



SURRY

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

UPDATE

MARCH 2005

SURRY
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
MARCH 2005



Prepared by the Surry Comprehensive Planning Committee:

Walter Kane, Chairman
James Dickinson
Ken Dugas
Jane Lord
Edward Magiera
Robert Salois
David Snow
Eleanor Carlisle, Selectwoman
Wilbur Saunders, Selectman
Susan McDonald, Selectwoman

**With technical assistance from the
Hancock County Planning Commission**

Certification: The Municipal Officers Certify that this is a copy of the comprehensive plan with the revisions as proposed on April 6, 2005.

First Selectman

Selectman

Selectman

Attest: A true copy of the **Surry Comprehensive Plan Update 2005**, as certified to me by the municipal officers of Surry, Maine on the ____ day of April, 2005.

Surry town clerk

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	v
A. POPULATION	1
1. PURPOSE	1
2. KEY FINDINGS AND ISSUES	1
3. HISTORICAL TRENDS	1
4. CURRENT CONDITIONS	2
a. <i>Age Characteristics</i>	2
b. <i>Household Size</i>	5
c. <i>Income</i>	5
d. <i>Other Information</i>	6
5. SEASONAL POPULATION	6
6. PROJECTED POPULATION	6
B. ECONOMY	8
1. PURPOSE	8
2. KEY FINDINGS AND ISSUES	8
3. RECENT EMPLOYMENT TRENDS	8
a. <i>Employment and Unemployment</i>	8
b. <i>Employment by Sector</i>	9
c. <i>Seasonal Fluctuations</i>	11
d. <i>Commuting Patterns</i>	12
e. <i>Major Employers</i>	12
C. HOUSING	14
1. PURPOSE	14
2. KEY FINDINGS AND ISSUES	14
3. RECENT HOUSING TRENDS	14
a. <i>Total Number of Year-round and Seasonal Units</i>	14
b. <i>Housing Unit Type</i>	15
c. <i>Renter and Owner-Occupied Housing</i>	16
d. <i>Housing Conditions</i>	17
4. AFFORDABLE HOUSING	19
5. DWELLING UNIT PROJECTIONS	20
6. REGIONAL HOUSING ISSUES	21
D. MUNICIPAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES	22
1. PURPOSE	22
2. KEY FINDINGS AND ISSUES	22
3. FIRE DEPARTMENT	22
a. <i>Current Conditions</i>	22
b. <i>Future Needs</i>	23
4. MUNICIPAL BUILDING AND GOVERNMENT	23
a. <i>Current Conditions</i>	23
b. <i>Future Needs</i>	24
5. EDUCATION	24
a. <i>Current Conditions</i>	24
b. <i>Current and Future Needs</i>	25
6. ROADS AND PUBLIC WORKS	25
7. RECREATION	26
E. VILLAGE ASSESSMENT	27
1. PURPOSE	27

2.	KEY FINDINGS AND ISSUES	27
3.	DEFINING THE VILLAGE AREA	27
4.	EXISTING CONDITIONS	27
a.	<i>Infrastructure</i>	27
b.	<i>Buildings and Structures</i>	28
c.	<i>Landscaping and Aesthetics</i>	29
d.	<i>Land Use Ordinances and Land Limitations</i>	30
e.	<i>Recent Development Trends in the Village Area</i>	31
F.	RURAL ASSESSMENT	32
1.	PURPOSE	32
2.	KEY FINDINGS AND ISSUES	32
3.	DEFINING THE RURAL AREAS	32
4.	EVALUATION OF RECENT DEVELOPMENT TRENDS.....	32
5.	EVALUATION OF CURRENT MEASURES TO DISCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT IN RURAL AREAS.....	34
6.	AN ASSESSMENT OF GROWTH AREAS OUTSIDE OF THE VILLAGE	36
G.	SUMMARY OF OTHER SECTIONS	37
1.	PURPOSE	37
2.	TRANSPORTATION	37
3.	WATER AND MARINE RESOURCES	37
a.	<i>Marine Resources</i>	37
b.	<i>Water Resources</i>	38
4.	NATURAL RESOURCES	40
5.	AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES.....	41
6.	HISTORICAL RESOURCES.....	42
7.	FISCAL CAPACITY	43
a.	<i>Municipal Valuation</i>	43
b.	<i>Tax Commitment</i>	44
c.	<i>State School Aid Trends</i>	45
d.	<i>Major Expenditure Categories</i>	46
e.	<i>Summary</i>	47
H.	INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS SUMMARY	48
1.	PURPOSE	48
2.	KEY ISSUES FACING SURRY	48
3.	POPULATION	48
4.	ECONOMY	48
5.	HOUSING.....	48
6.	PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES	48
7.	VILLAGE ASSESSMENT.....	49
8.	RURAL ASSESSMENT.....	49
9.	OTHER LOCAL TRENDS	49
10.	KEY REGIONAL ISSUES.....	49
II.A.	GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND IMPLEMENTATION.....	51
1.	PURPOSE	51
2.	OVERALL VISION	51
3.	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.....	52
A.	POPULATION GOAL	52
B.	ECONOMY GOAL	52
C.	HOUSING GOAL	53
D.	PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES GOAL.....	54
E.	VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT.....	56
F.	GENERAL LAND USE ORDINANCE REVISIONS	57
G.	WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY SITING ORDINANCE	58

