



THE CITY OF AUGUSTA

MARK S. O'BRIEN, MAYOR

CITY COUNCIL

JEFFREY M. BILODEAU CECIL E. MUNSON
MICHAEL G. BYRON PATRICK E. PARADIS
DALE McCORMICK DAVID M. ROLLINS
DAREK M. GRANT

WILLIAM R. BRIDGEO
CITY MANAGER

INFORMATIONAL MEETING AGENDA

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2014

CITY HALL (COUNCIL CHAMBERS)

6:30 P.M.

A. Items for discussion submitted by the City Council and/or the City Manager:

1. Middle Road dilapidated property
2. Green Street two-way traffic
3. Recycling program
4. Update on downtown policing
5. Possible clear cutting ordinance language
6. Downtown Historic District resolve
7. Riggs Brook Village rezoning
8. Viles Foundation parcel rezoning and expansion of uses in Institutional/Business/Professional (BP) zoning district

B. Persons wishing to address the City Council who have submitted a formal request in accordance with Section 2-61 of the Code of Ordinances:

1. Margaret Terrill-Discontinue the practice of adding fluoride to public drinking water

C. Open comment period for any persons wishing to address the City Council.

58 Middle Road





City of Augusta, Maine
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

AUGUSTA STATE AIRPORT
CODE ENFORCEMENT
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT



ENGINEERING
FACILITIES & SYSTEMS
PLANNING

Memo

To: City Council
William Bridgeo, City Manager
Lesley Jones, Director of Public Works

From: Matt Nazar, Director of Development Services
Lionel Cayer, City Engineer

Date: July 28, 2014

Re: Green Street Two Way Traffic

At the July 24, 2014, City Council Meeting the Council discussed the possibility of changing the segment of Green Street from Water Street to State Street from one way to two way traffic. The questions and concerns expressed were:

1. How did this issue come to the city's attention?
2. When did the street become one-way? And is there any accident data related to the Green Street / Water Street intersection prior to it becoming one-way?
3. Is there adequate sight distance to the north (left, down the hill) from the location of the reconfigured Green Street intersection with Water Street?
4. Have any residents, businesses, or organizations on this segment of Green Street expressed a concern about two-way traffic on Green Street?

Attorney Walter McKee requested that the city look at turning the street from one-way to two-way. The issue was referred to and reviewed by the city's Traffic Calming Committee. The Traffic Calming Committee reviewed the issue with respect to traffic safety, street width, parking, and traffic flow in the area. The committee voted unanimously to recommend to City Council that Green Street, with the reconfigured Green Street/Water Street intersection, be turned back to two-way traffic. The Traffic Calming Committee consists of City Engineer Lionel Cayer, Public Works Director Lesley Jones, Street Superintendent Jerry Dostie, Fire Chief Roger Audette, Police Chief Robert Gregoire, and Deputy Police Chief Jared Mills.

This segment of Green Street became one way via a Council vote on October 23, 1963. The 1963 Council Ordinance language states that Green Street, from Grove Street (now Water Street) to State Street is to be one way, and was sponsored by Councilor Beverage. No explanation for the reasons to go to one-way are stated.

The conditions in 1963 included an active CMP headquarters office and a guardrail all the way up the hill to the intersection of Green and Water Streets. This was likely a very busy intersection when CMP employees arrived at work and left work each day, and went to and from job sites throughout the day. The city does not have accident data for this location for accidents that occurred when the street was two-way, prior to October 1963. Since 1963, drivers exiting the former CMP building and driving straight out onto Green Street in order to access Grove/Water Street were illegally driving the wrong way on a one-way street. Because of the very large expanse of pavement, which has been that way for a very long time based on the concrete under the pavement, people may have been confused about what was legal and what was not, and made this movement anyway. Poorly designed intersections with wide undefined expanses of pavement increase possible traffic accidents.

Lionel Cayer measured the sight distance down Water Street from the reconfigured Green Street intersection. The measurement was taken 10 feet back from the edge of Water Street and 3 feet off the ground, which is approximately where a driver would be sitting in a vehicle exiting Green Street. The southbound traffic on Water Street was observed to conservatively have a distance of 185 feet from the Green Street intersection, with the current conditions. The guardrail has been removed and the street lighting will be at the back of the sidewalk. Sight distance will be further improved as the hillside is cut back a bit more near the toe of the slope adjacent to the sidewalk to deal with drainage coming off the hill.

