TOWN OF BRUNSWICK

ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE COMMITTEE

85 Union Street, Brunswick, ME 04011-1583

WORK SESSION AGENDA

TOWN HALL ROOM 206
85 UNION STREET
FRIDAY, APRIL 3, 2015, 1:00 PM

1. Public Comment
2. Discussion Topics:
    a. Recreation Requirements (update)
    b. Use Table
    c. Density Standards
    d. Dimensional and Density Table
    e. Neighborhood Protections Standards (discussion)
3. ZORC work session meeting schedule
    a. Monday, April 13th, 2:00 pm in Town Hall Room 206
4. 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.

Growth Area Permitted Use Table

Table 3.2: Permitted Use Table for Growth Area Base Districts[1]

P = Permitted C = Allowed Only with a Conditional Use Permit X = Prohibited
A = Allowed Only as an Accessory Use T = Allowed only as Temporary Use
* = Subject to Supplementary Use Standards

Land Use	NEW ZONE	GR1	GR2	GR3	GR4[2]	GR5	GR6	GR7	GR8	GR9	GM1	GM2	GM3	GM4[3]	GM5	GM6	GM7	GM8	GC1	GC2	GC3	GC4	GA	GI	GO	GN[4]	Supple-mentary Use Standards
	CURRENT ZONE	RR	R1 & 8	R2	R3, 4, 5, 6	R7	TR1	TR2	TR3 & 4	TR5	MU2	MU3 & 6	MU4, I1, I4	CC	HC1 & 2	TC1, 2, 3	RCMU	MUOZ	CU1, 2 & 3	CU5 & 6	CU4 & 7	CU/TC	R-AR	I2, I3, RBTI	R-R&OS	BCN	
Principal Uses																											
Residential Uses																											
Household Living																											
Dwelling, 1- or 2-family		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	~~C~~	P	P	P	P	X	X	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Staff Change																		**P**									
Dwelling, multifamily		P *	X	X	P *	P *	P	P	P	P	P	P *	P	P	P	P	P	P	P *	P	P	P	X	X	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Mobile home		Permitted Only in Mobile Home Park Overlay District																									
Group Living																											
Assisted/Congregate Living Facility		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	P	X	X	
Boarding house		X	X	X	C	P	C	X	C	C	P	P	P	C	C	C	P	P	X	~~P~~	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Staff Change																				**X**							
Nursing home		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	C	C	C	P	P	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Residence hall		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P *	X	P	C	C	X	C	P	P	P *	C	P	P	X	C	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Public, Institutional, and Civic Uses																											
Community, Cultural, and Educational Uses																											
Club or lodge		X	X	X	X	X	C	X	C	C	P	C	C	C	C	P	P	P	X	X	X	X	X	C	X	X	
~~**College facility not listed**~~		~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	~~C~~	~~P~~	~~C~~	~~X~~	~~P~~	~~P~~	~~P~~	~~C~~	~~P~~	~~P~~	~~P~~	~~P~~	~~P~~	~~C~~	~~P~~	~~P~~	~~P~~	~~P~~	~~P~~	~~P~~	~~P~~	~~X~~	
Community center		A	X	X	C	C	C	X	C	C	P	P	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	P	P	X	C	X	X	

[1] Where the consolidated districts apply different standards, the proposed standards is shaded in blue. Where we propose to change the current standard (other than through consolidation rules), the proposed designation is shaded in magenta.
[2] This also consolidates the Growth Area part of the CR2 District.
[3] This also consolidates the Growth Area part of the MU1 District.
[4] This district includes only those BCN lands located in the Growth Area.

Table 3.2: Permitted Use Table for Growth Area Base Districts[1]

P = Permitted C = Allowed Only with a Conditional Use Permit X = Prohibited
A = Allowed Only as an Accessory Use T = Allowed only as Temporary Use
* = Subject to Supplementary Use Standards

Land Use	NEW ZONE	GR1	GR2	GR3	GR4[2]	GR5	GR6	GR7	GR8	GR9	GM1	GM2	GM3	GM4[3]	GM5	GM6	GM7	GM8	GC1	GC2	GC3	GC4	GA	GI	GO	GN[4]	Supple-mentary Use Standards
	CURRENT ZONE	RR	R1 & 8	R2	R3, 4, 5, 6	R7	TR1	TR2	TR3 & 4	TR5	MU2	MU3 & 6	MU4, I1, I4	CC	HC1 & 2	TC1, 2, 3	RCMU	MUOZ	CU1, 2 & 3	CU5 & 6	CU4 & 7	CU/TC	R-AR	I2, I3, RBTI	R-R&OS	BCN	
Day care facility, small		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	
Day care facility, large		C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	
Hospital		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Library, museum, or art gallery		X	X	X	C	C	~~P~~	X	X	C	P	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	C	X	X	
Staff Change							**C**																				
Municipal facility		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	~~X~~	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	
Staff Change																		**P**									
Park or conservation area		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Religious institution		X	X	X	C	C	P	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	P	X	X	
School		P	P	P	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	
Communication Uses																											
Telecommunication tower		Permitted only in Telecommunications Overlay District																									
Telecommunication tower, small-scale																	C							C			**Error! Reference source not found.**
Staff Change		**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**C**	**X**	**X**	**X**			**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**		**X**	**X**	
Commercial Uses																											
Agriculture and Animal Care Uses																											
Aquaculture		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	
Equestrian facility		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	P	X	X	P	X	
Farm		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	X	X	P	X	
Kennel		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	X	X	X	C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	X	X	
Plant nursery		X	X	C	P	P	P	C	X	X	P	P	C	P	P	X	C	C	P	X	P	P	X	P	P	X	
Urban Agriculture		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	X P	X P	X P	X P	X P	X P	X P	X P	X P	X P	X P	X P	X P	X P	X P	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Veterinary office		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	C	~~C~~	P	P	P	P	P	X	X	X	X	X	P	X	X	
Staff Change													**P**														
Food, Beverage, and Entertainment																											
Adult entertainment establishment		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	**Error! Reference source not**

Table 3.2: Permitted Use Table for Growth Area Base Districts[1]

P = Permitted C = Allowed Only with a Conditional Use Permit X = Prohibited
A = Allowed Only as an Accessory Use T = Allowed only as Temporary Use
* = Subject to Supplementary Use Standards

Land Use	NEW ZONE	GR1	GR2	GR3	GR4[2]	GR5	GR6	GR7	GR8	GR9	GM1	GM2	GM3	GM4[3]	GM5	GM6	GM7	GM8	GC1	GC2	GC3	GC4	GA	GI	GO	GN[4]	Supple-mentary Use Standards
	CURRENT ZONE	RR	R1 & 8	R2	R3, 4, 5, 6	R7	TR1	TR2	TR3 & 4	TR5	MU2	MU3 & 6	MU4, I1, I4	CC	HC1 & 2	TC1, 2, 3	RCMU	MUOZ	CU1, 2 & 3	CU5 & 6	CU4 & 7	CU/TC	R-AR	I2, I3, RBTI	R-R&OS	BCN	
																											found.
Golf course		X	X	X	P	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	X	
Recreation facility, as a principal use		X	X	X	C	C	C	X	X	X	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	X	P	X	P	P	P	
Restaurant or dining facility		X	X	X	X	X	C	X	X	X	P	P	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	P*	P	P*	C	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Theater		X	X	X	X	X	C	X	X	X	P	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	P	P	X	P	X	X	
Lodging																											
Campground		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	C	C	C	C	C	X	C	C	C	C	X	X	X	P	X	
Hotel		X	X	X	X	X	C	X	X	X	P	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	X	X	~~P~~ *	X	X	P	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Staff Change																					**X**						
Retail Sales and Services																											
Bank		X	X	X	X	X	C	X	X	X	P	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	X	X	X	X	P	C	X	X	
Neighborhood store		P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	X	P*	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Office		X	X	X	X	C	C	X	X	C*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	~~X~~	P	P	P	P	A	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Staff Change																				**P**							
Retail, Class I		X	X	X	X	X	C	X	X	X	P*	C	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	X	X	X	P*	P*	P*	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Retail, Class II		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P*	C	C	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	X	X	X	X	X	P*	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Service business, Class I		X	X	X	X	C	C	X	X	X	P	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	X	X	X	P	P*	P	X	X	**Error! Reference source not**

Table 3.2: Permitted Use Table for Growth Area Base Districts[1]

P = Permitted C = Allowed Only with a Conditional Use Permit X = Prohibited
A = Allowed Only as an Accessory Use T = Allowed only as Temporary Use
* = Subject to Supplementary Use Standards

Land Use	NEW ZONE	GR1	GR2	GR3	GR4[2]	GR5	GR6	GR7	GR8	GR9	GM1	GM2	GM3	GM4[3]	GM5	GM6	GM7	GM8	GC1	GC2	GC3	GC4	GA	GI	GO	GN[4]	Supple-mentary Use Standards
	CURRENT ZONE	RR	R1 & 8	R2	R3, 4, 5, 6	R7	TR1	TR2	TR3 & 4	TR5	MU2	MU3 & 6	MU4, I1, I4	CC	HC1 & 2	TC1, 2, 3	RCMU	MUOZ	CU1, 2 & 3	CU5 & 6	CU4 & 7	CU/TC	R-AR	I2, I3, RBTI	R-R&OS	BCN	
																											found.
Service business, Class II		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	X	X	X	X	P *	P	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Studio		~~X~~	~~X~~	~~X~~	C	C	C	C	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	P	P	X	P	X	X	
Staff Change		**C**	**C**	**C**																							
Transportation and Vehicle-Related Uses																											
Aviation operations		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	~~C~~	~~C~~	~~C~~	X	P	P	X	X	
Aviation-related business		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	C	C	C	C	C	X	C	~~C~~	~~C~~	~~C~~	X	P	P	X	X	
STAFF CHANGE																			**X**	**X**	**X**						
Bus or rail station		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	~~X~~	X	P	P	X	P	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Staff Change														**P**													
Car wash		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	P	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Marina or boat storage		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	X	X	C	X	X	
Parking facility as a principal use		X	X	X	X	X	~~C~~	X	X	~~C~~	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	C	P	P	P	P	X	X	
Staff Change							**X**			**X**																	
Ultra-light airpark		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	~~C~~	~~C~~	~~C~~	X	C	C	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
STAFF CHANGE																			**X**	**X**	**X**						
Vehicle fueling station		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	X	X	C	P	X	P	C	X	X	X	X	P *	P	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Vehicle sales, rental, or storage		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P *	X	X	P *	P *	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C *	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Vehicle service or repair		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	X	X	P	P	X	P	C	X	X	X	P	X	P	X	X	
Industrial Uses																											
Contractor's space		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	C	C	C	C	P	P	C	X	X	C	X	A *	P	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS 4/1/15