H.	TRANSPORTATION GOAL	59
I.	WATER RESOURCES GOAL	60
J.	MARINE RESOURCES GOAL.....	63
K.	NATURAL & SCENIC RESOURCES GOAL.....	64
L.	AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCE GOAL.....	65
M.	HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES	67
N.	FISCAL CAPACITY GOAL.....	68
O.	CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN.....	69
P.	REGIONAL COORDINATION GOAL.....	70
Q.	CONSISTENCY OF SURRY’S POLICIES WITH THE STATE GOALS AND COASTAL POLICIES	70
II.B. FUTURE LAND USE PLAN		74
1.	INTRODUCTION.....	75
2.	LAND NEEDED FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT	75
a.	<i>Residential Acreage</i>	75
b.	<i>Commercial/Industrial Acreage</i>	76
c.	<i>Rural Undeveloped/Conservation Acreage</i>	76
3.	A FUTURE DEVELOPMENT SCHEME FOR SURRY.....	76
a.	<i>The Village</i>	77
b.	<i>The Shoreline</i>	77
c.	<i>Transitional District</i>	77
d.	<i>Residential Growth Areas</i>	77
e.	<i>Roadside Commercial District</i>	78
f.	<i>Rural Areas</i>	78
4.	GROWTH AND RURAL AREAS.....	78
5.	MEASURES TO DISTINGUISH GROWTH AND RURAL AREAS.....	79
6.	SUMMARY	79
<u>APPENDIX I: RELEVANT PORTIONS OF THE 1991 PLAN</u>		82
B. LAND USE.....		82
1.	FOREST LAND	82
2.	AGRICULTURAL LAND AND OPEN SPACE	82
3.	RESIDENTIAL LAND AND SUBDIVISIONS.....	82
4.	COMMERCIAL LAND.....	83
5.	WETLANDS AND MARSH	83
6.	LAND OWNERSHIP.....	83
C. NATURAL AND MARINE RESOURCES		85
1.	SOILS.....	85
2.	WATER RESOURCES	86
3.	WETLANDS.....	89
4.	MORGAN BAY	89
5.	FISHERIES.....	90
6.	SHELLFISH.....	90
7.	PUBLIC ACCESS TO SALT WATER.....	91
8.	KEY ISSUES	92
E. TRANSPORTATION		94
1.	TRAFFIC PROBLEM AREAS	94
2.	SURRY ROADS.....	95
a.	<i>State Aid Roads</i>	95
b.	<i>Town Roads</i>	95
3.	SUMMARY	97
4.	KEY ISSUES	97

G. CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	98
1. HISTORIC RESOURCES	98
2. ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES	98
3. RECREATION	99
4. SCENIC RESOURCES	100
5. KEY ISSUES	100

APPENDIX II: SURRY UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE: SUMMARY OF KEY PROVISIONS.