The minimum sight distance listed in the City of Augusta "Technical Standards Handbook" is 150 feet, which is the distance required for a safe stop on a level, wet surface according to the Institute of Transportation Engineers Transportation and Land Development book. Sight distances can be safely reduced by 10 to 20 feet for uphill grades in excess of 9%, which Rines Hill is, according to the same traffic engineering book. The recommended sight distance is 250 feet, in the City of Augusta Technical Standards Handbook. When the slope is cut back, it'll be closer to that number.

The only concerns expressed to date about traffic going to two-way have been stated at the July 24 City Council meeting. Others that have been spoken to outside of Council meeting have expressed no concerns over two-way traffic.

Loretta Lathe

From: William Bridgeo
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 4:31 PM
To: Loretta Lathe
Cc: Lionel Cayer
Subject: RE: making Green Street a 2 way street

Please add it to my file for that discussion.

From: Loretta Lathe
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 10:26 AM
To: William Bridgeo
Cc: Lionel Cayer
Subject: FW: making Green Street a 2 way street

Hi Bill,

Forwarding this along, which I believe is a response to Lionel's recent letter to Green Street residents.

Loretta Lathe
Executive Assistant
Office of the City Manager
City of Augusta
16 Cony Street
Augusta ME 04330
Phone: 207-626-2300
Fax: 207-620-8174
www.augustamaine.gov

From: Crouse, Renae [<mailto:Renae.Crouse@MaineGeneral.org>]
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 10:22 AM
To: Loretta Lathe
Subject: Re: making Green Street a 2 way street

Good Morning,

I work at 9 Green Street and find it would make it much more convenient not only for myself and other coworkers but also the clients that we serve who use public transportation. I am very much in favor of making this street a 2 way street.

Sincerely

Renae Crouse
Health Information Specialist
Maine General Counseling and ACT Team
PH: 207-621-3750 FAX: 207-621-3702

Loretta Lathe

From: William Bridgeo
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 4:39 PM
To: Loretta Lathe
Subject: RE: Green Street

Thanks. Add it to the file.

From: Loretta Lathe
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 4:38 PM
To: William Bridgeo
Subject: FW: Green Street

FYI

Loretta Lathe
Executive Assistant
Office of the City Manager
City of Augusta
16 Cony Street
Augusta ME 04330
Phone: 207-626-2300
Fax: 207-620-8174
www.augustamaine.gov

From: Hamilton, Kerry [<mailto:Kerry.Hamilton@MaineGeneral.org>]
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 4:12 PM
To: Loretta Lathe
Subject: Green Street

To Whom It May Concern:

I am currently employed at 9 Green Street and would like to support having Green Street returned from a one way to two way traffic. It will support public and private traffic needing to visit us and the traffic flow to and from the building.

Thank you very much,
Kerry Hamilton

For Thursday's Council Recycling Discussion

From: Lesley Jones

Sent: Monday, October 06, 2014 12:28 PM

To: William Bridgeo

Cc: Ralph St Pierre; townmanager@manchesterme.org; Mike Starn (citymanager@hallowellmaine.org); mcriverside@aol.com; 'Lissa Bittermann'; sbernier@wastezero.com

Subject: Recycling options update

Good Afternoon Bill,

As you are aware, a variety of City staff and interested outside parties have been exploring ways to improve recycling options for our residents and costs associated with doing so. To date we have done the following:

- You and Ralph joined me in a small road trip to Hallowell and Riverside Disposal in Chelsea to see a couple of simple and local programs. Hallowell is open to working with us on a trial basis to allow residents access to their drop-off facility located at Hallowell Public Works. Riverside Disposal, our largest local rubbish/recycling contractor, is also interested in what changes we might make to our recycling program.
- We have collected information on the pay-as-you-throw rubbish and curbside single stream collection program that Waterville recently instituted.
- Additionally, I have spoken with Manchester about the single stream roll-off program they do with Eco-Maine and will, in fact, be meeting with Eco-Maine tomorrow to see if there is an opportunity to work with them to provide more drop-off options for single stream recycling in Augusta and the costs associated with that.
- Ralph and I have met with Waste Zero and provided them with the costs and logistics of our current recycling program. They will do an analysis of this information and get back to us with possible scenarios for improved recycling and associated costs from their perspective.