Table 3.2: Permitted Use Table for Growth Area Base Districts[1]

P = Permitted C = Allowed Only with a Conditional Use Permit X = Prohibited
A = Allowed Only as an Accessory Use T = Allowed only as Temporary Use
* = Subject to Supplementary Use Standards

Land Use	NEW ZONE	GR1	GR2	GR3	GR4[2]	GR5	GR6	GR7	GR8	GR9	GM1	GM2	GM3	GM4[3]	GM5	GM6	GM7	GM8	GC1	GC2	GC3	GC4	GA	GI	GO	GN[4]	Supple-mentary Use Standards
	CURRENT ZONE	RR	R1 & 8	R2	R3, 4, 5, 6	R7	TR1	TR2	TR3 & 4	TR5	MU2	MU3 & 6	MU4, I1, I4	CC	HC1 & 2	TC1, 2, 3	RCMU	MUOZ	CU1, 2 & 3	CU5 & 6	CU4 & 7	CU/TC	R-AR	I2, I3, RBTI	R-R&OS	BCN	
Industry, Artisan		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	X	X	X	X	P	P	X	X	
Industry, Class I		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	C	C	C	C	X	P	C	X	X	X	X	P	P	X	X	
Industry, Class II		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C	C	C	C	X	X	P	C	X	X	X	X	P	P	X	X	
STAFF CHANGE**FOOTNOTE TO ALLOW INDUSTRIAL AS PERMITTED SOUTH OF ROUTE 1 (FORMER I1)**													****														
Junkyard or automobile graveyard		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Marine activity		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P*	X	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	X	X	X	X	P*	P*	P*	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Mineral extraction		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Recycling collection facility, as a principal use		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	P	C	C	C	C	P	P	C	X	X	X	X	P	P	X	X	
Renewable energy generating facility, as a principal use		C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	P	C	P	C	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Utility facility, major		C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	P	C	X	
Utility facility, minor		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Warehousing and storage		X	X	X	X	X	A	X	X	X	P	C	P	P	C	A	P	C	P	A	A	P	P	P	X	X	
Accessory Uses																											
Accessory apartment		A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	¥	A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	X	A*	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Staff Change																	**A***										
Bed and breakfast		X	X	X	A	A	A	AC	AC	AC	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	AC	AC	AC	A	X	A	X	X	
Day care facility, small		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	X	

Table 3.2: Permitted Use Table for Growth Area Base Districts[1]

P = Permitted C = Allowed Only with a Conditional Use Permit X = Prohibited
A = Allowed Only as an Accessory Use T = Allowed only as Temporary Use
* = Subject to Supplementary Use Standards

Land Use	NEW ZONE	GR1	GR2	GR3	GR4[2]	GR5	GR6	GR7	GR8	GR9	GM1	GM2	GM3	GM4[3]	GM5	GM6	GM7	GM8	GC1	GC2	GC3	GC4	GA	GI	GO	GN[4]	Supple-mentary Use Standards
	CURRENT ZONE	RR	R1 & 8	R2	R3, 4, 5, 6	R7	TR1	TR2	TR3 & 4	TR5	MU2	MU3 & 6	MU4, I1, I4	CC	HC1 & 2	TC1, 2, 3	RCMU	MUOZ	CU1, 2 & 3	CU5 & 6	CU4 & 7	CU/TC	R-AR	I2, I3, RBTI	R-R&OS	BCN	
Day care facility, large		A C	A C	A C	A C	A C	A C	A C	A C	A C	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		A	A	A C	A C	A C	X	
Drive-through service		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	A	X	X	A	A	A C *	A C	A	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
STAFF CHANGE: HELIPAD AS AN ACCESSORY USE																		**A**										
Home occupation		A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A*		A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Parking facility, as an accessory use		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		A	A	A	A	A	A	
Recreation facility, as an accessory use		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A		A	A	X	A	X	A	
Renewable energy generating facility, as an accessory use		A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A*		A *	A *	A *	A *	A *	A*	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Temporary Uses																												
Garage and yard sales		T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T*		T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Outdoor sales		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T*		T *	T *	T *	T *	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Special event		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	C T	C T	C T	C T	C T	C T	C T	C T	C T	CT		C T	C T	C T	C T	C T	X C*	
Temporary construction office or yard		T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T*		T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	X T*	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Temporary movable storage container		T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	T*		T *	T *	T *	T *	T *	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**

Table 3.2: Permitted Use Table for Growth Area Base Districts[1]

P = Permitted C = Allowed Only with a Conditional Use Permit X = Prohibited
A = Allowed Only as an Accessory Use T = Allowed only as Temporary Use
* = Subject to Supplementary Use Standards

Land Use	NEW ZONE	GR1	GR2	GR3	GR4[2]	GR5	GR6	GR7	GR8	GR9	GM1	GM2	GM3	GM4[3]	GM5	GM6	GM7	GM8	GC1	GC2	GC3	GC4	GA	GI	GO	GN[4]	Supple-mentary Use Standards
	CURRENT ZONE	RR	R1 & 8	R2	R3, 4, 5, 6	R7	TR1	TR2	TR3 & 4	TR5	MU2	MU3 & 6	MU4, I1, I4	CC	HC1 & 2	TC1, 2, 3	RCMU	MUOZ	CU1, 2 & 3	CU5 & 6	CU4 & 7	CU/TC	R-AR	I2, I3, RBTI	R-R&OS	BCN	
Temporary real estate sales office		T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	X	Error! Reference source not found.

1.1 Rural Area Permitted Use Table

Table 3.3: Permitted Use Table for Rural Base Districts[5]

P = Permitted C = Allowed Only with a Conditional Use Permit X = Prohibited
A = Allowed Only as an Accessory Use T = Allowed Only as a Temporary Use
* = Subject to Supplementary Use Standards

Land Use	NEW ZONE	RN[6]	RF	RR	RP1	RP2	RM	Supplementary Use Standards
	CURRENT ZONE	BCN	FF1, CR1	CR2	CP1, FF3	CP2	MU5	
Principal Uses								
Residential Uses								
Household Living								
Dwelling, 1- or 2-family		X	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	Error! Reference source not found.
Dwelling, multifamily		X	P*	P*	X	P*	P*	Error! Reference source not found.
Mobile home		X	P	P	P	P	P	
Group Living								
Assisted/Congregate Living Facility		P	P	P	P	P	P	
Boarding house		X	C	C	X	C	C	
Nursing home		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Residence hall		X	X	X	X	X	X	

[5] Where the consolidated districts apply different standards, the proposed standard is shaded in blue. Where we propose to change the current standard (other than through consolidation rules), the proposed designation is shaded in magenta.
[6] This district includes only those BCN lands located in the Growth Area.

Table 3.3: Permitted Use Table for Rural Base Districts[5]

P = Permitted C = Allowed Only with a Conditional Use Permit X = Prohibited
A = Allowed Only as an Accessory Use T = Allowed Only as a Temporary Use
* = Subject to Supplementary Use Standards

Land Use	NEW ZONE	RN[6]	RF	RR	RP1	RP2	RM	Supplementary Use Standards
	CURRENT ZONE	BCN	FF1, CR1	CR2	CP1, FF3	CP2	MU5	
Public, Institutional, and Civic Uses								
Community, Cultural, and Educational Uses								
Club or lodge		X	C	C	P	C	P	
~~College facility not listed~~		~~X~~	~~C~~	~~C~~	~~C~~	~~C~~	~~C~~	
Community center		X	C	C	X	C	P	
Day care facility, small		X	P	P	P	P	P	
Day care facility, large		X	C	P	C	C	C	
Hospital		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Library or museum, or art gallery		X	C	P	P	C	P	
Municipal facility		P	P	P	P	P	P	
Park or conservation area		P	P	P	P	P	P	
Religious institution		X	C	C	C	C	C	
School		X	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	
Communication Uses								
Telecommunication tower		Permitted only in Telecommunications Overlay District						
Telecommunication tower, Small-scale							P	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Staff Change		**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**	**X**		
Commercial Uses								
Agriculture, Aquaculture, and Animal Care Uses								
Aquaculture		X	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Equestrian facility		X	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Farm		X	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Kennel		X	C	C	X	C	C	
Plant nursery		X	P	P	P	P	P	
Veterinary office		X	P	P	X	P	P	
Food, Beverage, and Entertainment								
Adult entertainment establishment		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Golf course		X	C	C	X	C	C	

Table 3.3: Permitted Use Table for Rural Base Districts[5]

P = Permitted C = Allowed Only with a Conditional Use Permit X = Prohibited
A = Allowed Only as an Accessory Use T = Allowed Only as a Temporary Use
* = Subject to Supplementary Use Standards