TABLES AND MAPS

Tables:

A.1	Surry Year-round Population Change 1940-2000	1
A.2	Age Distribution Surry and Hancock County: 1970,1980, 1990.....	3
A.3	Age Breakdown, 2000	4
A.4	Change in Household Size, Surry and Hancock County	5
A.5	1998 Median Household Income, Surry and Adjacent Towns	6
B.1	Employment Trends	9
B.2	Employment by Industry Sector, 1990	10
B.3	Class of Worker, Employed Persons 16 Years and Over, 1990	11
B.4	Seasonal Unemployment Rates: 1999 & 2000	12
B.5	A Partial List of Businesses in Surry	13
C.1	Change in Total Dwelling Units: 1980-2000.....	15
C.2	Change in Dwelling Unit Types: 1980 & 1990	16
C.3	Estimated Tenure of Occupied Year-round Housing: 1990 & 2000	17
C.4	Housing Units Lacking Complete Plumbing: 1990.....	18
C.5	Source of Water: 1990.....	18
C.6	Sewage Disposal, 1990.....	19
C.7	Definitions of Household Incomes	20
C.10	Projected Year-round Occupied Dwelling Units, Surry	21
D.1	Surry School Enrollment Trends	25
F.1	Summary of Parcel Development by Land Use District: 1991-2001	33
F.2	Summary of Permits Granted for New Construction, Surry 1991-2002	34
G.1	Characteristics of Great Ponds Surry.....	39
G.2	Trends in Valuation, Surry 1993-2002	44
G.3	Trends in Tax Commitment, Surry 1993-2002.....	45
G.4	Trends in General State School Aid, Surry 1993-2002	46
G.5	Summary of Major Town Expenditures by Category, 1993-2002	46
G.6	Details on Surry School Expenditure	47

Maps (following page 80): (large-scale, color maps are available for inspection at the town office)

- Map 1 Village Area
- Map 2 Soil Potential Ratings
- Map 3 Construction Trends Since 1991
- Map 4 Future Land Use Plan
- Map 5 Flood Plain Areas

Maps from 1991 Plan (following Appendix I, page 101):

Map 35A Road Classification

Map 14A Base Map: Transportation and Water Resources

Map 17A and 19A Natural and Marine Resources

INTRODUCTION

The Surry comprehensive plan update is an advisory document. It builds upon the 1993 comprehensive plan. It reflects the desired future of the town. Overall, it identifies current issues and opportunities that the town faces and discusses what is expected to happen within the next five to ten years. This limited update focuses on recent changes in population, economy, housing, public services and land use. It reflects conditions in town as of August 2003.

The plan consists of two major parts. The *Inventory and Analysis* discusses recent trends in town and projects what may happen in the future. While it discusses some options for the town to consider, **these are not recommendations**. Rather, this section is a reference document.

The second part is the *Goals, Policies and Implementation Strategies*. This section sets specific recommendations for the future of the town. The plan, however, is not valid until it is adopted at town meeting. While the plan is the legal basis of any changes to zoning and other land use ordinances, all such changes must be voted upon at a town meeting separate from the comprehensive plan vote. Public hearings are required before any vote.

The plan is intended to guide the selectmen, planning board and other town committees in their decisions and provide continuity in town policy. It can also be used to help Surry seek funding from various state and federal grant programs. Residents are reminded that planning is an on-going process. This plan should be reviewed annually to see if its assumptions are still valid. A more thorough review may be needed in five years.

PART I

Inventory and Analysis

A. POPULATION

1. Purpose

Population is one of the most basic elements of a comprehensive plan. In order to understand the town's current and future needs, a detailed examination of population characteristics is necessary. For example, the age structure of the population will affect the provision of school facilities. This section aims to:

- a. describe Surry's recent population trends;
- b. discuss how these trends relate to and contrast with those in Hancock County and the state; and
- c. review likely future population trends.

2. Key Findings and Issues

Surry's population increased by about 36 percent between 1990 and 2000. This was a faster rate than was projected in the 1991 comprehensive plan. At a time when the median age in Hancock County as a whole is increasing, the median age in Surry is decreasing. The town thus has a younger population than many Hancock County towns.

3. Historical Trends

Surry's recent year-round population trends are shown on Table A.1. While the town's growth rate has varied in recent decades, overall the town has grown rapidly. While the 1991 plan projected a population of 1,275 by 2001, the U.S. Census reported a population of 1,361 in 2000. The town has thus grown faster than expected.

Year	Population	Ten-year change (%)
1940	497	--
1950	448	-9.8%
1960	547	22.0%
1970	623	13.8%
1980	894	43.4%
1990	1004	12.3%
2000	1,361	35.6%

SOURCE: U.S. Census 2000 and 1991 Comprehensive Plan

4. Current Conditions**a. Age Characteristics**

The change in age distribution in Surry between 1970 and 1990 is shown in Table A.2. An understanding of age characteristics is important for several reasons. First, an aging population will have different service demands than a population that is of child-bearing age and may create more demands on the school system. Second, a younger population may have more growth potential since a high birthrate will add more residents.

