

To: Boothbay Planning Board
From: Mark Eyerman
Subject: Development Standards for the BVC District
Date: December 6, 2018

At the last workshop we discussed the development standards for the BVC District. Here are some thoughts on how we can try to resolve the questions about them.

Comprehensive Plan

As we have discussed, State law requires that the ordinance be consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan. There is some flexibility in what consistent means but my working definition is that someone who reads the Comp Plan should see the major components reflected in the ordinances. So I suggest that before Tuesday's workshop everyone should read the description of the Boothbay Village Center in the Plan. It is on pages 53-54. Here is my take on the key components of what the Plan envisions for this area in terms of development standards:

- The area continues to be a village with a New England village character – while it doesn't say it I think this is the alternative to a suburban character with building set way back with parking in front of the building.
- The key elements of this character from the plan are:
 - Buildings reasonably close to the street
 - Designed to promote pedestrian movement
 - Parking to the side or rear of the building and the area between the building and the street used for landscaping or pedestrians
- As I said the other night – the Town office comes close.

Development Standards

So how do the proposed development standards relate to the Comp Plan? A key question as Alan said at the last workshop is what do you envision a traditional New England village to be. So here are some ideas to chew on:

1. The concept of requiring buildings to be close to the road is a key component. We can keep this and revise it along the following lines if desired:
 - a. Revise the minimum road setback to use the same approach as in other areas with the setback measured from the center of the travel way with the same basic setbacks – 50 feet on state roads and 33 feet on Town roads.
 - b. Keep the maximum road setback but tie it to the minimum setback – maybe within 25 feet of the minimum setback to provide some flexibility.

- c. Keep 7.5.3.4.3 and 7.5.3.4.4 to give the PB some flexibility on where buildings are located
2. Revise the maximum height to 34 feet and drop the minimum height requirement.
3. Drop 7.5.3.4.5 requiring a minimum of two stories.
4. Keep 7.5.3.4.6 since this is a key component of a traditional NE village style.
5. Keep 7.5.3.4.7 since this is tied to the Comp Plan and providing for pedestrians.
6. Keep 7.5.3.4.8 and 7.5.3.4.9 since they deal with a village character as opposed to a suburban character.

I think those changes are consistent with the Comp Plan and provide more flexibility as to how development in the BVC could occur while keeping the key components from the plan.