Land Use	NEW ZONE	RN[6]	RF	RR	RP1	RP2	RM	Supplementary Use Standards
	CURRENT ZONE	BCN	FF1, CR1	CR2	CP1, FF3	CP2	MU5	
Recreation facility, as a principal use		P*	C	C	C	C	C	
Restaurant or dining facility		X	X	X	X	X	X	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Theater		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Lodging								
Campground		X	C	C	C	C	C	
Hotel		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Retail Sales and Services								
Bank		X	X	X	X	X	C	
Neighborhood store		X	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Office		X	X	X	C	X	P	
Retail, Class I		X	X	P*	X	X	P*	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Retail, Class II		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Service business, Class I		X	C	X	C	C	P	
Service business, Class II		X	C	X	X	C	P	
Studio		X	P	P	C	P	P	
Transportation and Vehicle-Related Uses								
Aviation operations		X	X	X	X	X	S	
Staff Change							**C**	
Aviation-related business		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Bus or rail station		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Car wash		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Marina or boat storage		X	C	C	C	C	C	
Parking facility, as a principal use		X	X	X	X	X	C	
Ultra-light airpark		X	X	X	X	X	C	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Vehicle fueling station		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Vehicle sales, rental, or storage		X	X	X	X	X	C	
Vehicle service or repair		X	X	X	X	X	C	
Industrial Uses								
Contractor's space		X	C	C	X	C	C	
Industry, Artisan		X	X	X	X	X	P	

Table 3.3: Permitted Use Table for Rural Base Districts[5]

P = Permitted C = Allowed Only with a Conditional Use Permit X = Prohibited
A = Allowed Only as an Accessory Use T = Allowed Only as a Temporary Use
* = Subject to Supplementary Use Standards

Land Use	NEW ZONE	RN[6]	RF	RR	RP1	RP2	RM	Supplementary Use Standards
	CURRENT ZONE	BCN	FF1, CR1	CR2	CP1, FF3	CP2	MU5	
Industry, Class I		X	X	X	X	X	P	
Industry, Class II		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Junkyard or automobile graveyard		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Marine activity		P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	P*	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Mineral extraction		X	P	P	P	P	P	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Recycling collection facility, as a principal use		X	X	X	X	X	C	
Renewable energy generating facility, as a principal use		X	C	C	C	C	C	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Utility facility, major		X	C	C	C	C	C	
Utility facility, minor		P	P	P	P	P	P	
Warehousing and storage		X	X	X	X	C	P	
Accessory Uses								
Accessory apartment		X	A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Bed and breakfast (as accessory to a dwelling)		X	A	A	A	A	A	
Day care facility, small, as an accessory use		X	A	A	A	A	A	
Day care facility, large, as an accessory use		X	AC	AC	AC	AC	AC	
Drive-through service		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Home occupation		X	A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Parking facility, as an accessory use		X	A	A	A	A	A	
Recreation facility, as an accessory use		A	A	A	A	A	A	
Renewable energy generating facility, as an accessory use		X	A*	A*	A*	A*	A*	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Temporary Uses								
Garage and yard sales		X	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Outdoor sales		X	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	**Error! Reference source not**

Table 3.3: Permitted Use Table for Rural Base Districts[5]

P = Permitted C = Allowed Only with a Conditional Use Permit X = Prohibited
A = Allowed Only as an Accessory Use T = Allowed Only as a Temporary Use
* = Subject to Supplementary Use Standards

Land Use	NEW ZONE	RN[6]	RF	RR	RP1	RP2	RM	Supplementary Use Standards
	CURRENT ZONE	BCN	FF1, CR1	CR2	CP1, FF3	CP2	MU5	
								found.
Special event		CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	
Temporary construction office or yard		X	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Temporary movable storage container		X	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	**Error! Reference source not found.**
Temporary real estate sales office		X	T*	T*	T*	T*	T*	**Error! Reference source not found.**

Comparison of the Types of Housing that Can be Built Under the Current Brunswick Zoning Ordinance and the Proposed Zoning Ordinance

Leaving density the same as current ordinance/reducing lot size

DRAFT 4-1-15

All examples assume that if a single-family house or duplex is built, it will be the sole house on any individual lot (i.e. people will not put 2 or more houses or duplexes on a single lot, even though that is technically possible)

Conclusions are in Red after title on each page

Proposed Zoning Ordinance

R- 1 and 8 (No changes proposed)

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	10,000 sq. ft.	10,000 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	3	3
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	14,520 sq. ft.	14,520 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Not Permitted	Not Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (10,000)	Proposed Minimum (10,000)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	0 *	0 *	1	3	6
Single Family Proposed (unchanged)	0 *	0 *	1	3	6
Duplex Currently	0	0	0	1 duplex	3 duplex
Duplex Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	0	1 duplex	3 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-family Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	0	0	0

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Proposed Zoning Ordinance

More Single Family than current

R-2

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	15,000 sq. ft.	7,500 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	5	5
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	8,712 sq. ft.	8,712 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Not Permitted	Not Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Minimum (15,000)	Proposed Minimum (7,500)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	1	0 *	1	2	5
Single Family Proposed	1	0 *	2 (1 more)	5 (3 more)	10 (5 more)
Duplex Currently	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	5 duplex
Duplex Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	5 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-family Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	0	0	0

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Proposed Zoning Ordinance

More Single Family than current

R-3, 4, 5

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	15,000 sq. ft.	7,500 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	5	5
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	8,712 sq. ft.	8,712 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (15,000)	Proposed Minimum (7,500)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	1	0 *	1	2	5
Single Family Proposed	1	0 *	2 (1 more)	5 (3 more)	10 (5 more)
Duplex Currently	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	5 duplex
Duplex Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	5 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 duplex	1 5-unit	1 10-unit
Multi-family Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	1 duplex	1 5-unit	1 10-unit

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Proposed Zoning Ordinance

More Single Family, fewer duplex or multi-family than current

R-6

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	12,000 sq. ft.	7,500 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	8	5
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	5,445 sq. ft.	8,712 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (12,000)	Proposed Minimum (7,500)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	1	0 *	1	3	7
Single Family Proposed	1	0 *	2 (1 more)	5 (2 more)	10 (3 more)
Duplex Currently	1	0	1 duplex	3 duplex	7 duplex
Duplex Proposed	0 (1 less)	0	1 duplex	2 duplex (1 less)	5 duplex (2 less)
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 4-unit	1 8-unit	1 16-unit
Multi-family Proposed	0	0	1 duplex (2 fewer units)	1 5-unit (3 fewer units)	1 10-unit (6 fewer units)

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lo

Proposed Zoning Ordinance

R-7 (No changes proposed)

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	10,000 sq. ft.	10,000 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	7	7
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	6,223 sq. ft.	6,223 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (10,000)	Proposed Minimum (10,000)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	1	1	2	4	8
Single Family Proposed (unchanged)	1	1	2	4	8
Duplex Currently	0	0	1 duplex	3 duplex	7 duplex
Duplex Proposed (unchanged)	0	1 duplex	1 duplex	3 duplex	7 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 3-unit	1 7-unit	1 14-unit
Multi-family Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	1 3-unit	1 7-unit	1 14-unit

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Proposed Zoning Ordinance

R- R - (No changes proposed)

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	4,000 sq. ft.	4,000 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	8	8
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	5,445 sq. ft.	5,445 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (4,000)	Proposed Minimum (4,000)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	0 *	0 *	4	8	16
Single Family Proposed (unchanged)	0 *	0 *	4	8	16
Duplex Currently	0	0	2 duplex	4 duplex	8 duplex
Duplex Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	2 duplex	4 duplex	8 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 4-unit	1 8-unit	1 16-unit
Multi-family Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	1 4-unit	1 8-unit	1 16-unit

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Proposed Zoning Ordinance

TR-1 (No changes proposed)

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	7,500 sq. ft.	7,500 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	10	10
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	4,356 sq. ft.	4,356 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (7,500)	Proposed Minimum (7,500)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq ft.
Single Family Currently	1	1	5	10	20
Single Family Proposed (unchanged)	1	1	5	10	20
Duplex Currently	0	0	2 duplex	5 duplex	10 duplex
Duplex Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	2 duplex	5 duplex	10 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 5-unit	1 10-unit	1 20-unit
Multi-family Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	1 5-unit	1 10-unit	1 20-unit

Proposed Zoning Ordinance

TR-2 (No changes proposed)

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	10,000 sq. ft.	10,000 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	4	4
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	10,890 sq. ft.	10,890 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size				
Type of Housing	Current Min (10,000)	Proposed Minimum (10,000)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	0 *	0 *	2	4	8
Single Family Proposed (unchanged)	0 *	0 *	2	4	8
Duplex Currently	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	4 duplex
Duplex Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	4 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 duplex	1 4-unit	1 8-unit
Multi-family Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	1 duplex	1 4-unit	1 8-unit

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Proposed Zoning Ordinance

No Changes to # of DUs that can be built

TR-3, 4, & 5

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	10,000 sq. ft.	7,500 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	5	5
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	8,712 sq. ft.	8,712 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (10,000)	Proposed Minimum (7,500)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	1	0 *	2	5	10
Single Family Proposed (unchanged)	1	0 *	2	5	10
Duplex Currently	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	5 duplex
Duplex Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	5 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 duplex	1 5-unit	1 10-unit
Multi-family Proposed (unchanged)	0	0	1 duplex	1 5-unit	1 10-unit

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Comparison of the Types of Housing that Can be Built Under Current Brunswick Zoning Ord. and Alternatives to the Proposed Zoning Ordinance

Alternative 1 –Some increased density/lot size same as proposed

[Conclusions After Title in Red]

DRAFT 4-1-14

All examples assume that if a single-family house or duplex is built, it will be the sole house on any individual lot (i.e. people will not put 2 or more houses or duplexes on a single lot, even though that is technically possible)

Alternative 1 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance

R- 1 and 8 (No alternative change from current proposed)

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	10,000 sq. ft.	10,000 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	3	3
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	14,520 sq. ft.	14,520 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Not Permitted	Not Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (10,000)	Proposed Minimum (10,000)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	0 *	0 *	1	3	6
Single Family Alt 1 (unchanged)	0 *	0 *	1	3	6
Duplex Currently	0	0	0	1 duplex	3 duplex
Duplex Alt 1 (unchanged)	0	0	0	1 duplex	3 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-family Alt 1 (unchanged)	0	0	0	0	0

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Alternative 1 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance
More single-family and duplex units than current

