Minutes

CCC Workshop Meeting
Cape Cod Commission
Conference Room
3225 Main Street, Barnstable, MA 02630

December 17, 2015

The workshop meeting was convened at 3:00 p.m., and the Roll Call was recorded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnstable</td>
<td>Royden Richardson</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourne</td>
<td>Richard Conron</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewster</td>
<td>Elizabeth Taylor</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham</td>
<td>Michael Skelley</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Richard Roy</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>Joy Brookshire</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falmouth</td>
<td>Charles McCaffrey</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwich</td>
<td>Jacqueline Etsten</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashpee</td>
<td>Ernest Virgilio</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleans</td>
<td>Len Short</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincetown</td>
<td>Mark Weinress</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich</td>
<td>Harold Mitchell</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro</td>
<td>Kevin Grunwald</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellfleet</td>
<td>Roger Putnam</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmouth</td>
<td>John McCormack, Jr.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Commissioner</td>
<td>Mary Pat Flynn</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Representative</td>
<td>John Harris</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Rep.</td>
<td>Danielle Hill</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor's Appointee</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Cape Cod Commission Member Workshop Meeting was held on Thursday, December 17, 2015 at 3:00 p.m. in the Cape Cod Commission Large Conference Room, 3225 Main Street, Barnstable, MA. A quorum was established with 14 Commission members in attendance.

**SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP MEETING:**

**Review of Stakeholder Land Use Scenario Process:**
With the use of PowerPoint slides Commission staff gave a presentation on the stakeholder process and the Envision Tomorrow tool for land use scenario planning that is being used in the review process for the Commission’s Regional Policy Plan five-year update. There was discussion by Commission members and staff on the scenario planning process presented.

**Cape Cod Commission Members Use of Rules of Procedure**
Commission staff presented the Draft Cape Cod Commission Meeting Procedure Guidelines for consideration and potential adoption by Commission members. Following discussion by Commission members and staff it was decided that additional time be provided for members to review the draft Meeting Procedure Guidelines and that it be brought back for consideration and potential adoption at a future Commission Workshop Meeting.

**Minutes**
The Commission reviewed the minutes of the December 3, 2015 Cape Cod Commission meeting. Jack McCormack moved to approve the minutes of December 3, 2015. Len Short seconded the motion. A vote called on the motion to approve the minutes passed with one abstention.

**Review of Stakeholder Land Use Scenario Process**
Phil Dascombe, Community Design Manager at the Commission, with the use of PowerPoint slides reviewed the stakeholder land use scenario process and the Commission’s Envision Tomorrow tool that is being used in the review process for the Commission’s Regional Policy Plan (RPP) five-year update. He said the goals of the scenario planning were to give stakeholders a chance to express growth preferences, understand preferences for where and what kind of development, and to develop a regional vision for Cape Cod. Mr. Dascombe distributed to Commission members a handout—Cape Cod Commission: Regional Policy Plan/Trend Scenarios Quick Reference—and said it provides a summary of the information compiled from the stakeholder land use scenario process. He provided a scenario planning recap regarding trend scenarios for business as usual, alternate scenarios, and preferred scenario. He said the next steps are to map how areas are designated at regional scale, establish planning goals and actions, and evaluate regulatory tools to further the vision. Mr. Dascombe’s PowerPoint presentation and handout are attached to the minutes.

Following Mr. Dascombe’s presentation Commission members and staff discussed: floor area ratio, affordable housing and the need for more year-round affordable housing; year round economy and job creation from compact development; year-round and seasonal population; the need to re-energize discreet areas; employers have difficulty finding affordable housing for employees; job creation for young people to stay and relocate to the Cape, most people relocate because of employment; net zero zoning, re-zoning and green areas; how Chapter 40Bs fit in, Chapter 40Bs create a random act of density but also creates affordable housing in certain areas; need to consider affordable housing on a regional basis; nitrogen removal and impaired embayments result in large wastewater bills making affordable housing less affordable; how the land use scenario planning fits in with land use vision maps; create jobs within walking distances/mixed-use development—Mashpee Commons is a good example of that; can we have mixed-use Chapter 40Bs; use the market to provide an incentive to get the kind of housing that the Cape needs—we need better options for that; the Cape is becoming a geriatric community and the right type of housing for people in their life stage is needed; people who are here and work from their homes bring a different demographic to the area and are paying at a much higher standard for affordable housing; housing with accessory units; activity centers and pedestrian areas in associated neighborhoods.
Cape Cod Commission Members Use of Rules of Procedure

Executive Director Paul Niedzwiecki said the Commission’s current draft Meeting Procedure Guidelines that were distributed to Commission members does not adopt Roberts Rules or Mason Rules and said this is an opportunity for members to have a discussion on that.

