I have looked things over and it does lead me to a few more questions.

First off I think you folks are moving in the right direction.  But I do have some questions and concerns that you all can discuss at the meeting.

* It appears that only the dimensional standards for uses is being proposed to be reduced but the Lot sizes will remain the same Correct?
* Many of the uses that are on your chart are water dependent uses therefore they have no setback under the current rule but they have been included on the chart as being used to represent existing conditions.  I would encourage the town to look at the number again and reevaluate where the setback line should be.  If it sticks at 25 so be it but the numbers look a little off when you include things that currently have no setback.
* Parking areas reducing the setback on parking to 25’ does not seem consistent currently even in you water dependent uses the parking needs to be setback to 50’ for new parking I would encourage the town to make this 50’.
* I have looked over the reduction in dimensional standards piece to get down to 7260.  In this review I noticed that the condo numbers are included which greatly reduce the size required given it has 27 dwellings on the property.  I took the liberty to run the numbers without the condos and it comes out to closer to 11K per use.  We have asked towns to look at it this way in the past when there is something like this in play since regardless of whatever size limit is placed in this area the condos will always be non-conforming.  I would recommend that the town go with the 10K/use or dwelling instead of the 7260.
* The 35’ height limit is consistent with the chapter 1000 guidelines
* Lot coverage I see that many of the properties have high lot coverage numbers but there are a few that are low and in compliance with the state standards.  The town is essentially proposing a Limited Commercial district but is requesting the lot coverage level that relates to General Development.  I would encourage the town to go with the standard set forth in Chapter 1000 of 20% and the ones that are already exceeding would be able to keep their non conforming level while the properties that are not at that level would not be built out to the 70% level
* Schedule of uses
  + Roads, driveways and parking areas Should be PB review not a yes
  + You list boathouses is that to repair them less that 50% if not this should be a No
  + Piers Docks Wharves for permanent docks is PB review not CEO
  + Multifamily dwellings should be PB
  + Additionally there are a bunch of blanks spaces on the table that will need to be filled in

Also I wanted to add if the town is going through this process to update the ordinance has there been any consideration to update the whole document to be consistent with the chapter 1000 rules which became effective in January of 2015.  The non conforming structures section has been changed in statute therefore eliminating the old 30% floor area and volume.  There are many other sections that have been amended or added to provide a better working document for both regulators and applicants.  I would strongly suggest updating the whole document as part of this large project you have going as well

Lastly I wanted to point out that your current Comprehensive Plan speaks to this water dependent district being maintained.  I would strongly suggest that the municipality amend their plan at the same time as the SLZ ordinance is updated.  Failure to do so could leave the Town with 2 different documents stating 2 different things which could lead to someone challenging this in court.

I hope this provides some guidance and I realize there is likely more questions than answers but this is a very unique situation and I want to ensure the town puts forth the best ordinance they can.

Take care
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