The data show that there was an increase in all age groups. The fastest percentage change was in the 18-44 group, which includes those of prime child-bearing years. In 1990 this group represented about 38 percent of the population compared to 28 percent in 1970. While overall percentage of persons in the age 5-17 group increased during the 20-year period, there was an actual decrease between 1980 and 1990. While Surry's year-round population increased at a slower rate than Hancock County as a whole, its 0-4 population increased at a faster rate than the county average. It also had a slower rate of decrease in the age 5-17 group between 1980 and 1990.

**Table A.2
Age Distribution Surry and Hancock County: 1970, 1980, 1990**

	Years of Age	1970	% of total	1980	% of total	% change '70-'80	1990	% of total	% change '80-'90	% change '70-'90
SURRY	0-4	43	7%	56	6%	30.2%	62	6%	10.7%	44.2%
	5-17	135	22%	182	20%	34.8%	180	18%	-1.1%	33.3%
	18-44	175	28%	332	37%	89.7%	379	38%	14.2%	116.6%
	45-64	158	25%	177	20%	12.0%	222	22%	25.4%	40.5%
	65 +	112	18%	147	16%	31.3%	161	16%	9.5%	43.8%
	Surry Total	623	100%	894	100%	43.5%	1004	100%	12.3%	61.2%
HANCOCK COUNTY	0-4	2,652	8%	2,610	6.2%	-1.6%	3,205	6.8%	22.8%	20.9%
	5-17	8,593	25%	8,409	20.1%	-1.0%	8,130	7.3%	-3.3%	-4.3%
	18-44	10,810	31%	15,865	38.0%	45.4%	19,057	40.6%	20.1%	74.6%
	45-64	7,596	22%	8,465	20.3%	11.4%	9,401	20.0%	11.1%	23.8%
	65 +	4,939	14%	6,432	15.4%	30.2%	7,155	15.2%	11.2%	44.9%
	Hancock County Total	34,590	100%	41,781	100%	20.8%	46,948	100%	12.4%	35.7%

Source: U.S. Census 1970-1990

Limited 2000 U.S. Census data are presently available on age breakdown (see Table A.3). Since the age groups are not exactly the same as those used by the Census, it is difficult to make comparisons. Several trends can be noted, however. First, there is an increase in all

age groups.

Second, while the number of persons of prime child bearing years increased, this age group has decreased as percentage of the total population. In 1990, this group accounted for 38 percent of the population compared to 29 percent in 2000. While some of this decrease may be explained by the fact that the 1990 Census included the age 18-44 age group and the 2000 Census used a 20-44 age group, these data could indicate a leveling off of the child-bearing age group.

Third, there was a 13 percent increase in the population aged 65 and older. This is somewhat slower than the 15.4 percent rate for Hancock County as a whole. Overall, Surry has a younger population than Hancock County. In 2000 it had a median age of 38.4 years compared to 40.7 for Hancock County. While the median age for the county increased from 35.8 in 1990, Surry’s median age decreased from 39.2 in 1990. The median age in Surry did increase, however between 1980 (34.2) and 1990 (39.2).

Table A.3 Age Breakdown, 2000 Surry		
Years of Age	Numbers	Percent
0-4	72	5.3%
5-19	286	21.0%
20-44	395	29.0%
45-64	426	31.3%
65+	182	13.4%
Total	1,361	100%
Hancock County		
0-4	2,516	5%
5-19	10,292	20%
20-44	16,809	32%
45-64	13,889	27%
65+	8,285	16%
Total	51,791	100%
Source: 2000 U.S. Census, General Demographic Characteristics		

The 1991 plan projected that there would be 70 persons in the aged 0-4 age group in 2001, which is close to the actual numbers for 2000. While 210 were projected in the 5-17 group, there were actually 286 in the 5-19 group. There were 220 persons projected to be in the age 65 and older group compared to an actual 182 in 2000. The town is thus attracting a younger population than expected.

b. Household Size

Table A.4 compares household sizes in Surry and Hancock County. Surry has a larger household size than the county as a whole. Household sizes nationally have been declining in recent decades due to factors such as lower birth rates, higher divorce rates and greater longevity. Surry shows an actual increase between 1980 and 1990 and a only minor decrease between 1990 and 2000. Household size information is important in determining the how many homes will be needed to serve a given level of population. The smaller the household size, the more homes that will be needed.