Upgrading our existing recycling program is a bit complicated from both a capital outlay and operations perspective; we have to consider costs to both the curbside/drop-off program and also storage and transportation to recycling markets (the Hatch Hill piece of the pie). The information we are gathering will be very useful in showing costs associated with improving recycling. Once we hear back from Waste Zero and Eco-Maine we should have the information we need for a discussion at an Informational Meeting, hopefully later this month. We may be able to fairly inexpensively and quickly improve our options for dropped off recyclables. A larger investment in revamping our curbside program and infrastructure at Hatch Hill should probably be considered during the budget process.

Lesley Jones, P. E.
Director of Public Works
City of Augusta
16 Cony St
Augusta, Maine 04330

Ph: 207 626-2435

Fax: 207 626-2437

E-mail: lesley.jones@augustamaine.gov

City of Augusta, Maine
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

AUGUSTA STATE AIRPORT
CODE ENFORCEMENT
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT



ENGINEERING
FACILITIES & SYSTEMS
PLANNING

Memo

To : City Council
William Bridgeo, City Manager

From: Matt Nazar, Director of Development Services

Date: October 20, 2014

Re: Tree Harvesting

Councilor McCormick requested that the issue of tree harvesting be the subject of a City Council Informational meeting. The issue arose due to a harvest out on Riverside Drive that was a concern to neighbors.

The city passed some basic regulations regarding harvesting a couple of years ago in response to issues that had arisen related to noise and the proximity of heavy equipment operation to adjacent residences and time of day for such operations. There were several Planning Board meetings on the topic where the State's Department of Conservation were present to speak as well as harvesters and residents. But the Council did not limit the amount of harvesting that could occur on a property. As I understand it, Councilor McCormick would like to discuss the issue of requiring a vegetated buffer that would remain unharvested adjacent to the property lines where the harvest is occurring.

The Maine Department of Conservation has regulations related to harvesting, but if a property owner has less than 100 acres of land holdings throughout the state, the regulations are very limited. If the owner has less than 100 acres of land holdings in the state, DoC requires nothing more than a form that is a notice of the harvest.

If the Council wishes to take this issue up, there are a number of ways it can be addressed and a number of issues to consider.

1. Is the parcel being harvested in conjunction with an existing building permit or Planning Board approved subdivision/project? Does the Council view clearing a lot for the construction of a home or business, even if that clearing is 50 acres, to be different from clearing solely for a tree harvest? If so, there could be differing regulations proposed when there is an active building permit or subdivision approval for the parcel.
2. Is there a difference between a harvest in the urban compact area and outside the urban compact area – or some other geographies? Do urban settings lend themselves to neighbors

that want lawns abutting each other rather than forested strips abutting each other?

3. Does the size of the harvest affect the Council's desire to regulate the cut, or should a 3 acre cut be regulated in the same way as a 30 acre cut?

There may be other issues that arise as part of the discussion at the Informational Meeting as well that should be part of the evaluation of tree harvesting in Augusta and any new regulations regarding harvesting.

**A
RESOLUTION
of the
CITY COUNCIL
City of Augusta, Maine**

WHEREAS, The City of Augusta is interested in creating an historic district in the City's downtown; and,

WHEREAS, The first step in the process of creating said district is to request the Maine Historic Preservation Commission to undertake an assessment survey of Augusta's downtown area, with a subsequent recommendation being forwarded to the National Register of Historic Places for consideration of designation of Augusta's downtown as a National Historical District.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council approves of and requests the Maine Historic Preservation Commission to perform an assessment survey of the area to include both sides of Canal Street, both sides of Water Street including Front and Commercial Streets on both sides southerly to Monument Park. Said assessment will form the basis for the request to designate the area a National Historical District.

