The Draft Special Places Map only includes those features that got 5 or more dots at Workshop 1. Another 31 features got fewer or no dots. Should the map include any of the features that got fewer than 5 dots?
Among the features identified were the Congregational, St. Andrews, and St. Patricks churches. Should the other churches in Newcastle be added to this map?

We want to pick up on the discussion about community values at Workshop 1, where folks who live in different parts of Town said they have different values. Some groups thought Newcastle’s values align well with Damariscotta’s values. Some said they believe there is a split in town, that older rural folks, especially, may not share the same values as those who live in villages. And others observed that the split “...was no big thing, just that the rural folks had a different attitude.” They do not like sidewalks, street lights, etc. and say “Why do we need that stuff? It does not do us any good.”

Newcastle’s main Village, neighborhoods and small village centers and rural areas represent a diversity that may define the character of the Town. Is one of Newcastle’s community values that there is a place for each group in Newcastle and in fact, the diversity of the groups is part what of defines the place known as Newcastle?
We were reminded of market research on homebuyers done by the State Planning Office (SPO), which described 5 distinct groups of homebuyers that held different attitudes and values. SPO’s research is not entirely applicable, but may offer some insight into Newcastle’s diversity and values. To help remember the different groups, they were given “cute” names.

**Homeowners’ Values**

- **Ozzies & Harriets**
  - mostly young/middle age families, usually seeking child-oriented neighborhoods

- **Small Town Civics**
  - mostly middle/later age families, many with children at home, strong community interests
Homeowners’ Values

**Young Turks**
youngest group, largely in professional and administrative occupations, most likely to be male

**Introspectives**
tend to be middle to upper income, need nature out their back door and prefer little interaction with their neighbors

---

Homeowners’ Values

**Suburban Thoreaus**
somewhat older, moderate to middle income, want privacy and convenient access to services
This map of significant wildlife habitat outlines most of the constraints to development in Newcastle – reflecting not only habitat but shoreland areas, surface water features, and wetlands. The white areas reflect the least naturally constrained lands in the community.

Historically, Newcastle consisted of a number of outlying villages anchored by the more developed village of Newcastle, which is across the Damariscotta River from Damariscotta. Villages included Damariscotta Mills, East Newcastle, and Sheepscot Village were relatively densely developed with a dozen or so structures by the 1950s. South Newcastle was much more rural, with a half dozen homes.
during the same time period. North Newcastle has always been an agricultural area with a more functional than traditional village pattern of development. Development along town roads was mostly associated with agricultural and low density residential land uses. For the most part, these villages are intact with most new development situated on the outskirts.

One way to think about Newcastle’s development patterns is Farm and/or Conserved land, Hamlets, Villages, and Town that together make up the PLACE called Newcastle.
We are going to attempt to illustrate four very different development patterns. This material is based on original work done in Falmouth by Planning Decisions, Terrence J DeWan & Associates, and Spatial Alternatives for the Town of Falmouth. Parts of their work are not directly comparable – it focuses on subdivisions rather than the lot by lot development that is more common in Newcastle. Furthermore, Falmouth’s overall scale of the development is greater than what Newcastle experiences. Regardless of the limitations, the analysis does offer a way to think about different development patterns for Newcastle. We would have liked to do a similar analysis specifically for Newcastle, but couldn’t given the budget for this project.

The first image is a build-out analysis of a large section of Falmouth (although it could be almost any community). The road and home locations were determined by an assessment of grades, wetlands (shown in olive), sight distance, maximum length of dead-end road requirements, and zoning ordinance. This is the anticipated pattern of development, assuming no changes to the current ordinance.

This is the same area, using four models that we will describe (Conventional, Conservation/Cluster, County Estates, and Compact). The result is the same number of housing units, but a greater percentage of land retained in open space.
The conventional approach uses a standard 2 acre house lot (or 80,000 SF). This is a likely result (the town’s desire to preserve open space for view corridors results in the green area that separates two pods of development).

Under a conservation or cluster subdivision approach, the number of house lots remains the same as in the conventional approach, but the lot sizes are reduced (in this case to one acre). The resulting open space can be used to continue agricultural operations, forest management, wildlife habitat, and recreational open space.
Country Estates are ten± acres of land, with no common open space. Roads may be private and gravel, so there is no burden on the community. With proper siting, the homes can be situated so they are out of sight, preserving the rural character of the landscape. Without proper planning, homes can get placed in the middle of fields or on ridgelines, or other visually inappropriate locations.
Compact development can be a mixed use development (following the principles of Traditional Neighborhood Development) or exclusively housing. Density can be greatly increased over single lot subdivisions by incorporating multiplex housing. Density increases can be accomplished by transferring development rights from other parts of the community to preserve land for habitat or other open space purposes.

These next charts compare the four approaches for the 478 acres, following the principles outlined earlier.
Note that most of these development approaches only work at the specified density with municipal services or community systems.

Mixed use can include a number of different types of housing (such as senior/retirement community, garage apartments, mid-rise, garden apartments, townhomes, apartments over commercial space, live/work units, etc.).
Another way to visualize different development patterns is represented on this and the following slides.
Development opportunities include areas that have public utilities, are within the high density overlay zones and light industrial overlay zones which were laid out in the Town’s 2007 Comprehensive Plan.
We recognize that some of you may be concerned about how we achieve a village and countryside pattern without imposing on private property rights, particularly in rural areas. However, we are begging your indulgence to put off discussion of how to achieve what you want until we establish what it is that you want. We will return to how to implement the community’s vision at a later date in this process.

Brainstorm the pros and cons of alternative development patterns in Newcastle.
We Welcome Your Input

Please contact
Mark Crummett
Chris Doherty
Ben Frey
Kensell Krah
Rob Nelson
Alan Pooley

Thank you!

Please join us on November 30th for the third Newcastle 2030 Visioning Workshop!