Commission members discussed the Commission’s draft Meeting Procedure Guidelines and Michael Skelley suggested that a motion for reconsideration should be done by a ruling majority not a member and the reconsideration should be done at another meeting. Mr. Skelley also referred to moving the question and suggested that it be included in the guidelines. He said it should be used in a situation when discussion becomes an impediment. He said it could be used to curtail a discussion from dragging out an issue.

Jessica Wielgus, Commission Counsel, reviewed the guidelines with the members and said as a matter of drafting she had not put that in but it could be added. She said all members should be heard and given the opportunity to speak. Mr. Skelley said he believes it would not be disruptive. He referred to a recent Commission meeting that was held where a motion was made to move the question and said that was a situation where the question should have been moved. Some members suggested having a mediator at Commission meetings and other members felt that was the function of the Commission Chair. The members had a discussion whether they wanted the power to rest with the Chairman or with the members. Joy Brookshire expressed that she felt confident with the Chair. Commission Counsel explained that as drafted, a member could raise a point of order that a topic is not germane and request that the Chair take a vote.

Paul Niedzwiecki suggested that Commission members take more time to review the draft Meeting Procedure Guidelines. He said this discussion could continue at a later date during a Commission Workshop Meeting session. Commission members agreed and the consensus was to continue the discussion and consideration for potential adoption of the draft Procedure Guidelines to a later date during a Commission Workshop Meeting.

A motion was made to adjourn at 4:45 p.m. The motion was seconded and voted unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

John H. McCormack, Secretary

Materials Presented at the December 17, 2015 Commission Member Workshop Meeting

• Handout material: Meeting minutes of the December 3, 2015 Cape Cod Commission meeting.
• Handout material: December 17, 2015 Commission Member Workshop/Meeting Agenda.
• Handout material: Draft Cape Cod Commission Meeting Procedure Guidelines.
• Handout material: Cape Cod Commission Regional Policy Plan Update Trend Scenarios Quick Reference sheet and Envision Tomorrow development types.
• Materials presented: PowerPoint slide presentation on Scenario Planning prepared and presented by Phil Dascombe, Community Design Manager at the Commission.
SCENARIO PLANNING
SCENARIO PLANNING GOALS

• Give stakeholders chance to express growth preferences
• Understand preferences for where & what kind of development
• Develop a regional vision for Cape Cod
SCENARIO PLANNING RECAP

1 Business as usual scenario
2 Alternate scenarios
3 Preferred scenario

“Where are we heading?”
“What are the possibilities?”
“Where do we want to go from here?”
What happens if the current trends and land use policies continue?

DEVELOPED REMAINING VACANT LAND

APPLIED DEVELOPMENT SIMILAR TO WHAT ALLOWED BY ZONING
### Development Type

- **No Growth**: Open Space
- **Dispersed Residential**: Jobs & Housing
- **Dispersed Commercial**: Jobs & Housing
- **Conservation Cluster**: Jobs & Housing
- **Compact Residential**: Jobs & Housing
- **Compact R & D**: Jobs & Housing
- **Town Center**: Jobs & Housing
- **Compact Mixed Use**: Jobs & Housing

### Housing & Job Creation

- **Open Space**
  - No Growth
  - Jobs & Housing
  - Dispersed Residential
  - Dispersed Commercial
  - Conservation Cluster
  - Compact Residential
  - Compact R & D
  - Town Center
  - Compact Mixed Use
TREND SCENARIO

- NO GROWTH
- OPEN SPACE
- CONSERVATION CLUSTER
- DISPERSED RESIDENTIAL
- COMPACT RESIDENTIAL
- DISPERSED COMMERCIAL
- COMPACT R & D
- TOWN CENTER
- COMPACT MIXED USE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Housing &amp; Job Creation</th>
<th>Residential Density</th>
<th>Job Creation</th>
<th>Residential Housing Per Acre</th>
<th>Job Creation</th>
<th>Residential Housing Per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Growth Open Space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed Residential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Cluster</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact Residential</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact R &amp; D</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEVELOPMENT TYPE

