of the footprint from 7,500 to 10,000 sq. ft. off the table. That is a big part of the feedback the Committee heard from neighbors. Mr. Hutchinson made a recommendation that staff study the rest of the GR-6 and further discuss it at the January 29, 2015, meeting.

**Carol Liscovitz, 11 Berry Street**, stated that the impervious surface percentage was not an arbitrary number, and if it were extended to all of GR-6, she has concerns about the effect on soil and drainage. Mr. Frizzle responded that generally speaking, areas that are served by storm drains are not as sensitive to changes as other areas, but they will look at

that before any recommendations are made. Mr. Frizzle announced they would defer the inner Pleasant Street discussion to the January 29, 2015, meeting, but with the decision made to stay with the 7,500 sq. ft. maximum footprint.

- **Table 4.1.2. – Dimensional Standards** – This comment supported the decision to change minimum lot sizes to 7,500 sq. ft.
- **Table 4.1.3. – Dimensional Standards for Rural Base Districts** – ZORC confirmed their agreement with this revision.
- **4.1.4.A. – Calculation of Net Site Area** – ZORC confirmed agreement with recommendations of 12/17/14.
- **4.2.7. – Historic Resources** – ZORC confirmed their agreement with staff recommendations from 12/17/14.
- **Tables 4.1.4.C.5. and 6. – Dimensional Standards for Open Space Development** – ZORC confirmed their action of 12/17/14.
- **4.5.2.B.1. – Street Trees** – Mr. Frizzle understood ZORC to agree to Development Review applications only in the Growth Area, and not to push street tree dictates into the rural area. Ms. Wilson thought they agreed to any Development Review applications, and anything in the Growth Zone. Mr. Elliott’s memory was that Mr. Hutchinson was going to think about it, but it was the basic structure to apply to single-lot building permits. Ms. Wilson referenced the meeting summary, which stated that the majority of the Committee agreed to have street trees applicable in the Growth Area, whether or not the project goes through Development Review. Mr. Elliott replied that that would be very typical. The Committee confirmed this approach.
- **4.7.1.B.2.** – This item will need further discussion by ZORC.
- **4.7.2.B.** – Ms. Breinich and Mr. Doxsee have been working on this item.
- **4.7.4.B.1. – Parking in lieu** – This item is being worked on.
- **4.9.2.B.** – This item was discussed at the 12/16/14 Village Review Board meeting, and Ms. Wilson authored language to deal with façade treatment for buildings on corner lots. Mr. Frizzle thought that sounded like a reasonable statement.  
**Allison Harris, Cumberland Street**, voiced her appreciation for the language. ZORC endorses this recommendation of the VRB and Ms. Wilson.
- **4.10.1., 4.10.2.C. – Neighborhood Protection Standards** – ZORC has previously addressed the Neighborhood Protection Standards.  
**Catherine Ferdinand, Bowdoin College**, had a question about a large lot and the requirement for a fence, and this will receive additional discussion after Clarion responds to the large lot buffering question. Mr. Frizzle said in general, they’re sympathetic to a large lot, and not having to put a fence around the entire lot because you are building in one corner.
- **4.11.3.E.1.** – This item is waiting for staff rewrite.
- **4.11.4.H.** - This item is waiting for staff rewrite.
- **4.12 – Performance Standards** – This item is waiting for further review by Mr. Hutchinson.
- **4.12.1.A.1.** – ZORC has already agreed to the staff recommendation, and this item will be removed from the spreadsheet.
- **4.12.2., 4.12.4., 4.12.5.,** - ZORC has already agreed to the staff recommendation, and this item will be removed from the spreadsheet.

- **4.8. – Outdoor Lighting** – Additional follow up need by Code Enforcement Officer.
- **5.2.6.C. – Review Standards** – VRB will be discussing this item on 1/16/14 at their workshop.
- **5.2.6.C.2.b. viii. and xii.** – It is anticipated that the Village Review Zone Design Guidelines will be updated for consistency sometime after the zoning ordinance update. ZORC and VRB agreed to this.
- **5.2.6.C.4.a. & b. – Demolition and Relocation** – The VRB will be reviewing this section and offering additional recommendations to ZORC.
- **Table 5.2.7.B. – Review Authority** – This item is for further discussion and review of thresholds.
- This was a general comment dealing with limiting future right-of-way access to Rossmore Road as part of a planned subdivision due to the rural nature of the existing roadway. Mr. Frizzle added the commenter saw something that led them to believe that there was a future access road planned onto Rossmore, and there was a concept at one time that did show something like that. He stated whatever determination they make with respect to another road coming out of Rossmore will be made as part of whatever they are being asked to review. They are not going to limit further access to Rossmore at this point in time. Ms. Breinich added that that would not be appropriate for a zoning ordinance, and Mr. Frizzle agreed.

Ms. Breinich is intending to get through the rest of the public comments next meeting.

Ms. Wilson believes it would be helpful to this group to clarify which policy issues will be discussed by the Committee. Committee members mentioned:

- Whether or not to consolidate, particularly in R-1 and R-8, and CU-1 and CU-2
- Whether or not they want to change the Review Standards to conform with what we're doing already at Brunswick Landing
- Mapping (will be after the presentation of the draft to Clarion)

Ms. Breinich would like to complete the review of the text material before the policies, because the policies will affect the review of signs, and she would like to finish outdoor storage and the nonconforming section.

Mr. Visser asked about recommendations from the Recreation Commission and the Conservation Committee. Ms. Breinich mentioned she just got recommendations from the Conservation Committee, which will be reviewed at the next meeting.

**Allison Harris, Cumberland Street**, believes the whole issue in her mind is of balancing the protection of the historic integrity of the downtown versus promoting growth and prosperity throughout the community, which involves some development in the downtown area, and how you strike the proper balance. She talked about her involvement with the Village Review Zone when renovating their house, and mentioned that in her original documents for the house there was nothing in the listing or disclosure statement that indicated that they would be subject to this kind of review. The VRB is discussing additional restrictions, which makes it difficult to own property and use your property in the Village Review Zone. She would like that to be something that people are mindful of, as it's going to be hard for people to purchase if they have these additional burdens. Mr. Frizzle said the overall discussion belongs at the VRB. What, if anything, we can do about the disclosure is a whole different issue.

**Jane Millett, 10 Franklin Street**, said the disclosures are handed down from the State, and there is a check off under the inspection area if you desire to check and make as a contingency zoning restrictions.

Mr. Frizzle said right now the burden is very much on the homeowner to find out information such as that which they have been talking about. He asked Ms. Breinich to start a list with respect to major policy issues to review at the next few meetings, so they will have it when they are ready for those general policy discussions. Ms. Wilson discussed the use tables and dimensional tables, which Ms. Breinich responded is more of a technical review, but she would like to complete that before the policy issues, and Ms. Wilson agreed.

Mr. Elliott suggested they respond to the staff recommendations in the Use and Dimensional Tables rather than going line by line because they will never get to the place where they are sure every dimension works with every possible use on every possible lot.

**ZORC work session meeting schedule:**

**January 15, 2014**, Work Session, Town Hall, Room 206, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm

**January 22, 2014**, Work Session, Town Hall, Room 206, 3:00 pm – 6:00 pm – revised time/location

**January 29, 2014**, Work Session, Council Chambers, 5:30 pm – 8:30 pm – revised time

**Other business:**

None.

Mr. Frizzle adjourned the meeting.

Attest

Debra Blum  
Recording Secretary