

A landscape photograph showing a grassy field in the foreground, a dense line of green trees in the middle ground, and a clear blue sky with a few wispy clouds. The text is overlaid on the lower half of the image.

**Planning Board's
Recommendations
to Selectboard
October 25, 2010**

Committee Members

- Mark Beliveau
- Dorin Cox
- Allan Dennis
- Frank DeRocchi
- Lou Ann Griswold
- Scott Kemp
- Bob Moynihan
- Caren Rossi

Overview of the Process

- Information/Idea Generating Meetings (June 2, 11, & 23) and Site Walk (June 12)
- Committee meeting (June 29)
 - Discussed ideas and concerns from citizens
 - Developed criteria to rate all ideas
- Committee meeting to evaluate ideas and determine options (August 30)
- Presented options to Planning Board (Sept 8)
- Presented options to public (Sept 22)
- Presented to Planning Board (Oct 13)

Process



Ideas gathered

Rating of ideas
to narrow list

Proposed
options

Ideas Gathered

- 44 specific ideas

Categories:

- Recreation
- Residential
- Mixed use residential & light commercial
- Commercial/Industrial
- Agriculture
- Rock use
- Pond
- Leave land alone

Concerns Raised

- 20 specific concerns raised by public
- Two primary concerns
 - Maintain natural character
 - Generate revenue for town
- More specifically
 - Protective haven for wildlife
 - Avoid heavy traffic
 - Impact on taxes
 - Protect water on property & abutting properties
 - Potential to generate money for the town



05/24/2010

Rating of Ideas

- Rating criteria used by committee
 - Maximize revenue to town
 - Maximize environmental/ natural resources benefit/value
 - Create local jobs
 - Provide local benefit/services/ products
 - Be compatible with neighborhood
 - Be economically viable
 - Maintain historical heritage
 - Develop recreational facilities
 - Maintain & preserve rural & agricultural land

Weighted Criteria

- ***Maximize revenue to town***
- ***Maximize environmental/ natural resources benefit/value***
- Create local jobs
- Provide local benefit/services/ products
- ***Be compatible with neighborhood***
- ***Be economically viable***
- Maintain historical heritage
- Develop recreational facilities
- Maintain & preserve rural & agricultural land

Ideas to Options

- Reviewed rating of ideas
- Considered weight/value of each criteria
- Considered feasibility of each idea for our town

Proposed Options to Public on September 22, 2010

- ***Residential*** and ***Natural area***
- ***Light/clean industry*** and ***Natural area***
- ***Residential*** and ***Light/clean industry***
and ***Natural area***

Options within each category

- ***Natural***

- Trails for walking
- Keep a well (maintain water supply) for future town water needs
- Keep part of land open and green
- Maintains pond (in easement)

All could be done simultaneously

Options within each category

- ***Residential***
 - Housing for over 55 years of age
 - Affordable housing (for any age)
 - Continuum of care housing for the elderly (independent, assisted living, to skilled nursing)

Options within each category

- ***Light/clean industry***
 - “Lindt Chocolate” image
 - Research & Development space
 - Office space

Input from public

- Take care of the abutter and town interests first
 - Need to keep a buffer around property
 - Traffic concerns
- Question reduction of water
- Suggest town maintains control of property
 - Lease land to business
 - Have a management plan for property

Revised Proposed Options

1. Mixed use: light, clean industry and natural
2. Mixed use: affordable residential and natural

Note:

- (#3. Omitted because of lot size)
- (Leaving land all natural omitted because of desire for some revenue generation)

Mixed use: light, clean industry & natural

Benefits

- ✧ Could more easily maintain a buffer zone
- ✧ More predictable water use
- ✧ Predictable traffic patterns
- ✧ Would generate revenue to town, initially
- ✧ Would generate revenue over time
- ✧ Minimal town service needs
- ✧ Planning board could monitor appearance of building
- ✧ Could lease the land, further increasing revenue over time

Drawbacks

- Land could sit for a long time
 - Not generating income
 - Continued vandalism
 - Continue to overgrow
 - People will “use it” as they wish raising liability for town
- Rezoning required
- Spot zoning would be required

“Spot zoning”

- A zone within a zone
- Would require writing new ordinances
- Sets a new precedent for the town

Town leasing land

- ***Benefits***

- Land remains ours
- We have control over what happens
- Would continue to generate revenue over time

- ***Drawbacks***

- Town is not a realtor or property manager
- Could increase town government/employees
- Would involve ongoing maintenance of property
- Would not reap revenue at one time

Mixed use: affordable residential & natural decreasing number of house lots

Benefits

- Generate revenue initially
- Maintains current zoning
- Would offer options for people to live in Lee

Drawbacks

- Traffic concerns
- More town services required
- Questionable water use/supply
- Cost to town for ORSD
- More people nearby will decrease water quality of pond
- We question if high taxes would continue to make Lee unaffordable in the end

Process for Either Plan

- Hire a consultant or property developer to draft land use options and feasibility, (would require warrant article to use town money) taking into consideration:
 - Buffer zone, walking paths, water protection area if needed
 - Drainage needs
 - Best design for remaining land for development
- Re-zoning and perhaps “spot zoning”
- Continue to have active Planning Board involvement for style of building(s) to compliment landscape and neighborhood



05/24/2010