R-2

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	15,000 sq. ft.	7,500 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	5	6
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	8,712 sq. ft.	7,260 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Not Permitted	Not Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Minimum (15,000)	Proposed Minimum (7,500)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	1	0 *	1	2	5
Single Family Alt 1	2 (1 more)	1 (1 more)	2 (1 more)	5 (3 more)	11 (6 more)
Duplex Currently	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	5 duplex
Duplex Alt 1	1 (1 more)	0	1 duplex	3 duplex (1 more)	6 duplex (1 more)
Multi-family Currently	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-family Alt 1 (unchanged)	0	0	0	0	0

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Alternative 1 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance

More single family, duplex and multi-family units than current

R-3, 4, 5

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	15,000 sq. ft.	7,500 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	5	6
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	8,712 sq. ft.	7,260 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (15,000)	Proposed Minimum (7,500)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	1	0 *	1	2	5
Single Family Alt 1	2 (1 more)	1 (1 more)	2 (1 more)	5 (3 more)	11 (6 more)
Duplex Currently	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	5 duplex
Duplex Alt 1	1 (1 more)	0	3 duplex (2 more)	3 duplex (1 more)	6 duplex (1 more)
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 duplex	1 5-unit	1 10-unit
Multi-family Alt 1	1 duplex (1 more)	0	1 3-unit (1 more unit)	1 6-unit (1 more unit)	1 12-unit (2 more units)

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Alternative 1 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance
(More single family and duplex, fewer multi-family units than Proposed)

R-6

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	12,000 sq. ft.	7,500 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	8	6
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	5,445 sq. ft.	7,260 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (12,000)	Proposed Minimum (7,500)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	2	0 *	1	3	7
Single Family Alt 1	1	1 (1 more)	2 (1 more)	5 (2 more)	11 (4 more)
Duplex Currently	1	0	1 duplex	3 duplex	7 duplex
Duplex Alt 1	0	0	2 duplex (1 more)	5 duplex (2 more)	6 duplex (2 less)
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 4-unit	1 8-unit	1 16-unit
Multi-family Alt 1	0	0	1 3-unit (1 fewer units)	1 6-unit (2 fewer units)	1 12-unit (4 fewer units)

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Alternative 1 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance

R-7 (No alternative change proposed)

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	10,000 sq. ft.	10,000 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	7	7
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	6,223 sq. ft.	6,223 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (10,000)	Proposed Minimum (10,000)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq ft.
Single Family Currently	1	1	2	4	8
Single Family Alt 1 (unchanged)	1	1	2	4	8
Duplex Currently	0	0	1 duplex	3 duplex	7 duplex
Duplex Alt 1 (unchanged)	0	1 duplex	1 duplex	3 duplex	7 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 3-unit	1 7-unit	1 14-unit
Multi-family Alt 1 (unchanged)	0	0	1 3-unit	1 7-unit	1 14-unit

Alternative 1 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance

R- R (No alternative change proposed)

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	4,000 sq. ft.	4,000 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	8	8
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	5,445 sq. ft.	5,445 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (4,000)	Proposed Minimum (4,000)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	0 *	0 *	4	8	16
Single Family Alt 1 (unchanged)	0 *	0 *	4	8	16
Duplex Currently	0	0	2 duplex	4 duplex	8 duplex
Duplex Alt 1 (unchanged)	0	0	2 duplex	4 duplex	8 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 4-unit	1 8-unit	1 16-unit
Multi-family Alt 1 (unchanged)	0	0	1 4-unit	1 8-unit	1 16-unit

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Alternative 1 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance

TR-1 (No alternative change proposed)

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	7,500 sq. ft.	7,500 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	10	10
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	4,356 sq. ft.	4,356 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (7,500)	Proposed Minimum (7,500)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq ft.
Single Family Currently	1	1	2	5	11
Single Family Alt 1 (unchanged)	1	1	2	5	11
Duplex Currently	0	0	2 duplex	5 duplex	10 duplex
Duplex Alt 1 (unchanged)	0	0	2 duplex	5 duplex	10 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 5-unit	1 10-unit	1 20-unit
Multi-family Alt 1 (unchanged)	0	0	1 5-unit	1 10-unit	1 20-unit

Alternative 1 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance

TR-2 (No alternative change proposed)

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	10,000 sq. ft.	10,000 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	4	4
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	10,890 sq. ft.	10,890 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (10,000)	Proposed Minimum (10,000)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	0 *	0 *	2	4	8
Single Family Alt 1 (unchanged)	0 *	0 *	2	4	8
Duplex Currently	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	4 duplex
Duplex Alt 1 (unchanged)	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	4 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 duplex	1 4-unit	1 8-unit
Multi-family Alt 1 (unchanged)	0	0	1 duplex	1 4-unit	1 8-unit

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Alternative 1 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance
More single-family,units than proposed

TR-3, 4, & 5

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	10,000 sq. ft.	7,500 sq. ft.
Density (du per acre):	5	6
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	8,712 sq. ft.	7,260 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (10,000)	Proposed Minimum (7,500)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	1	0 *	2	4	8
Single Family Alt 1	1	1 (1 more)	3 (1 more)	6 (2 more)	12 (4 more)
Duplex Currently	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	4 duplex
Duplex Alt 1	0	0	1 duplex	3 duplex (1 more)	5 duplex (1 more)
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 duplex	1 5-unit	1 10-unit
Multi-family Alt 1	0	0	1 3-unit (1 more unit)	1 6-unit (1 more unit)	1 12-unit (2 more units)

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Comparison of the Types of Housing that Can be Built Under the Current Brunswick Zoning Ordinance and Alternatives to the Proposed Zoning Ordinance

Alternative 3 -increasing density from current ordinance/lot size eliminated

DRAFT 4-1-15

All examples assume that if a single-family house or duplex is built, it will be the sole house on any individual lot (i.e. people will not put 2 or more houses or duplexes on a single lot, even though that is technically possible)

[Conclusions After Title in Red]

Alternative 3 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance
(Same # of DUs can be built as current)

R- 1 and 8

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	10,000 sq. ft.	None
Density (du per acre):	3	3
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	14,520 sq. ft.	14,520 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Not Permitted	Not Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (10,000)	Alternative Density Factor Minimum (14,520)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	0 *	1	1	3	6
Single Family Alt. 3 (unchanged)	0 *	1	1	3	6
Duplex Currently	0	0	0	1 duplex	3 duplex
Duplex Alt. 3 (unchanged)	0	0	0	1 duplex	3 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-family Alt. 3 (unchanged)	0	0	0	0	0

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Alternative 3 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance
More single-family and duplex units than current

R-2

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	15,000 sq. ft.	None
Density (du per acre):	5	6
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	8,712 sq. ft.	7,260 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Not Permitted	Not Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Minimum (15,000)	Alternative Density Factor Minimum (7,260)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	1	0 *	1	2	5
Single Family Alt. 3	2 (1 more)	1 (1 more)	3 (2 more)	6 (4 more)	12 (7 more)
Duplex Currently	1 duplex	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	5 duplex
Duplex Alt. 3	1 duplex	0	1 duplex	3 duplex (1 more)	6 duplex (1 more)
Multi-family Currently	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-family Alt. 3 (unchanged)	0	0	0	0	0

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Alternative 3 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance

More single-family, duplexes, and multi-family units than current

R-3, 4, 5

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	15,000 sq. ft.	none
Density (du per acre):	5	6
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	8,712 sq. ft.	7,260 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size across				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (15,000)	Alternative Density Factor Minimum (7,260)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	1	0 *	1	2	5
Single Family Alt. 3	2 (1 more)	1 (1 more)	3 (2 more)	6 (4 more)	12 (7 more)
Duplex Currently	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	5 duplex
Duplex Alt. 3	1 (1 more)	0	1 duplex	3 duplex (1more)	6 duplex (2 more)
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 duplex	1 5-unit	1 12-unit
Multi-family Alt. 3	1 duplex (1 more)	0	1 3-unit (1 more unit)	1 6-unit (1 more unit)	1 12-unit (2 more units)

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Alternative 3 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance
(More single family, fewer duplex and multi-family units than Proposed)

R-6

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	12,000 sq. ft.	none
Density (du per acre):	8	6
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	5,445 sq. ft.	7,260 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (12,000)	Alternative Density Factor Minimum (7,260)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	1	0 *	1	3	7
Single Family Alt. 3	1	1 (1 more)	3 (2 more)	6 (3 more)	12 (5 more)
Duplex Currently	1	0	1 duplex	3 duplex	7 duplex
Duplex Alt. 3	1	0	1 duplex (1 less)	3 duplex	6 duplex (1 less)
Multi-family Currently	1 duplex	0	1 4-unit	1 8-unit	1 16-unit
Multi-family Alt. 3	0 (2 less units)	0	1 3-unit (1 fewer units)	1 6-unit (2 fewer units)	1 12-unit (4 fewer units)

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Alternative 3 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance

(Same # of DUs can be built as current)

R-7

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	10,000 sq. ft.	none
Density (du per acre):	7	7
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	6,223 sq. ft.	6,223 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (10,000)	Alternative Density Factor Minimum (6,223)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq ft.
Single Family Currently	1	1	3	7	14
Single Family Alt. 3 (unchanged)	1	1	3	7	14
Duplex Currently	0	0	1 duplex	3 duplex	7 duplex
Duplex Alt. 3 (unchanged)	0	0	1 duplex	3 duplex	7 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 3-unit	1 7-unit	1 14-unit
Multi-family Alt. 3 (unchanged)	0	0	1 3-unit	1 7-unit	1 14-unit

Alternative 3 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance
(Same # of DUs can be built as current)

R- R

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	4,000 sq. ft.	none
Density (du per acre):	8	8
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	5,445 sq. ft.	5,445 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (4,000)	Alternative Density Factor Minimum (5,445)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	0 *	1	4	8	16
Single Family Alt. (unchanged)	0 *	1	4	8	16
Duplex Currently	0	0	2 duplex	4 duplex	8 duplex
Duplex Alt. 3 (unchanged)	0	0	2 duplex	4 duplex	8 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 4-unit	1 8-unit	1 16-unit
Multi-family Alt. 3 (unchanged)	0	0	1 4-unit	1 8-unit	1 16-unit

