

**DRAFT Meeting Minutes for Future Open Space Preservation Committee
December 14th 7pm.
Cape Elizabeth Town Hall, Jordan Conference Room.**

Attendees: John Greene (Chair), Wayne Brooking, Carol Ann Jordan, Caitlin Jordan, Frank Governali, Craig Cooper, Bo Norris, Chris Franklin, Richard Bauman, Jessica Sullivan Maureen O’Meara (Staff), Chuck Lawton (Planning Decisions).

Absent: None

Call to order: Chair Greene called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Public comment: No members of the public were present (Frank Strout arrived after comment period concluded).

Correspondence: None

Approval of meeting minutes from November 16, 2011: The minutes from November 16, 2011 were reviewed and discussed. A simple typo on page 6 was revised. Motion by Wayne Brookings, Seconded by Bo Norris. Motion passed unanimously.

Presentation of Open Space Cost/Benefit Analysis final report by Charles Lawton.

Mr. Lawton provided a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the methodology and findings of his report.

Among the findings discussed were:

- **Fiscal findings** that new services driven by new development in Cape Elizabeth are more of a management issue than a capital issue, that is that current staffing can be utilized to cover many of the new service requirements.
- This applies to school department as well.
- Among the findings are that:
 1. Demand for services not formulaic
 2. Demand for service will change with different demographic profile
 3. Maintaining service is often a matter of management allocation

4. School has capacity for +/- 200 student, or at 0.47 students per HH, +/- 400 homes

Questions raised by committee members:

Frank Governali made the point that certain types of construction would be more attractive to young families and have the potential to alter this number. Mr. Lawton agreed that certain spikes could form if all new construction were occupied by young families.

Richard Bauman asked about an aging population being replaced by younger families? Is this a factor aside from new construction? Mr. Lawton agreed that some of this will naturally happen but the changing demographics and census show an aging population in Cape Elizabeth.

Jessica Sullivan asked if we are monitoring the vacancy rate in Cape?

Mr. Lawton continued his presentation regarding the Geographic Context of this discussion regarding the total available land for development in Cape Elizabeth (based upon a buildout analysis conducted by the comprehensive plan committee in 2007).

Conclusions were:

- Potential new housing units in Cape Elizabeth estimated at 1,266 including Sprague and Purpoodock lands.
- Without Sprague and Purpoodock lands the estimate is approximately 870 housing units.
-

From this point Mr. Lawton reviewed how the development of these available 'units' would differ based upon the four 'typical' neighborhood types chosen for comparison. These were Hemlock Hill, Elizabeth Farms, Cross Hill and Hobstone.

To create a normative comparison Mr. Lawton provided a standardized example of 100 acres of development for each type comparing acres of open space, occupied housing units, population demographics, land and

building value and new household total. These comparisons were also provided in graphical form for review for side-by-side comparison. In conclusion Mr. Lawton discussed the “Application for the Future” by providing a spreadsheet depicting the full buildout (all available acres) of a certain type of development (Cross Hill chosen).

As presented findings conclude that the savings need to be viewed in the context of the overall buildout of the town and that the simple preservation of a parcel will not have much overall effect when much land still remains for development but as the available land lessens then the impact may be greater. Utilizing an example of 300 acres purchased for open space and the impact (in Cross Hill example) of 128 housing units not being built the savings of these houses not being built falls far short of the revenue that would be generated by the new housing.

Questions from the committee followed:

Richard Bauman—Are we basing our assumptions on existing ordinance in terms of what can still be built?

The question was also raised as to whether the example of the Hobstone Condo development was misleading. Chris Franklin suggested removal of the allocation of 50 acres of open space per 100 acres developed because when Hobstone was approved by the planning board in included zero acres of open space, the open space was only acquired after the full development faltered and the town, Hobstone residents and the land trust purchased the open space after the fact.

Discussion followed as to whether we were providing a model to help understand what different types of development brought to the table, or whether these were simply examples, and should the examples/model be tied to existing zoning?

Discussion led to a decision suggested by Jessica Sullivan that we may want to remove the specific names of the neighborhoods and simply provide examples/models of how different developments played out.

A motion was made by Caitlyn Jordan to change the names to generic neighborhood types and to have 2 versions of condo development represented (A+B). Seconded by Bo Norris. Motion Passed 9-1.

The Committee moved on to a discussion of next steps with the report.

Bo Norris suggested that when the study is shared publicly the committee should think about how to best present the findings.

Mr. Lawton then concluded his comments by looking to the future and stating that the removal of housing development lots will not return the revenue lost based upon where we are on the 'S' curve. Current demographics and census data suggest that around 4,300 housing units costs will begin to rise more noticeably.

Jessica Sullivan referenced the table on page 8 of the written report regarding the effect of the number of residents as it relates to pure municipal operating costs. Mr. Lawton responded that he believed this figure to be around 3% of the budget.

John Greene commented on the disparity within the same table that indicates education spending as a majority of the dollars but not necessarily the overall percentage of change.

Chris Franklin commented that he felt ill prepared to accept the final report until he had more time to review the document again. Maureen O'Meara suggested that comments by the committee should be submitted by January 17th for distribution for the next meeting.

CELT KEY PARCELS PRESENTATION:

Chris Franklin distributed materials related to the Cape Elizabeth Land Trust's approach toward identifying key strategic parcels. Three maps were provided. One depicted CELT's Recreational Focus Areas, one CELT's Habitat Focus Areas, and one CELT's Agricultural Focus Areas. Chris discussed each map citing the rationale for the inclusion of each parcel

which is based in varying weight upon the resources and attributes of the property but also consider landowner relationships, deed restrictions and other variables.

Chris reminded the committee that CELT's position is inherently less threatening to a landowner as CELT does not have any authority to dictate or change allowable land uses. Chris also indicated the importance of these focus areas when talking with local landowners to show not only why the lands are considered strategically important, but also how these lands interact in relation to nearby important habitat, recreation and agricultural focus areas.

The list of parcel currently used by CELT is used simply to guide their proactive landowner outreach efforts, to help CELT prioritize its efforts.

NEXT STEPS

John Greene suggested that the next meeting continue the cost/benefit review and that the committee should try to wrap up the key parcels and open space criteria.

Public Comment: Frank Strout spoke to the committee noting that Hobstone neighbors came to the Land Trust and the town asking for help to purchase 'phase III' of the development, that the open space happened only after the initial development ran out of money.

In response to the question of whether the town should consider some of the land acquisition criteria provided by the Land for Maine's Future program he felt this would not be a good modal for local land conservation priorities.

Motion to adjourn by Carol Jordan, Seconded by Craig Cooper. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 pm.

Submitted by Chris Franklin, acting secretary.

