

Senator Daughtry, Representative Sylvester and members of the Labor & Housing Committee:

My name is Dan Davis from Kezar Fall (*Porter*) over in Oxford County, and angst toward **LD1312** involves no paid or non-profit affiliation or corporate handler (*benevolent, commercial, political, or otherwise*).

LD1312 appears to have been fast tracked through committee but there still remains several serious concerns with the bill as written.

This bill, similar to LD2003:

- 1.) Severely undermines local democracy and subverts Home Rule authority,
- 2.) Discredits decades of conscientious long-term planning regarding appropriate development growth right-sized zoning based on capacity and demand, and protection of natural resources,
- 3.) Prescribes allowances and uses that are indifferent to the widely varied population densities that exist throughout the many municipalities in this state (*ranging to 2 people per square mile to over 3,000 people per square mile*),
- 4.) Essentially permits doubling density with zero consideration on the infrastructure needed to sustain it,
- 5.) Promotes unrestrained real estate and gentrification speculation throughout Maine (*which has allowed Maine to be exploited and caused problems in the past*),
- 6.) Assumes that all communities have accessible "community resources", adequate tax base, on-street parking, businesses and ample employment opportunities such that no additional traffic impacts would be experienced by simply doubling residential density; and
- 8.) Does not consider the short-term rental abuses that will ensue and the unfunded mandate imposed on local governments to attempt to resolve or shunt its negative impacts.

Reducing setbacks to an arbitrary 5 feet in rural sparsely populated areas will also likely lead to a flurry of litigation, as it is indifferent to the reality that most rural boundaries in Maine are not gridded, planned, surveyed, or mapped consistently, often relying on stone walls (*that shift naturally or are purposefully altered*), old growth trees (*often long-dead and gone*), or reference 4th-5th generation Mainers in deed rather than defined metes and bounds.

Doubling densities in rural sparsely populated areas that do not have adequate infrastructure, businesses, employment, or community resources will undoubtedly cause a wide array of negative consequences.

It appears as if this bill is structured for the more developed 25% of the state, rather than considering the 75% of the less developed state that it will undoubtedly be subjected to unrestrained and unplanned development should this be signed into law as it is written. A population threshold is recommended for this bill, possibly over 5,000 in pop/community. But even then, there are larger communities that have planned specific rural/agricultural areas (*district/zoning overlays*) to produce food, should those densities be arbitrarily doubled with no consideration to land use impacts and compatibility of uses?

As this bill strains credibility and risks long-term, unintended, negative consequences to Maine, I respectfully ask that this bill, LD 1312, **OUGHT NOT PASS**, so that the merits, intent, and risks can be more thoroughly vetted in the 131st legislature.

Dan Davis – Porter Maine

Dan Davis
Porter
LD 1312

Senator Daughtry, Representative Sylvester and members of the Labor & Housing Committee:

My name is Dan Davis from Kezar Fall (Porter) over in Oxford County, and angst toward LD1312 involves no paid or non-profit affiliation or corporate handler (benevolent, commercial, political, or otherwise).

LD1312 appears to have been fast tracked through committee but there still remains several serious concerns with the bill as written.

This bill, similar to LD2003:

- 1.) Severely undermines local democracy and subverts Home Rule authority,
- 2.) Discredits decades of conscientious long-term planning regarding appropriate development growth right-sized zoning based on capacity and demand, and protection of natural resources,
- 3.) Prescribes allowances and uses that are indifferent to the widely varied population densities that exist throughout the many municipalities in this state (ranging to 2 people per square mile to over 3,000 people per square mile),
- 4.) Essentially permits doubling density with zero consideration on the infrastructure needed to sustain it,
- 5.) Promotes unrestrained real estate and gentrification speculation throughout Maine (which has allowed Maine to be exploited and caused problems in the past),
- 6.) Assumes that all communities have accessible "community resources", adequate tax base, on-street parking, businesses and ample employment opportunities such that no additional traffic impacts would be experienced by simply doubling residential density; and
- 8.) Does not consider the short-term rental abuses that will ensue and the unfunded mandate imposed on local governments to attempt to resolve or shunt its negative impacts.

Reducing setbacks to an arbitrary 5 feet in rural sparsely populated areas will also likely lead to a flurry of litigation, as it is indifferent to the reality that most rural boundaries in Maine are not gridded, planned, surveyed, or mapped consistently, often relying on stone walls (that shift naturally or are purposefully altered), old growth trees (often long-dead and gone), or reference 4th-5th generation Mainers in deed rather than defined metes and bounds.

Doubling densities in rural sparsely populated areas that do not have adequate infrastructure, businesses, employment, or community resources will undoubtedly cause a wide array of negative consequences.

It appears as if this bill is structured for the more developed 25% of the state, rather than considering the 75% of the less developed state that it will undoubtedly be subjected to unrestrained and unplanned development should this be signed into law as it is written. A population threshold is recommended for this bill, possibly over 5,000 in pop/community. But even then, there are larger communities that have planned specific rural/agricultural areas (district/zoning overlays) to produce food, should those densities be arbitrarily doubled with no consideration to land use impacts and compatibility of uses?

As this bill strains credibility and risks long-term, unintended, negative consequences to Maine, I respectfully ask that this bill, LD 1312, OUGHT NOT PASS, so that the merits, intent, and risks can be more thoroughly vetted in the 131st legislature.

Dan Davis – Porter Maine