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Alternative 3 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance

More single-family units than current

TR-1

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	7,500 sq. ft.	none
Density (du per acre):	10	10
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	4,356 sq. ft.	4,356 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (7,500)	Alternative Density Factor Minimum (4,356)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq ft.
Single Family Currently	1	0	2	5	11
Single Family Alt. 3	1	1 (1 more)	5 (3 more)	10 (5more)	20 (9 more)
Duplex Currently	0	0	2 duplex	5 duplex	10 duplex
Duplex Alt. 3 (unchanged)	0	0	2 duplex	5 duplex	10 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 5-unit	1 10-unit	1 20-unit
Multi-family Alt. 3 (unchanged)	0	0	1 5-unit	1 10-unit	1 20-unit

Alternative 3 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance
More single-family units than current

TR-2

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	10,000 sq. ft.	none
Density (du per acre):	4	4
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	10,890 sq. ft.	10,890 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (10,000)	Alternative Density Factor Minimum (10,890)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	0 *	0 *	2	4	8
Single Family Alt. 3	0 *	1 (1 more)	2	4	8
Duplex Currently	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	4 duplex
Duplex Alt. 3 (unchanged)	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	4 duplex
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 duplex	1 4-unit	1 8-unit
Multi-family Alt. 3 (inchanged)	0	0	1 duplex	1 4-unit	1 8-unit

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Alternative 3 to Proposed Zoning Ordinance

More single family, duplex, and multi-family units than current

TR-3, 4, & 5

	Current	Proposed
Minimum Lot Size:	10,000 sq. ft.	none
Density (du per acre):	5	6
Minimum Lot Area per dwelling unit required by density calculation:	8,712 sq. ft.	7,260 sq. ft.
Multifamily:	Permitted	Permitted

Number of each type of housing that can be built per size of lot:

	Lot Size (across)				
Type of Housing (below)	Current Min (10,000)	Alternative Density Factor Minimum (7,260)	½ acre 21,780 sq. ft.	1 acre 43,560 sq. ft.	2 acres 87,120 sq. ft.
Single Family Currently	1	0 *	2	5	10
Single Family Alt. 3	1	1 (1 more)	3 (1 more)	6 (1 more)	12 (2 more)
Duplex Currently	0	0	1 duplex	2 duplex	5 duplex
Duplex Alt. 3	0	0	1 duplex	3 duplex (1 more)	6 duplex (1 more)
Multi-family Currently	0	0	1 duplex	1 5-unit	1 10-unit
Multi-family Alt. 3	0	0	1 3-unit (1 more unit)	1 6-unit (1 more unit)	1 12-unit (2 more units)

* One single family OK if legally non-conforming (grandfathered) lot

Growth Area Dimensional AND DENSITY Standards –Staff Recommendations 4/1/15

Table 0: Dimensional AND DENSITY Standards for Growth Area Base Districts[1]

Standard	New Zone	GR1	GR2	GR3	GR4[2]	GR5	GR6	GR7	GR8	GR9	GM1	GM2	GM3	GM4[1]	GM5	GM6	GM7	GM8	GC1	GC2	GC3	GC4	GA	GI	GO	GN[2][3]
	Current Zone	R-R	R1 & 8	R2	R3, 4, 5, 6	R7	TR1	TR2	TR3 & 4	TR5	MU2	MU3 & 6	MU4 I1, I-4[4]	CC,MU1	HC1 & 2	TC1, 2, 3	I2,R-CMU	MUOZ	CU1, 2 & 3	CU5 & 6	CU4 & 7	CU/TC	R-AR	I2,I3 & R-B&TI	R-R&OS	BCN
Lot area, min. **FOR NONRESIDENTIAL USES** (1,000 square feet)		~~4~~[3]	~~10~~	~~7.5~~	~~7.5~~	~~10~~	~~7.5~~	~~10~~	~~7.5~~	~~7.5~~	~~7.5~~	~~10~~	~~7.5~~	~~7.5~~	~~7.5~~	~~n/a~~	~~n/a~~	~~30~~	~~7.5~~	~~10~~	~~10~~	~~4~~	~~n/a~~	~~7.5~~ [3]	~~n/a~~	[2]
Staff Change		**7,000 square feet**																								
Density, max. (dwelling units per acre of net site area)		8	3	5[4]	5[3]	7	10	4	5	5	5	10	10	15	5	n/a	24		12	24 [5]	10 [6]	24	n/a	n/a	n/a	[2]
DENSITY, MAX. FOR LOT SPLITS (DU'S PER ACRE)																										
Lot width, min. (feet)		40 [3]	65	75	75	100	65	65	65	65	60	65	75	60	75	n/a	n/a	150	65	65	65	40	50 [2]	50 [3]	n/a	[2]
Building frontage, min. (% of lot width)		80 [3]														75 [3,7]	80 [3]					n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	[2]
Building frontage, max. (% of lot width)		100 [3]														100	100					n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	[2]
STAFF CHANGE TO BUILDING FRONTAGE MIN AND MAX ***FOOTNOTE AS N/A TO PARK ROW																***										
Front yard **setback**, min. (feet)		n/a	15	20	20	15	15[8]	20	20	20	20	15	30	0	15	n/a	0	30	15	15	15	10	0	10 [3]	0	[2]
Build-to Zone (feet)		5[3]												[9]		0-5 [10]	5[3]					n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	[2]

[1] Where the consolidated districts apply different standards, the proposed standards is shaded in blue. Where we propose to change the current standard (other than through consolidation rules), the proposed designation is shaded in magenta.

[2] This also consolidates the Growth Area part of the CR2 District.

[3] This district includes only those BCN lands located in the Growth Area.

[4] This also consolidates the Growth Area part of the MU1 District.

Table 0: Dimensional AND DENSITY Standards for Growth Area Base Districts[1]

Standard	New Zone	GR1	GR2	GR3	GR4[2]	GR5	GR6	GR7	GR8	GR9	GM1	GM2	GM3	GM4[1]	GM5	GM6	GM7	GM8	GC1	GC2	GC3	GC4	GA	GI	GO	GN[2]3
	Current Zone	R-R	R1 & 8	R2	R3, 4, 5, 6	R7	TR1	TR2	TR3 & 4	TR5	MU2	MU3 & 6	MU4 I1, I-4[4]	CC,MU1	HC1 & 2	TC1, 2, 3	I2,R-CMU	MUOZ	CU1, 2 & 3	CU5 & 6	CU4 & 7	CU/TC	R-AR	I2,I3 & R-B&TI	R-R&OS	BCN
Rear yard **setback**, min. (feet)		0	20	20	20	20	15[8]	20	20	20	20	20	30	15	15	n/a	0	30	15	15	15	10	20	20 [3]	20 [3]	[2]
Side yard **setback,** min. (feet)		0	15	15	15	15	15[8]	15	15	15	15	15	15	0	20	n/a	0	30	15	15	15	10	15	15 [3]	10 [3]	[2]
Impervious surface coverage, max. (% of lot area)		100 [3]	30	35	35	30	50[8]	35	35	35	75	50	60	80 [11]	70	100 [12]	100	50	60	50	50	50	80 [2]	80 [3]	10 [3]	[2]
Building height, min. (stories/feet) – both minimums apply[13]		2/ 24														2/ 24 [14]	2/ 24					n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	[2]
Building height, max. (stories/feet or feet) – both maximums apply[15,16]		4/ 50	35	35	35	35	35[8]	35	35	35	40	35	60	40	45	40 [17]	4/ 50	40	70	45	~~n/a~~	70	100	60	35	[2]
STAFF CHANGE																					**35**					
Building footprint per structure, max. (1,000 square feet)		20 [3]	5 [18]	5 [18]	5 [18, 19]	5 [18, 19]	7.5 [8]	5	5	5	20	5 [19]	n/a	50 [20]	20	n/a	n/a		~~30 [19]~~	10	20 [20]	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	[2]
STAFF CHANGE FOOTNOTE TO LIMIT FOOTPRINT TO 5,000 SF FOR FORMER CU4 AREA																			**N/A**		***					

NOTES:

[1] All new, enlarged, or redeveloped buildings and additions in the GM4 District subject to Development Review shall also be consistent with the Cook's Corner Design Standards, unless such design standards are waived in accordance with Section **Error! Reference source not found.** (**Error! Reference source not found.**).

[2] See Section **Error! Reference source not found.** (**Error! Reference source not found.**) for alternative standards applicable in the GN District.

~~**[3] Not applicable to buildings or structures that are part of and in conformance with a Common Development Plan approved by the Planning Board in accordance with Section** Error! Reference source not found.**).**~~ **STAFF COMMENT: AS CDP IS RECOMMENDED TO BE APPLICABLE THROUGHOUT GROWTH AREA, FOOTNOTE SHOULD APPLY TO ENTIRE GROWTH AREA TABLE.**

[4] 1 du per ~~**30,000**~~ **20,000** sf of net site area for developments using subsurface wastewater disposal systems.

[5] Except that lands north of Bath Road shall be limited to 8 du/ac.

