STATE OF MAINE
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
STATE PLANNING OFFICE
38 STATE HOUSE STATION AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333

RECEIVED 2.7.07
cc: TC

JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI
GOVERNOR

MARTHA E. FREEMAN
DIRECTOR

February 5, 2007

James L. Fisk, RLA
Director of Planning and Development
Town of South Berwick
180 Main Street,
South Berwick, ME 03908

Dear Jim:

The Maine State Planning Office (SPO) has received material from South Berwick dated January 9, 2007. This material has been submitted to address the three inconsistencies identified in the May 12, 2006 SPO comprehensive plan review findings letter regarding draft South Berwick 2006 Comprehensive Plan. We are pleased that South Berwick is working to address these inconsistencies.

Inconsistency 1. A. Planning period - *This inconsistency is partially addressed but is still outstanding.*

The material submitted includes revised population projections and addresses the first two bullets of this inconsistency.

We do have one suggestion regarding the analysis of the data as presented. The analysis of the projection data available on the SPO website included dividing the SPO population projection for 2015 by the SPO household unit projection for 2015 to ascertain an average household size of 3.14 for 2015. Because the general statewide trend is a decrease in household size, we agree with the statement on page 4 of your January 9, 2007 submission that "an increase to 3.14 appears to be unlikely". The two SPO data sets were developed independently and using them to calculate average household size is a bit like comparing apples with oranges. However, even if the 2000 Census figure of 2.76 is used with the 2015 population projection and a figure of 547 projected residential units is calculated, the residential growth areas appear adequately sized to accommodate the additional units.

The third bullet is partially addressed – see discussion below.

Inconsistency 1. B. Compact development

SPO concurs there is adequate residential land available within the growth area as proposed in the Future Land Use Plan (January 2006). *This portion of the inconsistency has been adequately addressed.*

However, the material presented in the memo does not project the desired or anticipated growth in industrial development to determine whether the industrial growth area proposed in the Future Land Use Plan (January 2006) is appropriately sized. *This portion of the inconsistency is still outstanding.*

I1 District
As noted in SPO's original findings letter, clarification is needed for the size of the industrial district along Route236. The Plan must include a discussion of industrial or light industrial development desired and/or anticipated within the planning period.

The Plan's Land Use Goal M includes a number of strategies related to development of the industrial zone. These include:

- Land Use M-3: Continue to reevaluate the location of the existing Industrial Park and the uses in that park.
- Land Use M-1 (excerpt): Rezone land along Route 236 for commercial and industrial use conditional upon a "corridor study" along Route 236

Elaborating upon what is being referred to in these two strategies and a discussion of the need for the size of the industrial district stretching along Route 236 will assist in evaluating the size of the industrial growth area. The town may need to re-evaluate the size of the proposed I-1 zone, and/or describe the rationale for including areas with significant physical limitations (slopes >20%) and lands in conservation ownership.

I2 District
A new district has been presented to SPO for review in its evaluation of the size and configuration of the growth area. Additional information is required to evaluate this district.

The January 9th submission separates the original industrial growth area into two sub-districts, I1 and I2. As described in the material, the west side of Route 236 includes an I2 district which provides for new 'mixed residential' development. The Future Land Use Plan presented in the Comprehensive Plan reviewed, does not identify an I2 zone to distinguish this area as permitting future residential development. As a distinct area, the I2 district should be described in the Future Land Use Plan and shown on the Future Land Use Map. Please clarify whether an updated Future Land Use Map has been prepared which includes an I2 district. Include a description of the purpose of the I2 district and types of uses allowed to clarify the intent of mixed residential.

Inconsistency 2. Implementation strategy section

This inconsistency is still outstanding.

An implementation matrix is being prepared by the Vision Committee and will be submitted for SPO's review once it is finalized. The Sample Implementation Matrix included in the material submitted January 9, 2007 is an excellent approach to addressing this inconsistency.

Inconsistency 3. Affordable housing

It is not clear from the material submitted on January 9th if the Comprehensive Plan Committee has proposed to incorporate the recommendations into the Comprehensive Plan to address Inconsistency 3. *This inconsistency is still outstanding.*

This inconsistency will be addressed if the Comprehensive Plan is revised to incorporate the gap analysis by SMRPC, as well as the affordability goal and housing strategies presented in the January 9 material.

In closing, I would be happy to discuss or clarify any items in this findings letter or provide additional assistance.

Yours truly,

Ruta Dzenis

Ruta Dzenis AICP
Senior Planner – Land Use Team
c: Stacy Benjamin, Director – Land Use Team
Dennis Smith, Comprehensive Plan Committee
Jeffrey A. Grossman, Town Manager