City of Augusta, Maine
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

AUGUSTA STATE AIRPORT
CODE ENFORCEMENT
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT



ENGINEERING
FACILITIES & SYSTEMS
PLANNING

MEMORANDUM

TO: City Council
William Bridgeo, City Manager

FROM: Matt Nazar, Director of Development Services

DATE: October 20, 2014

RE: Riggs Brook Village Rezoning

The proposal below is a significant reworking of the Riggs Brook Village zone from the subcommittee created by the Planning Board. The new district is effectively a reworking of the existing district putting it into a format far more similar to the format of the existing zoning districts and eliminating or modifying some of the more confusing aspects of the district. This would be a complete repeal and replace of the district and I have not attempted to do a line by line analysis of the differences between the two districts. The Planning Board unanimously recommends this text amendment to the Land Use Ordinance.

The significant changes include:

1. Removal of the quadrants. The existing RBV district has four quadrants with slightly different uses and rules. This is gone in favor of one single district.
2. Removal of the difference between subdivision lots and lot splits. The existing RBV district attempted to favor subdivision lots as a way to encourage developers to create larger, more coordinated mixed use developments. Unfortunately, that type of development style is simply not employed by most developers in Maine, leaving the penalty for not developing this way as a significant impediment to any development.
3. Reduction in allowed lot sizes, but maintenance of fairly significant road frontage requirements. The intent is to encourage internal roads, and limit curb cuts along major highways.
4. Removal of the building design requirements for additions to existing buildings. This proved to be a serious impediment on a number of projects. New buildings are still required to meet the new building design standards.
5. There remained the desire to keep many of the design guidelines for site development, sign construction, new utilities, and building appearance. The hope is that new

development will be high quality development, but that there is enough flexibility for developers to be able to reasonably create projects at a manageable cost.

Purpose: The Riggs Brook Village District (RBV), establishes commercial and residential land uses, land development requirements, infrastructure requirements, development design standards and open space amenities appropriate to fostering development of a new economic sector in Augusta. Riggs Brook Village will be a geographically and visually unique area wherein people can live, work, shop, converse, and recreate within walking, bicycling and quick commuting distance of one other. Attracting development of a new economic sector is critical to the improvement of the general welfare of current and future residents and businesses of Augusta, and the incorporation of higher design standards and amenities in the RBV District will be required to make Augusta competitive with other Maine cities as a location for knowledge-based businesses, workers and residents.

It has been proven that allowance of a linear pattern of land-use development results in a very inefficient use of land, resulting in vacant back-lands, excessive infrastructure costs, and added commuting costs, known collectively as development sprawl. The prevention of development sprawl is identified as the first of ten goals of the Maine Growth Management Program (see 30-A M.R.S.A. subsection 4312(3)). The pattern of land development that will be strongly encouraged in Riggs Brook Village (the Village) in support of this goal shall be that of "development parks" that will create multiple lots or land uses out of a larger tract/parcel of land.

Internal streets, stormwater, sewer, and water infrastructure will be required to achieve an appropriate density of Village development. The creation of independent, small lots in a linear fashion along Route 3 and Church Hill Road shall be strongly discouraged, and the creation of development parks that efficiently utilize back lands will be strongly encouraged so that the Village can economically support sewer, water and road infrastructure without subsidization from the remainder of the community.

The design and scale of development projects in Riggs Brook Village shall be that of small and medium-sized structures that, along with defined setbacks, buffering, landscaping and sidewalks, encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel and human interaction. Residential land uses are encouraged throughout the Village in several configurations: townhouse/rowhouse; two-family; and single-family. The identification of the Village as a unique and unified area shall be encouraged via the use of signage, lighting, and other streetscape improvements. Village Greens should be created along Church Hill Road to provide a common Village focal point for each side of Route 3.

Dimensional Requirements

<u>Min. Lot Size</u>	<u>Minimum Frontage on new internal roads (Feet)</u>	<u>Minimum Frontage on Rt 3, Church Hill Rd, and South Belfast Ave (Feet)</u>	<u>Min. Depth (Feet)</u>	<u>Area Per Dwelling Unit</u>	<u>Min. Front Setback ** (Feet)</u>	<u>Max. Height (Feet)</u>
<u>20,000 Square feet</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>20,000*** Square feet</u>	<u>10/80</u>	<u>60</u>

Minimum side/rear setbacks are flexible; see sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.16.