Table 0: Dimensional AND DENSITY Standards for Growth Area Base Districts[1]																											
Standard	New Zone	GR1	GR2	GR3	GR4[2]	GR5	GR6	GR7	GR8	GR9	GM1	GM2	GM3	GM4[1]	GM5	GM6	GM7	GM8	GC1	GC2	GC3	GC4	GA	GI	GO	GN [2]3
	Current Zone	R-R	R1 & 8	R2	R3, 4, 5, 6	R7	TR1	TR2	TR3 & 4	TR5	MU2	MU3 & 6	MU4 I1, I-4[4]	CC,MU1	HC1 & 2	TC1, 2, 3	I2,R-CMU	MUOZ	CU1, 2 & 3	CU5 & 6	CU4 & 7	CU/TC	R-AR	I2,I3 & R-B&TI	R-R&OS	BCN

[6] Except that parcels between South Street and Grove Street shall be limited to 5 du/ac.
[7] Applicable only to the first floor of buildings along Maine Street.
~~**[8] Except for lots fronting Pleasant Street, where minimum front, side and rear yard depth shall be 10 feet, maximum lot coverage shall be 80%, maximum height is 45 feet, and there is no maximum building footprint.**~~
[9] See Cook's Corner Design Standards for maximum front yard **setback** applicable along Bath Rd., Gurnet Rd., proposed Perimeter Rd, Thomas Rd., and all public and private connector roads.
[10] Applicable only to the first floor of buildings along Maine Street. For all other buildings in the GM6 District, the build-to zone shall be determined by the range of front yard depths of principal buildings on the nearest occupied lots on either side on the same block face.
[11] Limited to 50% impervious coverage and maximum building footprint of 20,000 sq. ft. north of Route 1.
[12] Except that parcels adjacent to Park Row shall have a maximum lot coverage of 45%.
[13] Where minimum building height is expressed in stories or feet, both minimums shall apply.
[14] Minimum height is triggered if floor area is being increased by 50%, and must be met at front lot line.
[15] Where maximum building height is expressed in stories and feet, both maximums shall apply.
[16] Unless restricted to a lower height by Flight Path Overlay (FPO) District regulations (see Section **Error! Reference source not found.**).
[17] Except that lands north of U.S. Highway 1 shall have a maximum building height of 60 ft.
[18] May be increased to up to 30,000 square feet for single-family dwellings that constitute a community living arrangement under 30-A M.R.S.A § 4357-A, with a Conditional Use Permit approved in accordance with Section **Error! Reference source not found.** (**Error! Reference source not found.**).
[19] 10,000 square feet for multifamily dwellings.
[20] 250,000 square feet if the structure meets one of the conditions listed in Section **Error! Reference source not found.**.
STAFF CHANGE: ADDRESS FOOTPRINTS OVER 10,000 SF IN GR/GM DISTRICTS (REQUIRE CONDITIONAL USES)?

Rural Area Dimensional Standards

Table 4.1.3: Dimensional AND DENSITY Standards Table for Rural Base Districts[5]							
Standard	New Zone	RN [1]	RF	RR	RP1	RP2	RM
	Current Zone	BCN[6]	FF1, CR1	CR2	CP1, FF3	CP2	MU5
Minimum Lot Area	Residential	[1]	2 ac	1.5 ac	~~2 ac~~	20,000 sf	2 ac
	STAFF CHANGE				**20,000 sf**		
	Nonresidential				4 ac [1]	4 acres[2]	
Maximum Density	Developments subject to Development Review	[1]	1 du per 2 ac	1 du per 1.5 ac	1 du per 4 ac	1 du per 4 ac	1 du per 2 ac
	Developments not subject to Development Review				1 du per 5 ac	1 du per 5 ac	
Lot width, min. (feet)		[1]	150	150	~~150~~	125	150
STAFF CHANGE					**125**		
Front yard, max. (feet)		[1]	25	25	30	30	25

[5] Where the consolidated districts apply different standards, the proposed standards is shaded in blue. Where we propose to change the current standard (other than through consolidation rules), the proposed designation is shaded in magenta.
[6] This district includes only those BCN lands located in the Rural Area.

Table 4.1.3: Dimensional AND DENSITY Standards Table for Rural Base Districts[5]							
Standard	New Zone	RN [1]	RF	RR	RP1	RP2	RM
	Current Zone	BCN[6]	FF1, CR1	CR2	CP1, FF3	CP2	MU5
Rear yard, min. (feet)		[1]	30	30	30	30	30
Side yard, min. (feet)		[1]	30	30	~~30~~	25	30
STAFF CHANGE					**25**		
Impervious surface coverage, max. (% of lot area)		[1]	20%	20%	~~25%~~	Lesser of 40% or 21,780 sf	25%
STAFF CHANGE					**LESSER OF 35% OR 10,890 sf**		
New lawn area for wooded sites (1,000 square feet)		[1]			20	20	
Building height, max. (stories/feet or feet)[3]			40	40	40	40	40
Building footprint per structure, max. (1,000 square feet)			10	10	10	10	10

NOTES: ac = acre(s) sf = square feet

[1] See Section **Error! Reference source not found.**, **Error! Reference source not found.**, for alternative standards applicable in the RN District.

[2] 20,000 sf for lots created by the division of a lot existing on November 6, 2001, and having an area of at least 3.5 ac but less than 7 ac, into two lots.

[3] 20,000 sf for lots created by the division of a lot existing on October 9, 1991, and having an area of at least 160,000 sf, but less than 10 ac, into two lots.

	Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
58	12/30	3.2 Use Table; 4.1 Dimensional Standards	Many residents on Katherine Street not happy with the rezoning of our area and going from Growth Residential to Mixed Growth. Yes, we know that are already business in our immediate area, however, our concern is there will be even more as you are trying to address the "hole in the donut" on Water Street. That, and our not having any say in what goes where. Seeing more and more multi-family housing. Trying to improve upon the area.		TR3 (Water St. neighborhood) and TR4 (Jordan Ave. neighborhood) are proposed to be combined to form GR8 District. Very little changes in existing uses since both districts are very similar in permitted uses presently. Minimum lot size is proposed to decrease from 10,000 sq. ft. to 7,500 sq. ft. with no other changes in dimensional standards. GM3 is proposed as a replacement for the existing I1 District (Industry Road Industrial District), maintaining the existing district boundaries. In summary, the residentially areas will continue to be zoned residential. The Industrial District will now become a Mixed Use District, more compatible with the surrounding residential areas.	1/8: ZORC agreed.
59	12/31	3.2 Use Table	Under GC1, aviation operations, aviation-related businesses and ultra-light airpark should be removed as Conditional Uses. Incompatible with adjoining residential uses.		Agree that aviation operations, aviation-related businesses and ultra-light airpark should be removed as Conditional Uses within GC1, as well as GC2 and GC3. In reviewing this request, it became apparent that helipads as a use were combined with aviation operations. Based on staff's recent experience with the siting of helipads within the medical use overlay, they should be treated as a separate and continue to be permitted as an accessory use with neighborhood protections. ZORC should consider this approach as well as consider permitting helipads in GC1 district also with neighborhood protections.	1/8: ZORC recommended deletion of aviation operations, aviation-related businesses and ultra-light airpark as Conditional Uses within all Growth College Districts. Further recommended permitting such uses in the GA District, and as an accessory use limited to helipads in GM8.

*Date comment added to table.

	Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
60 61	**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 for CU6 which is inconsistent with the use table. (Bowdoin August 19 memo to ZORC.)		See earlier response regarding Residence Hall use. Staff to do.	12/17: For further discussion by ZORC on 1/8/15. 1/8: For zoning purposes, Bowdoin-designated residence halls will be allowed where permitted, as either multi-family dwelling units or residence hall per ordinance definition.
62	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.		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.	11/5: Agreed. Delete as accessory use. 11/5: Agreed. Staff to review and revise text accordingly.

*Date comment added to table.

	Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
63			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)			
64	10/23	3.2 Use Table	Office – this use is now prohibited in GC2. Please note that several college offices are located in the proposed GC2 district, such as Rhodes Hall and Ham House. Prohibition of this use in this area would be very problematic for the College. (See August 19, 2014 memo to ZORC).	Recommend Office be a Permitted Use in GC2 with any existing exceptions/notes attached.		11/5: Agreed.
65			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.		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.	11/5: Agreed.

*Date comment added to table.

	Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
66	10/23	3.2 Use Table	Car Wash, Outdoor Sales, Special Events – see previous notes 5, 13 and 17.		See earlier response.	
67	12/15	3.4 Supplementary Use Standards	Request made to keep all neighborhood protections contained in existing Section 204.3 (CU Districts).		Staff recommends reviewing all of Section 204.3 in present neighborhood context and include those still applicable in proposed Section 3.4 as supplementary use standards. It is also recommended that in a map of existing CU Districts in included as an appendix with geographic reference made to such standards. Setbacks will be confirmed upon receipt of existing residence hall setbacks from Bowdoin.	12/17: ZORC agreed to include map referencing existing CU Districts within an appendix in final ordinance.
68 69 70 71	10/23	3.4.1.B.2. Supplementary Use Standards 3-18	Typo – Longfellow Street should be Longfellow Avenue.		See earlier response.	
72	11/13	3.4.1.G.	Do we really want to allow Adult Entertainment Establishments? Can we ban it altogether?		Currently permitted in Highway Commercial Districts with restrictions and is recommended to remain permitted with same restrictions in GM5 (now HC1 and 2). Discuss with Clarion.	11/20: As advised by Clarion, must allow for use (1st Amendment, Freedom of Speech). Clarion to revise definitions.

*Date comment added to table.

	Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
73	**1/23**	**3.2 Use Table**	**It is being proposed that manufacturing be a conditional use in the proposed GM3 District. As all are well aware, the Cooper Wire (CWD) property is part of the first Brunswick Industrial Park established in the early '60's. Soon after that, Route 1 bypass was constructed which bisected the industrial park, creating two industrial areas..one at the location of the public works garage and former Times Record location, and the other where the CWD building is located. Both areas are currently zoned I-1 which, as would be expected, allows for both small scale and large scale manufacturing use. Under the proposed ordinance, any industrial use would be conditional, not permitted, which would unnecessarily complicate the sale and leasing of the property.**		**Staff agrees that the original industrial park has been bisected by Route 1. Although identified as and Industry District, the use make-up has been one of mixed use, including residential uses. As the river's health has improved, the Water Street side of the I-1 area has become more attractive as waterfront residential properties. few industrial uses remain to the north of Route 1. South of the Route 1 is CDW and Knights of Columbus facility, all surrounded by residential districts. It is recommended that manufacturing as a permitted use be limited to the south side of Route 1 within the proposed GM3 District.**	

*Date comment added to table.

	Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
74	**1/13**	**3.4.1.U.**	**When inquiring about safeguards with regard to Small Wind Energy Systems (SWES), the response was an acknowledgement of the adverse impacts inherent in the systems and assurances that language will be worked into future updates of the new ordinance. This technology is not so new as to disregard those negative impacts at this time and provide guidelines as to how a property owner can install these systems in a conscientious and non-invasive manner, Any such application done before regulations are in place will lead to an installation that is grandfathered; with those who are negatively impacted by the installation no recourse to require modification.**		**The included SWES provisions were well researched and developed in 2009 by then Town Planner, Kris Hultgren. Careful consideration was given to the placement of much smaller scale systems in the growth area to minimize any negative impacts. Since adopted, the only SWES was installed in 2010 outside the growth area with no complaints expressed. Staff recommends that the provisions as stated be considered as accessory to a principal residential or nonresidential use. Staff also requests additional standards be developed by Clarion for any renewable energy generating facility as a principal use, such as the recently approved solar array facility on Bowdoin owned lands and added to this section.**	**1/15: ZORC agreed with staff recommendation. Additionally noted that this section needs to address renewable energy systems as a primary use including required setbacks and maximum impervious coverage. Requested staff/Clarion research updated standards/best practices developed since the existing ordinance provisions were developed in 2009, including but not limited to reflective light and noise.**
75	11/13	3.4.2.A.5. and 3.4.2.C.4.	Does this violate fire and safety code?		No change from existing ordinance. This provision was originally included in order to restrict changes to existing facades of single-family dwellings to accommodate accessory apartments. This restriction does not violate fire or life safety codes.	11/20: ZORC agreed.

*Date comment added to table.

	Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
81			**d. GR7 and GR8 dimensions are the same, but lower for GR6, for front year depth and rear yard depth. Why?**		**d. No proposed changes in front or rear yard depths from existing standards.**	
82	11/17	Table 4.1.2, footnote [20]	Please explain "250,000 sf if the structure meets one of the conditions listed in Section 4.1.4.B.9." Maximum building footprint in GM4 is 250,000sf, if meets one of …a. through g. What can go in? What are the boundaries of GM4, difficult to see on map.		GM4 is current Cooks Corner District and allows for a mix of higher density residential (15 dwelling units/acre) and large-scale non-residential development, including "big box" retail. Maximum building footprint is 50,000 sf unless one of conditions listed in Section 4.1.4.B.9 is met. All conditions are presently listed in the existing zoning ordinance. No changes are proposed.	11/20: ZORC agreed.
83	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.		

*Date comment added to table.

	Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
84 85	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 Brecken Streets, and Atwood Lane (B), and 125 feet along the northern boundary of Meadowbrook Road (A). Since the College now owns, and has developed the property along 'boundary D', we believe the 50 foot setback requirement is no longer necessary. The College also does not object to the prohibition on the construction of new roads connecting to Meadowbrook Road, Whittier, Berry and Bowdoin Streets, Atwood Lane and Brecken Road from GC1.	Please include all additional setbacks in interim draft. Please include prohibition in interim draft.	Agree. Boundary "D" no longer exists.	11/5: Agreed. 12/17: To be part of college setbacks discussion on 1/8/15. 1/8: ZORC recommended use of sliding scale to control height of structures for parcels abutting residential uses and include in neighborhood protection standards. In addition, incorporate existing Sec. 204.3.G. into neighborhood protection standards.
86	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.	11/5: Agreed.

*Date comment added to table.

	Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
87	10/23	Table 4.1.2	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. 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.	11/5: Agreed to keep 5000 SF footprint. Revise density for current CU7 area to agreed upon density of 10 units/acre.
88	**12/30**	**Table 4.1.2. Dimensional Standards**	**Regarding Footnote [8], this specialized control of inner Pleasant Street should be removed, allowing that section of Pleasant Street to remain, as it should, a part of GR6 - the Northwest Brunswick Neighborhood. The footnote, which reads "Except for lots fronting Pleasant Street, where minimum front, side and rear yard depth shall be 10 feet, maximum lot coverage shall be 80%, maximum height is 45 ft., and there is no maximum building footprint" establishes a marked difference between that section of Pleasant and the rest of the neighborhood, and I, along with all neighbors to whom I have spoken. am opposed to that change. Neighborhood Protection Standards should be followed and applied uniformly to this neighborhood. If the section**		**Please note a portion of Footnote [8], the elimination of maximum building footprint standard, was in error. The remaining dimensional standards were proposed to allow for additions to existing homes. The majority of residences along Pleasant Street lack the required side yard setback of 15 feet. The proposed 10 feet side setback will help bring several properties in conformity. Another way of handling the situation is to require a required distance between structures instead of from property lines. Impervious coverage exceeding the maximum of 50% is also an existing issue and is still recommended to be increased. It is further recommended that a maximum of 10,000 sq. ft. building footprints be permitted for civic and religious uses. For further discussion by ZORC.**	**1/8: ZORC recommended keeping the existing 7,500 square foot footprint standard with further discussion regarding reduced setbacks/increased impervious coverage in at least what are now existing TR districts as part of a broader discussion on dimensional standards during 1/29 work session. Staff to check with Public Works as to any affect such changes would have on storm water drainage.** **1/16 (From VRB): VRB concerned about scale of development that might be permitted on inner Pleasant and determined to remain vigilant on this issue during the rewrite process.**

*Date comment added to table.

	Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
89			**of Pleasant between Union and Stanwood is allowed to be separated from the rest of GR6, then that uniformity and cohesiveness will be lost. There are plenty of commercial options as well a possibilities for more density on outer Pleasant and between Union and Maine. The section of Pleasant from Stanwood to Union should stay intact.**			
90	1/13	Table 4.1.2. Dimensional Standards	Additional comment concerning increasing intensity of use along inner Pleasant Street; changes are designed to allow for more commercial development.		See previous staff recommendation. In addition, no change in permitted uses is proposed.	See previous ZORC response and additional follow-up work to be completed by staff.
91	**1/21**	**Table 4.1.2. Dimensional Standards**	**From VRB (1/16): Consider setting front setbacks as what is an existing average setback within the block for in-fill development in established neighborhoods.**		**Staff agrees with recommendation.**	**1/22: ZORC agreed with additional recommendation for staff to draft language using existing Section 305.1 as basis, to allow for a prevailing setbacks for purposes of reducing front setbacks.**

*Date comment added to table.

	Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
92	11/21	Table 4.1.2. Dimensional Standards	Assisted/Congregate Living Facility is a permitted use in the GR zones but some of the dimensional standards are not adequate for this use. As an example, the Thornton Oaks assisted living facility is 40 ft. tall and has a footprint of about 58,000 sq.ft. The proposed building height is 35 ft. and it appears the maximum footprint would only be 5,000 sq.ft. (footnote #18 allows a 30,000 sq.ft. footprint but only for buildings that constitute a community living arrangement…" but not typical assisted living facilities.) Suggestion – Increase height to 40 ft. and footprint to 30,000 sq.ft. for Assisted/Congregate Living Facility in GR zones.		Further discussion needed with Clarion and ZORC. The maximum footprint in GR districts of 5,000 sf (7,500 – GR6) may be problematic for other permitted nonresidential uses as well as multi-family dwellings.	
93	12/12	Table 4.1.2. Dimensional Standards	Staff Comment: Review uses in the context of footprint limitations to determine ability to actually site uses in the district.		See comment above. Question: Should we allow permitted uses with larger footprints or height by conditional use permit?	12/3: ZORC requested verification of applicability for footnote (19) for districts permitted multi-family residential uses. Disagreed with allowing a 10%-15% increase in footprint and height by right since can already do so through the use of administrative adjustment standards. Recommended anything over 10,000 square feet in footprint would require a conditional use permit.
94	12/31	Table 4.1.2. Dimensional Standards	Agree with changing minimum lot size downward to 7500 sq. ft. in many of the growth zones. This flexibility is necessary for future development with will undoubtedly contain smaller homes. I believe development patterns are going to change for several reasons including higher energy costs.		Supportive of smaller lot sizes.	1/8: ZORC agreed.

*Date comment added to table.

	Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
95	12/15	Table 4.1.3. Dimensional Standards for Rural Base Districts	Proposed maximum impervious area in RP1 is 25% which must have got carried over from FF3 in consolidation. It used to be the lesser of 35%or 10,890 sq.ft. in CP1. There are many small lots in CP1 that need the "floor" of 10, 890 sq.ft. (1/4 acre) to accomplish reasonable expansions considering all gravel, decks, roads and buildings are deemed impervious. This was studied by the Coastal Protection zone Committee. (The "floor" of 21, 780 sq.ft. was carried over in the consolidation to create RP2. Suggestion - Leave the requirement the same as it was in the CP1. The lesser of 10,890 sq.ft. or 35%.		This needed revision was already noted by ZORC, in addition to the need to maintaining existing CP1 lot area (20,000 sq.ft. for residential uses, 4 acres for nonresidential uses) for proposed RP1. Staff recommends these changes.	12/17: ZORC agreed. Existing CP1 Standards are recommended for replacement of existing FF3 district.
96	11/21	4.1.4.A. Calculation of Net Site Area	I am in receipt of a letter from the Department of Island Fisheries and Wildlife to Planning Staff regarding Deer Wintering Areas. This letter indicates the state provided data to towns relative to Deer Wintering Areas for general planning purposes and was “not meant to be used for regulatory purposes” and the boundary surveys “may have occurred decades ago.” Suggestion – Given the essence of the letter, these Deer Wintering Areas should not be part of the ordinance and certainly not part of the formula to determine Net Site Area.		Staff recommends leaving language as is. Only references "high or moderate value" deer wintering areas being subtracted from the parcel in calculating net site area per IF&W. Presently Brunswick does not have any high or moderate value deer wintering areas but should that change, an amendment to the zoning ordinance would not be necessary.	12/17: ZORC recommended removal of reference to "high or moderate value" deer wintering areas. Also revise Section 4.1.4.A.6., deleting words "whether or not mapped". ZORC also requested staff input regarding keeping "proposed right-of-way" when calculating net site area, as stated in Section 4.1.4.A.4.

*Date comment added to table.

