I had a few additional comments on the proposed zoning revisions related to the proposed shorelines and highland conservation districts.

1. I support the intent to allow smaller lots to cluster development in conservation zones to manage environmental resources, but in reality this goal may not be realized. Instead the smaller lots have the unintended consequences of encouraging rapid increased development in an area due to reduced economic development costs, small lot subdivisions and roadway sprawl.

The proposed large reduction in minimum lot size from the current 5 acres minimum to 1 acre minimum will encourage significantly more development in this area due to reducing the cost of lots and much reduced development costs. It will also spur strip development of small 1 acre lots. The proposed underlying density remaining at 1 residence per 5 acres may control overall density on a parcel but will not be effective in actual growth management in a conservation area.

I would recommend leaving the zoning as it currently is at 5 acre minimum lots, or as an alternative make the minimum lot size 2 acres instead of 1acre as a less drastic change to current zoning and as a less drastic change to existing growth patterns .

2. Change the boundary between the proposed highland conservation and shoreland conservation districts to 1000' from Brookfield Road instead of 1500 feet as proposed. This would more accurately reflect the terrain, development capability of the land, and environmental characteristics.

3. Do not allow density bonuses in the shore land or highland conservation districts. This should be allowed only in the other residential districts. The proposed density in these districts is already sufficiently high based on land conservation goals without bonuses.

4. The method to review lot size versus density has not been published for review, but I am concerned that it will be difficult managing an underlying density that is much lower than the lot size. (ie density of 1 unit per 5 acres vs 1 acre lot size). An owner of a 20 acre lot can develop 4 one acre lots and have a remaining 16 acre parcel. How will the remaining 16 acres be defined in the zoning/subdivision approvals to prohibit future subdivisions? Conservation easements? restrictions in the plat/approval prohibiting further subdivision by future owners? In other areas these large remainder lots have been sold and resubdivided. Also, how will subsequent single lots out of a larger parcel be reviewed during the town approval process to monitor underlying density. I think this wording has to be closely reviewed, possibly by the Towns legal counsel, to be sure the Town can manage future development of the parcels.

Thanks for all your work on this effort and your consideration of my

current and past comments. I look forward to reviewing the next draft and adoption of the new zoning.

Regards

Ron Lyon