

# PLANNING BOARD

**Special Session: May 3, 2022 – 6:00PM**

1. **ROLL CALL:**

Board Members present: Riley Bergeron, Mathieu Duvall, Toni Ferraro, Stacey LeBlanc, Evan Cyr, Paul Jacques, Joshua Daigle, Darren Finnegan, and Brian Dubois.

Staff Present: John Blais, Deputy Director of Planning and Permitting and Katherine Cook, Planning Coordinator

2. **MINUTES:** 4/12/22- Mathieu Duvall asked for correction on the spelling of his last name in the minutes

3. **WORKSHOP: PART II; T-4.2B A-D** Consider changing four areas of the City from Rural Residential, Urban Residential, Suburban Residential, and Multi-Family Suburban areas to the Traditional Neighborhood Development District as defined in the Comprehensive Plan. **Area A:** includes 936 acres of Urban Residential, Multi-Family Suburban and Rural Residential within the New Auburn Urban Residential areas and to Broad Street; **Area B:** includes 19 acres of Urban Residential within the Vickery Road area; **Area C:** includes 148 acres of Suburban Residential and Urban Residential within the Poland, Manley, Hotel Road Residential area; and **Area D:** includes 288 acres of Urban Residential and Multi-Family Suburban within the Bates, Bradman, Stetson Road Residential area.

Deliberation amongst staff and board members. Some points/questions listed below:

- Explain why we are including or excluding the NB districts as a few single parcels within the otherwise proposed T-4.2 areas. As it stands it appears as though it is spot-zoned.
- Area D does not seem to jive currently with the characteristics of T-4.2
- Is contract zoning an option?
- Where would the Turnpike exit attach to Vickery Rd? South Main St VS Broad St?
- Are there any old, unrealized plans that could guide how and where to increase density near the urban core(s)?
- We should think about expanding the T-4.2 definition to exclude some areas or decide which areas the description of this zone could apply to.
  - We could use an additional tool representing increased neighborhood density incorporating some changes
- Is this like strip zoning because the identified spots grow in separate areas, not all stemming out from the downtown core?
  - Evan believes area A and B should be connected because they are close together
  - What would incorporating more land (in the AG zone in this case) look like to connect these spots?
- What would it look like to extend the new zone down South Main Street in Area A instead of into the RR area as proposed?
- What does it mean for something to be "consistent with the character of the neighborhood"?

- One area is taken up largely by the YMCA. What are the implications of changing this?

4. **WORKSHOP: Lake Auburn Watershed Zone Change** with the adoption of a zoning change that reduces the housing density in all parts of the Lake Auburn Watershed to one dwelling unit per three acres as recommended in the comprehensive plan. Considered changes include changing three separate areas of Rural Residential to Low Country Density Residential for a total of 1038 Acres.

**5. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Bruce Rioux of 85 Mary Carroll concerned about development around the lake

Maureen O'Brien of 42 Winter St Concerned about increase in density (Inaudible)

Elizabeth Dunn of 530 Court St concerned about citizens having a voice and opportunity for education as well as time to ask questions to staff and receive answers.

Jason Levesque 205 Youngs Corner Rd discussed fact checking, trends for zoning across the country and line items in the budget. Highlighted Comp Plan and Lake Auburn topics.

**6. PLANNING BOARD ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:**

Meeting Schedule: CC Chambers are NOT available June 14<sup>th</sup> and November 8– elections. Consider new location or modify schedule.

*June meeting moved to June 28<sup>th</sup> & November meeting moved to November 15<sup>th</sup>*

**7. MISCELLANEOUS:**

- a. Upcoming items for June

**8. ADJOURNMENT:**

Next Planning Board Meeting is on May 10, 2022