**Minimum front setback: 80 feet from street ROW line of arterial and collector streets; 10 feet from the street ROW line of all other streets.

***May be reduced to 2,500 square feet per dwelling unit if served by public sewer.

a) Design Criteria. The following minimum design criteria shall be met within the Riggs Brook Village (RBV) District.

1. Utilities: All utility services for new building/structure construction shall be placed underground.
2. Outdoor Lighting Standards: The purpose of this section is to provide Outdoor Lighting Standards to help ensure compatibility with neighboring uses, preserve our dark skies, and provide a more pleasant and comfortable nighttime environment while preserving the ability to install effective security lighting.
 - i. Use of motion sensing devises are encouraged; and
 - ii. Lighting shall not blink, flash or be of unusually high intensity or brightness; and

- iii. All lighting fixtures shall be appropriate in scale, intensity and height to the use they are serving.
 - iv. Lighting shall also conform to Section 5.1.11.1, 5.1.11.3, 5.1.11.4, 5.1.11.5, and 5.1.11.6 of the Land Use Ordinance.
3. Location of Parking, Servicing, and Loading Areas for non-residential uses: All off-street parking lots/areas/stalls, vehicle servicing areas (including gasoline/diesel pumps), and delivery and garage bay doors shall be located at the side or rear of buildings, the only exception being for handicapped parking spaces, which may be located at the front of the building. Bufferyard standards for Urban, Industrial, and Planned Development Districts identified in section 5.1.1 of the Land Use Ordinance are applicable to all parking lots with 6 or more spaces.
4. Screening of Machinery, Equipment, Storage Areas, and other appurtenances for non-residential uses: Open storage areas; exposed machinery, electrical/electronic equipment, heating and/or air conditioning equipment, fuel tanks, etc (whether located above the ground on structures or on the ground); areas used for storage & collection of rubbish; and areas determined to be similar to those listed, must be visually screened from roads and surrounding land uses. Suitable types of screening for above-ground equipment, storage areas and appurtenances includes landscaping (e.g. shrubs, plants, trees, fencing) and/or architectural elements (e.g. false walls, false roofing, masonry, blocks, etc.). Suitable types of screening on the ground include opaque wood fences and dense evergreen hedges of five (5) feet or more in height. Where evergreen hedges are proposed, a temporary fence shall be built to provide screening until the evergreens are of sufficient height to hide the unit(s) being screened.
5. Building Design Standards for new structures:
- i. Exterior Building Design: Buildings with exterior walls greater than fifty (50) feet in horizontal length shall be constructed using a combination of architectural features and a variety of building materials and landscaping near the walls. Walls which can be viewed from public streets shall be designed using architectural features and landscaping (abutting the building) for at least fifty (50) percent of the wall length. Other walls shall incorporate architectural features and landscaping for at least thirty (30) percent of the wall length.

1. Architectural Features Architectural features include, but are not limited to the following: recesses, projections, wall insets, arcades, window display areas, awnings, balconies, window projections, landscape structures or other features that complement the design intent of the structure and are acceptable to the review authority. A portion of the on-site landscaping shall abut the walls so that the vegetation combined with the architectural features significantly reduce the visual impact of the building mass as viewed from the street.
- ii. Building Materials. The predominant building materials shall be materials that are characteristic of Central Maine such as brick, wood, native stone and tinted/textured concrete masonry units and/or glass products. Other materials such as smooth-faced concrete block, undecorated tilt-up concrete panels, or pre-fabricated steel panels should only be used as accents and not dominate the building exterior of the structure. Metal roofs may be allowed if compatible with the overall architectural design of the building. Materials shall be of low reflectance, subtle, neutral or earth tone colors. The use of high intensity colors such as neon, metallic or florescent colors for the facade and/or roof of the building are prohibited except as approved for building trim. The use of trademark colors will require approval by the Planning Board.
- iii. Roof Design. Roofs shall be designed to reduce the apparent exterior mass of a building, add visual interest and be appropriate to the architectural style of the building. Variations within one (1) architectural style are highly encouraged. Visible rooflines and roofs that project over the exterior wall or a building enough to cast a shadow on the ground are highly encouraged. Architectural methods shall be used to conceal flat roof tops. Overhanging eaves, sloped roofs and multiple roof elements are highly encouraged. Mansard style roofs are discouraged.
- iv. Customer Entrance(s). Each building shall have at least one (1) clearly defined, highly visible customer entrance using a combination of the following architectural features: canopies, porticos, arcades, arches, wing walls, and permanent above grade integral planters.