Table A.4					
Change in Household Size, Surry and Hancock County					
		1980	1990	2000	2010*
Surry	# persons per household	2.27	2.53	2.47	2.41
Hancock County	# persons per household	2.62	2.48	2.31	2.31

Source: U.S. Census;
 * Year 2010 estimates are extrapolations

c. Income

Income statistics are important in determining whether a community is better or worse off financially than its immediate region. Incomes in Surry are higher than the state median and those of Blue Hill, Penobscot and Ellsworth. They are lower than those of Trenton and Orland. Surry residents are thus better off financially than many of the adjoining towns. Employment issues are discussed in the Economy chapter. While there are no poverty statistics presently available from the 2000 Census, poverty appears to be a minimal problem in Surry. A review of general assistance records indicates that requests for assistance have decreased in recent years.

Table A.5 1998 Median Household Income, Surry and Adjacent Towns	
Town	Median Household Income
Surry	\$37,283
Ellsworth	\$28,091
Trenton	\$37,721
Orland	\$38,269
Blue Hill	\$33,056
Penobscot	\$31,538
Hancock County	\$31,716
State of Maine	\$31,952
Source: State Planning Office	

d. Other Information

Racially, the town was 98.4 percent white in 2000. The U.S. Census reported there were four blacks, three Native Americans and six Japanese. Racial information is important in filing many federal grant funding applications.

5. Seasonal Population

The 2000 Census identified 338 housing units for seasonal, recreational or occasional use. Assuming a household size of one and a half to two times the year-round average, Surry could conceivably gain as many as 1,560 additional persons in the summer. (The household size of seasonal units is generally larger than year-round units since people occupying second homes are less likely to be single and more likely to have more overnight visitors.) Assuming this estimate is correct, there are more seasonal residents than the 1,361 year-round residents.

A rough estimate is that fewer than 10 second homes are owned by year-round residents. There thus may be a minor overlap in the count of summer population. Other sources of summer population include guests staying in inns and bed and breakfasts and campground residents.

6. Projected Population

It is always risky to project future population growth. It is particularly difficult without the complete results of the 2000 Census, which would document in-migration rates and offer more detailed age breakdown of the population. Surry, however, has experienced a faster year-

round population growth than Hancock County as a whole. According to the State Planning Office, Surry is projected to have a year-round population of 1,791 by 2015.

B. ECONOMY

1. Purpose

An understanding of the local and regional economy is important in assessing a town's current and future needs. The number of local jobs will affect future growth. This section:

- a. describes employment trends;
- b. describes the local and regional economy; and
- c. discusses likely future economic activity in Surry.

2. Key Findings and Issues

Surry has an economy similar to Hancock County as a whole. Its unemployment rate has been slightly lower than the county's in recent years. The town's labor force has been increasing steadily in recent years. This is a sign of a growing population.

3. Recent Employment Trends

a. Employment and Unemployment

Employment trends are important in understanding the overall status of the economy. A higher than average unemployment rate may indicate the need for a more rigorous economic development program. According to 1999 figures from the Maine Department of Labor, approximately 654 people, or about half of Surry's year-round population was in the labor force (see Table B.1). These figures, compiled by the Maine Department of Labor, only consider persons aged 18 to 64 employed or looking for work. They do **not** include self-employed persons or those who are not looking for work. They may thus understate the amount of unemployment.

Unemployment rates in both Surry and Hancock County decreased during the later part of the 1990s. This was at a time when the labor force was increasing. Surry's labor force increased from 603 in 1993 to 654 in 1999, a rate of 8.5 percent. This is slower than the 13 percent rate of increase for Hancock County as a whole.