- DISPERSED RESIDENTIAL
- DISPERSED COMMERCIAL
- TOWN CENTER

HOUSING & JOB CREATION

- JOBS PER ACRE
- RESIDENTIAL DENSITY

- 0
- 1.5
- 0.5

- 17
- 4.5
TREND SCENARIO

A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE?
SCENARIO PLANNING RECAP

1. Business as usual scenario
   “Where are we heading?”

2. Alternate scenarios
   “What are the possibilities?”

3. Preferred scenario
   “Where do we want to go from here?”
STAKEHOLDERS SCENARIOS
PATTERNS

- Compact centers
- Reimagined Industrial Areas
TOWN CENTER
COMPACT RESIDENTIAL
COMPACT R & D
COMPACT MIXED USE

DEVELOPMENT TYPE

HOUSING & JOB CREATION

COMPACT RESIDENTIAL
COMPACT R & D
TOWN CENTER
COMPACT MIXED USE

RESIDENTIAL DENSITY
JOB CREATION
RESIDENTIAL DENSITY
JOB CREATION
RESIDENTIAL DENSITY
JOB CREATION
RESIDENTIAL DENSITY
JOB CREATION

3
10
15.5
10
0
17
4.5
20
14

HOUSING & JOB CREATION
SCENARIO COMPARISON

**Trend – Business as Usual**
- Dispersed (sprawl)
- One and two story
- Lower density
- Mostly green field

**Alternative**
- Compact
- One, two and three story
- Higher density
- Mostly redevelopment

Population the same
The alternative scenario puts 70% more development in existing developed areas. Decreases the new impervious acres more than 80%.
The alternative scenario requires **13 times LESS** land than the trend scenario.
The alternative scenario creates **14 times** more housing units per acre.
Floor-Area Ratio (FAR) increased **8 times** for residential units, and **twice** for commercial units in the **alternative** scenario.
In the trend scenario, 88% of the housing units are conventional or large lot SFR.

In the alternative scenario, 95% multi-family (owner & renters).
CREATES MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING

TREND

90%
Household Income $100K or more

ALTERNATIVE

94%
Household Income $50-75K
The alternative scenario results in 90% reduction in new road construction.
The alternative scenario creates nearly twice as many jobs.
NET POSITIVE FISCAL IMPACT

TOTAL VALUE INCREASED
$125 PER SQ. FT.
IN THE ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO,
COMPARED WITH THE TREND SCENARIO

COST TO REVENUE

The alternate scenario revenue are 2 X costs

95%

The trend scenario costs are 2 X revenue

-49%
1 Business as usual scenario
2 Alternate scenarios
3 Preferred scenario

“Where are we heading?”
“What are the possibilities?”
“Where do we want to go from here?”
CENTERS OF ACTIVITY

- Centers of activity
  - Compact mixed use forms with potential to create walkable neighborhoods
  - Greater housing opportunities within the pedestrian-shed
  - Transform Industrial Areas

- Categorize centers into:
  - Maintain
  - Evolve
  - Transform
ACTIVITY CENTERS: MAINTAIN

- Enhance an area, building upon its existing character with small-scale improvements.
- Historic Villages and areas with well developed local character
- Examples:
  - Barnstable Village
  - Chatham Downtown
  - Provincetown
ACTIVITY CENTERS: EVOLVE

- Areas to target opportunities for incremental changes
  - infill opportunities
  - public improvements
- Reinforce the existing character and scale of the area
- Villages and centers where selective changes are appropriate
- Examples:
  - Hyannis
  - Orleans
  - Buzzards Bay
ACTIVITY CENTERS: TRANSFORM

- Areas to target major opportunities for large-scale changes
  - Infill, redevelopment
  - Public improvements
  - Reconfiguration of connections
- The character of the area is intended to change
- Appropriate for activity areas that are heavily auto-oriented
- Examples:
  - Route 132
  - Route 28
NEXT STEPS

- Map of how areas are designated at regional scale
- Establish planning goals and actions
- Evaluate regulatory tools to further the vision