	Date Added*	Section Reference	Comment	Staff Recommendations for Clarion follow-up	Staff Recommendation for ZORC Consideration	ZORC Responses
97	**1/21**	**4.1.4.C.4.a.i.**	**From Conservation Commission: " The land set aside as conserved open space" is all unbuildable, already protected land. Why are we rewarding with potential density bonuses for setting aside unbuildable land? Should be additional developable land offered to be set aside that would generate bonus densities. Perhaps separate criteria should be developed, as some protected areas (stands of mature trees, areas of rare plant communities, indeterminate deer winter habitat) could be developed. Others - wetlands, shoreland zoning, steep slopes. Unbuildable land (steep slopes, vernal pools, etc.), should not be used to satisfy open space requirements.**			**1/15: ZORC agreed. Will review section and compare to those lands subtracted from parcels to determine net site area (4.1.4.A.). For further discussion by ZORC.**
98	**1/21**	**4.1.4.C.4.a.iii.**	**From Conservation Commission: This language should be put up front and be strengthened or be more explicit that acceptance of unconnected strips of land is less desirable to Town.**			**1/15: ZORC agreed.** **1/22: Deferred discussion until 1/27.**

*Date comment added to table.

VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD WORKSHOP for the ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE
January 16, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Emily Swan, Laura Lienert, Connie Lundquist, Gary Massanek and Karen Topp

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice Chair Brooks Stoddard

ALSO PRESENT: Charlie Frizzle, Chair of the Planning Board and the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee

STAFF PRESENT: Anna Breinich, Director of Planning & Development

CONSULTANT PRESENT: Don Elliott and partner Matt Goebel from Clarion Associates via ZOOM

A Village Review Board workshop was held on Friday, January 16, 2015, at the Town Hall at 85 Union Street in Room 206. The Village Review Board will be discussing the parts of the proposed draft zoning ordinance related to the Village Review Zone, with the principal task being to clarify some of the issues raised at their last workshop. Mr. Frizzle and Ms. Breinich of the Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee are present to answer questions about the proposed rewrite.

<u>Continue Review of Public Draft Zoning Ordinance Comments Related to the Village Review Overlay:</u>

- **Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation:**

  Ms. Breinich introduced Matt Goebel from Clarion to be present as their Historic Preservation expert with respect to the zoning work Clarion is completing, as well as the work other communities are doing when it comes to implementation of the use of the Secretary's standards. Ms. Breinich asked if he could be available to answer questions from the Board, in particular the questions raised about the utilization of the standards when Brunswick has design guidelines, which are based on the standards, but do not go as far as requirements because they are guidelines.
  Mr. Goebel outlined his experience with various communities' historic preservation ordinances and how local standards relate to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines. Based on the work he's done, he's seen a full range of examples of relating locally tailored standards to the Federal standards. From their perspective, the Federal standards and guidelines are a good source of guiding philosophy and a good articulation of general principles, but often don't provide enough guidance at the local level to help with day to day decision making. They are typically a source of guiding principles that are supplemented at the local level. It is also important to know the distinction between standards and guidelines. From a zoning perspective, standards are mandatory and guidelines are voluntary. The Federal Secretary of the Interior also has something called standards vs. guidelines, but those

standards are only mandatory for projects where federal money is involved. If one looks at the Secretary of the Interior's standards as general guidance, that doesn't mean they are mandatory standards for someone in Brunswick.
Ms. Swan read aloud general standards from the current ordinance and said there had been comments from the public asking if they refer to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, aren't they subjecting people to standards; things that must be met that aren't just guidelines, but when the standards language is read it is really not saying that this or that must be done. Mr. Frizzle added that the language says you are consulting them for guidance. Ms. Swan feels the use of the word *"standards"* is misleading. Mr. Goebel agreed that the language can be confusing because of the word *"standards"*, and that the document is not going to answer every question or provide the specific guidance that the decision-makers need every time. That's why some communities have tried to narrow the language down and make it more specific over time. Mr. Elliott responded that there is nothing in the language that says someone shall follow the guidelines; if they want to make it more specific or restrictive, they can.
Ms. Lienert doesn't see the issue as standards vs. guidelines, but the way attention is paid to the guidelines by the Board, where sometimes it is better to get the property renovated than to insure strict adherence to guidelines.
Jane Millett, 10 Franklin Parkway, asked if standards were required if an individual street or property was listed on the national historic registry. Ms. Swan replied they do not meet the threshold for mandatory standards, and Mr. Goebel agreed that just being on the historic registry does not confer any special standards, but may then be eligible for certain tax credits. Ms. Breinich stated that if they received the tax credits, they would then have to comply, and Mr. Goebel agreed, but only if that tax credit comes into play.
Alison Harris thinks what is challenging for the VRB is the dual mandate of protecting and preserving the architectural context and historical integrity of downtown neighbors but also being charged with not stifling change or forcing modern recreations of historic styles. It is challenging to bring that into balance, and it becomes interesting with the renovations of her house in this district. She was able to do most of what she wanted, but it was important to have a Board who understood her desire to make her house comfortable and livable for her family and not a historic recreation, but at the same time keeping up the standards of the neighborhood.
Ms. Swan would like to come to a conclusion on the language for the purposes of the ordinance. She likes their current guidelines, the way they are set up, and the fact that they are Brunswick-specific, but they are informed by the other standards and need updating, expanding and improving. Their main purpose is to help people plan their projects and for people, and the Board, to refer to. There may be no change in regards to the zoning rewrite, but the Board may want to articulate reasons for deviation from the guidelines in cases where it seems like the Board is being inconsistent. Ms. Lienert asked if they were leaving it up to the subjectivity of the Board, and believes if they're not going to change the language, then maybe the Board needs to decide on some level how they are guided. Ms. Swan believed the Board could try to uphold their guidelines unless there is a particular reason it cannot be done, and if that was reasonable. Ms. Lundquist believes the language should state that the Board *"shall"* obtain additional guidance, and if they do not follow it, than they need to state their reasons. Ms. Breinich stated that guidelines cannot be required, and said language stating the applicant and the Board in

the review could both obtain guidance from the general standards. Ms. Breinich reminded the Board that they do have their own design guidelines, which are informed by the Secretary's Standards, and perhaps that's how it's reworded, rather than refer to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the Village Review Board's Design Guidelines. They could add that *"additional guidance from our design guidelines informed by…"* Mr. Goebel responded that the federal work should form the basis of your criteria locally, but they do not need to substitute for local decisions. Ms. Swan asked Mr. Goebel if he had any model ordinance language to say that both the applicant is aided by these guidelines and the Board is guided by them, but to have a more formal way to articulate deviations. Mr. Goebel questioned the amount of survey work that has been done on these historic properties to determine their relative significance, and if some have more architectural integrity than other similar properties, because those are the type of factors that should help the Board in their decision making, and in figuring out how stringent they need to be or what allowances can be made for deviations from the standard. Ms. Breinich is wary of mandating standards for the historic register properties because that may prevent people from listing properties on the National Historic Register, and Ms. Swan agrees. Ms. Lienert stated that she previously shared language with the Board regarding demolition guidelines more specific than what is used currently. Mr. Massanek believes that beyond some minor language changes today, the Board should be getting into the design guidelines and discussing why there is a differential between what we have and what the Secretary's guidelines have. Mr. Goebel agreed that the language currently in the ordinance sounds like it's sufficiently flexible, either with the *may* or the *shall*, to get people to look at the federal guidance but not to feel entirely constrained by it. He said what they need to do now is to look closely at the design guidelines and try to think through the local priorities and the direction to go in, but this should all be done outside the ordinance. The consensus of the Board is that they agree with the language change for the ordinance, and they will be discussing their design guidelines in the future.

- The Board discussed comments and questions with Mr. Frizzle and Ms. Breinich. Ms. Lienert had questions about artisan industry, esplanades, the proposed front and side yard setbacks and the maximum building footprint for properties along Pleasant Street, which Mr. Frizzle and Ms. Breinich answered. Ms. Breinich also reminded the Board that ZORC meetings and meeting summaries are available on the Town website. Many zoning questions have been answered, and discussions have occurred which may give them more information. Mr. Frizzle talked an approach to setbacks in other zoning ordinances that Brunswick may want to consider, which maintains street standards but allows flexibility, to which the Board voiced approval. The Board also remains concerned about the maximum footprint in the downtown district. The Board discussed the expansion of the current Village Review Zone. Ms. Lienert asked about natural boundaries and extending the zone. Mr. Frizzle believed there was a level of support for the proposed expansion because of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Frizzle stated that he had no problems with whatever the Board wanted to recommend for expansion of the zone, but wanted them to be aware it was a political issue, and he didn't want that to undermine the acceptance of the proposed zoning ordinance. Ms. Breinich explained there was never any formal study or analysis when the area of the Village Review Zone was adopted, and any changing of the boundaries going forward should include such a study as evidence they should go forward. It would not currently be consistent with the

Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Lienert mentioned that they have a study from the '80's, and will share a copy of that with Ms. Breinich, because an update of that study could be used for future boundaries. The Board discussed Ms. Swan's comments related to parking, including a revision related to demolition and side parking lots, demolition, and Maine Street standards. The Board agreed in asking for a revision of language related to side parking lots. The Board was in agreement with a proposed joint new construction/demolition permit with exceptions. The Board discussed combining abutting lots in the MU district, with the concern being the creation of large structures. They are satisfied with the proposed language and footprints.

- **2.4.9.B.1.a.i. (D) – VRO District –** VRB requested confirmation of required notification from staff for contributing resources. Mr. Frizzle explained that staff was saying if you do whatever it is that's being proposed, you'll have to notify all of the property owners and get their permission to include their properties on the listing. Ms. Breinich put confirmation of that in the meeting packet via an email correspondence, and currently said they are using the information about contributing resources only to better inform someone about the property. They reviewed the demolition standards, and the Board agreed to leave the language as is, and to delete a reference to the standards, instead noting that they are available at the Department of Planning and Development.

Other business:

None.

Ms. Swan adjourned the workshop.

Attest

Debra L. Blum
Recording Secretary