6. Additions to Existing Structures: The Planning Board may waive any of the design criteria outlined in this section via a Conditional Use permit process.

Sections of the bufferyard ordinance would need to be amended to add the new district, as would sections of the sign ordinance. Those amendments, are as follows:

Amend Table 5.1.1-A to add the RBV district to the cell that says "Bufferyard requirements in the Urban Area (RA, RB1, RB2, BP, KBD1, KL, RBV, CB, CC, CD zones):"

This would require the same bufferyard standard as in most of the rest of the urban core. Sign ordinance issues can be dealt with as follows:

5.1.17.1.1 **Size, setback, and height regulations.** Ground graphics must comply with the following size, setback, and height regulations. Size shall be reduced by 10 percent for every 10 feet, or portion thereof, that a sign does not meet the proper distance between ground graphics in §5.4.3.

District	Size (Sq. Feet)	Setback (side and rear only) (Feet)	Height (Feet)
CD, PD, IA	200	10	25
CB, CC, KBD2, MED, PD2, RBV	120	10	25
GS, KBD1, KL, RD, RV	50	10	15
BP, RA, RB1, RB2, RC, RPDS, RR, RR2, RRES	15	10	15
All Shoreland zoning districts, except GD	12	10	15
GD Shoreland zoning district	Regulations shall be identical to the underlying base zoning district		

5.1.17.9.2 **Illumination permitted.** A street graphic may be illuminated in the following zoning districts:

RA, RB1, RB2, All Shoreland Zones (except GD Zone)	KBD1, KBD2, RBV, Shoreland GD Business Professional	CB, CC, CD, MED, PD, PD2, KL, IA, RD, RC, RR, RRES, RPDS, RV, RR2

External Illumination only	Internal and External Illumination	Internal and External Illumination
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

5.1.17.9.5.1 Internal Illumination Color Requirements. In the Medical (MED), Kennebec Lockes (KL), and Riggs Brook Village District (RBV) all internally illuminated signs must use a dark colored background with a light colored copy.

City of Augusta, Maine
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

AUGUSTA STATE AIRPORT
CODE ENFORCEMENT
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT



ENGINEERING
FACILITIES & SYSTEMS
PLANNING

Memo

To: City Council
William Bridgeo, City Manager
From: Matt Nazar, Director of Development Services
Date: October 20, 2014
Re: Viles property rezoning

The City Council sent the issue of rezoning the Viles property to the Planning Board for review and recommendation. The Viles Foundation is interested in converting the existing house and barn into conference space for non-profits that need room for meetings.

The existing zoning on the property is Residential A (RA). None of the neighboring zoning districts allow this type of use, so this is not a simple rezone of the parcel to a neighboring district. The Planning Board recommendation is to create a new use for small conference centers, just large enough to cover the square footage necessary for the Viles property, allow the use in the BP zoning district, then contract rezone the Viles property to BP.

The result will be that there will be a new use in the BP zoning district that will be somewhat limited by size, but it's a use that could occur elsewhere in the BP district. It's a use similar to what occurs at the Governor Hill mansion – in the BP district.

The proposed definition for two new uses is:

Conference Center – A facility used for conferences and seminars, with accommodations for food preparation and eating, entertainment, resource facilities, and meeting rooms. The total floor area of a conference center shall not exceed 20,000 square feet.

Convention Facility – A building, or portion thereof designed to accommodate 300 or more people in assembly.

Conference Center is proposed to become a conditional use in the BP, CB, CC, CD, KBD2, and KL districts.

Convention Center is proposed to become a conditional use in the CC and CD district. Finally, Map 10 Lot 31 would be rezoned such that the front 600 feet, as measured from the edge of the property line abutting Stone Street would be Institutional/Business/Professional (BP). This would place the house and the barn, plus an additional 100-150 feet of the property in the BP district.