

Town of Carrabassett Valley 1001 Carriage Road Carrabassett Valley, ME 04947 207-235-2645 www.carrabassettvalley.org

<u>Carrabassett Valley Planning Board</u> <u>Thursday, March 7, 2024 at 4:30 P.M.</u>

Meeting to be held at the Town Office

Guests may join remotely with **Zoom ID** <u>531 268 2243</u> & Passcode of <u>04947</u> or:

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/5312682243?pwd=TGxrUExKcXdqQTdlZUZhYUVteG5GZz09

To use a traditional phone to call 1-929-205-6099 and follow prompts for Meeting ID and Access Code listed above. Please announce yourself and then remain quiet/muted while you listen.

<u>Agenda</u>

- 1. Call to Order, Board Member Attendance & Voting Quorum
- 2. Review the Minutes of the February 22, 2024 Meeting
- 3. Conditional Use Shoreland Zoning Permit for house relocation and addition at 3075 Carrabassett Drive, Map 9, Lot 62
- 4. Review & Sign Gondola Village Residential Condo Floor Plans for Registry
- 5. Continued Workshop Discussions on LD2003 Housing & Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's)
- 6. Other Business?
 - a. Comp Plan Visioning Session from 3-5pm on 3/13 at Outdoor Center
- 7. Next Meeting?
- 8. Adjourn

Town of Carrabassett Valley

Planning Board Minutes

February 22, 2024

Location: Town Office Time: 4:30-5:30 Topic: West Mountain lots, workshops Board Present: Brian Demshar, Tim Flight, John Slagle, Scott Stoutamyer Tim Gerencer, Jim Benoit, PB Alternate Board Absent: Tom Bird, Roddy Ehrlenbach Others Present: Chris Parks, CEO; Sue Davis On Zoom: Erica Bufkins, Planner for AVCOG

Chair Brian Demshar called the February 22, 2024, meeting of the Carrabassett Valley Planning Board to order at 4:35 at the Town Office. He noted that there was a quorum.

Review February 8 minutes: corrections included p. 2, 3rd ¶, penultimate line: "Scott Stoutamyer, not Tim Flight, asked..." and p. 3 Signage ¶, penultimate line: "John Slagle pointed out that it's easier –not harder—to write..."

John Slagle moved approval of the minutes with corrections, seconded by Tim Flight and approved unanimously.

Accessory Dwelling Units—ADUs

CEO Chris Parks introduced Erica Bufkins of Androscoggin Valley Council of Governments / AVCOG, noting that AVCOG and Erica in particular have been demonstrating their value to CV in multiple areas lately as they recover from recent staff transitions and shortages.

Bufkins was present by zoom to discuss the LD 2003 affordable housing legislation with the Planning Board, which covers three areas:

- 1) Affordable Housing
- 2) Increased Density
- 3) Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

Affordable housing has to rely on water and sewer capacity. The applicant needs to prove that it is available at an affordable rate.

For an ADU, any lot that has a single-family dwelling on it is allowed to have an ADU. It does not have to meet the lot area requirements, but it does have to meet setbacks.

The ADU can either be attached, detached or within the primary dwelling unit. The legislation has a minimum set at 190 sf, but there is no maximum. Some communities have provided specific maximums, for example 750 sf or no more than 30% of the original unit, but the legislation does not limit it. Someone could conceivably build an ADU bigger than the original dwelling.

Chris Parks mentioned the Lewiston ordinance as a sample. John Slagle asked what would happen when someone with a non-conforming structure chose to add on an ADU. Bufkins cited the rule that appears to allow an ADU to be built on a non-conforming lot but must meet the

existing municipal dimensional requirements for an accessory structure for setbacks, sewer and water. This needs further investigation.

Slagle also asked about the difference between adding on a bedroom for an in-law and an ADU. Bufkins explained that an ADU has to have its own kitchen and bathroom. Re STR's (short-term rentals), towns have been adding restrictions that require the ADU or the primary dwelling to be owner-occupied and that both cannot be STR's.

Bufkins offered to answer any questions anyone might have via her email <u>ebufkins@avcog.org</u>.

Parks asked what the town needs to do about the first two parts, the affordable and the higher density, to make sure the Town's ordinance aligns with State Statute and doesn't expose the Town legally.

According to Bufkins adding an ADU depends on public water and sewer availability and potentially whether it is located in the growth area. If a lot has an existing dwelling unit, a total of two additional dwelling units are permitted on the lot depending upon lot area and water and sewer capacity. If there is no public water and sewer there can only have one ADU on the lot.

Re minimum lot size, they have to meet municipal requirements. Capacity and lot area are the main controls.

On the affordable housing side, overall affordability standards require cost to be 80% or less of the area average medium income (AMI) for rentals or 120% AMI for property ownership. If affordable, they get a density bonus of 2.5 times what is normally allowed.

Bufkins has created some bare-minimum model ordinances to allow the town to get started, which the Town can expand as it gets used to implementation.

In discussing the Lewiston model, Bufkins' noted that an ADU or primary dwelling has to be owner occupied, to prevent people from buying properties exclusively for STR's and building an ADU for a second STR. This is an important component for a lot of towns. HOA rules may take precedence, which suggests that HOAs might consider adopting the State guidelines for their own neighborhoods to avoid conflicts.

Chair Brian Demshar requested <u>additional literature</u> to understand the issue; Bufkins recommended a <u>Department of Community Development</u> document that clearly defines the ramifications of LD 2003.

Parks and Demshar discussed the possibility of getting this on the June School Board Town Meeting warrant, to meet the July 1 deadline for compliance with the State rule.

The Comprehensive Plan, currently being revised, was also mentioned as a place to encode the intentions of LD 2003 and its affordable housing, density and ADU solutions to the housing issue. Bufkins offered to assist with such an effort, noting that her predecessor John Malone left great notes and recommendations dealing with this.

Other business

Parks gave a quick run-down of items remaining on the agenda:

• Nonconforming structures: note the handout on the language of a possible ordinance. The grayed-out areas represent change.

- Signage: on the handout there are a few definitions at the end to consider. He plans to measure existing signs to see how they comply.
- Scenic Corridor Standards: there is a little history here. The Study can be found on the MDOT <u>website</u>.
- Colored zoning boundaries mark-up: may want to consider changing some zones based on recent land changes with Crocker, etc. There are some areas on Sugarloaf, for example that are currently commercial recreation with ski trails and lifts that shouldn't be considered conservation?

Next meeting: Thursday, March 7, 2024, Town Office, 430pm.

Respectfully submitted, Sue Davis, Secretary