		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
S U R R Y	Labor force	603	619	633	612	627	626	654
	Employment	554	575	601	584	593	597	629
	Unemployment	49	44	32	28	34	29	25
	Unemployment Rate	8.1%	7.1%	5.1%	4.6%	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%
H A C K O N C O U N T Y	Labor force	25,490	25,780	26,410	26,850	27,650	27,240	28,740
	Employment	23,330	23,710	24,670	25,260	26,010	25,860	27,230
	Unemployment	2,160	2,070	1,740	1,590	1,610	1,380	1,580
	Unemployment Rate	8.5%	8.0%	6.6%	5.9%	5.9%	5.1%	5.3%
Source: Maine Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security								

b. Employment by Sector

Table B.2 compares employment by industry sector for Surry and Hancock County as reported by the 1990 US Census. The sector in this table refers to the type of industry the employer operates, not the actual jobs performed by workers. This table refers to all Surry residents who are employed, whether they worked in Surry or commuted elsewhere. There were a total of 448 persons reported as employed in 1990 compared to 332 in 1980. The number of employed persons thus increased by about 35 percent between 1980 and 1990. This rate is far faster than the approximately 12 percent growth rates for population during the same period. This may be due in part to more two-income households and the fact that Surry is attracting more residents of working age.

While the largest proportion of the labor force (14 percent) was employed in retail trade, this was less than the 18 percent proportion for Hancock County as a whole. Construction and education also accounted for significant portions of total employment. Overall, there were no major shifts from the 1980 employment breakdown. Patterns are also similar to those of Hancock County as a whole.

Table B.2
Surry & Hancock County: Employment by Industry Sector, 1990

Category	Surry		Hancock County	
	Numbers	Percent	Numbers	Percent
Agriculture, Forestry, & Fisheries	25	5.6%	1,108	5.3%
Mining	0	0%	22	0.1%
Construction	52	11.6%	2,297	10.9%
Manufacturing, Non-durable Goods	22	4.9%	1,406	6.7%
Manufacturing, Durable Goods	31	6.9%	1,254	6.0%
Transportation	13	2.9%	681	3.2%
Communications and Utilities	8	1.8%	399	1.9%
Wholesale Trade	8	1.8%	636	3.0%
Retail Trade	63	14.1%	3,799	18.1%
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	22	4.9%	913	4.3%
Business & Repair Services	26	5.8%	801	3.8%
Personal Services	16	3.6%	1,089	5.2%
Entertainment/Recreation Services	11	2.5%	175	0.8%
Health Services	41	9.2%	1,958	9.3%
Educational Services	51	11.4%	1,993	9.5%
Other Professional/Retail Services	36	8.0%	1,653	7.9%
Public Administration	23	5.1%	816	3.9%
Total	448	100%	21,000	100%

Source: 1990 U.S. Census: CPH-L-83 Table 2 and CPH-L-81 Table 2

In 1990, about 64 percent of employed persons were in the private sector, which is slightly below the Hancock County average of 70 percent (see Table B.3). About 14 percent of the county’s labor forces were employed in government compared to a 20 percent rate for Surry. Both Surry and the county had an approximately 16 percent self employment rate.

Table B.3 Class of Worker, Employed Persons 16 Years and Over Surry and Hancock County: 1990				
	Surry		Hancock County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Private Wage & Salary	286	63.8%	14,604	69.5%
Fed/State/Local Govt.	88	19.6%	2,998	14.3%
Self-employed	74	16.5%	3,325	15.8%
Unpaid Family Member	0	0%	73	0.3%
Total	448	100%	21,000	100%
Source: U.S. Census				

c. Seasonal Fluctuations

Hancock County, as a whole, experiences considerable seasonal fluctuations in its employment rates. Table B.4 compares seasonal rates in Surry to the county. In most cases, Surry had a lower monthly unemployment rate than the county. The seasonal fluctuations are similar.

Table B.4 Hancock County & Surry Seasonal Unemployment Rates: 1999 & 2000				
	1999		2000	
	Unemployment Rates		Unemployment Rates	
	Hancock County	Surry	Hancock County	Surry
January	8.2	7.6	8.1	5.9
February	8.0	7.9	8.1	7.1
March	7.8	7.4	7.5	6.3
April	6.0	3.4	5.0	2.5
May	4.5	2.5	3.7	1.7
June	3.8	4.4	3.1	5.2
July	2.8	0.5	2.3	2.4
August	2.7	2.5	1.9	1.3
September	2.5	1.9	1.9	2.4
October	2.8	0.6	2.3	4.6
November	5.1	1.3	3.7	3.7
December	5.8	3.8	4.2	2.3
Source: Maine Department of Labor				

d. Commuting Patterns

The employment data cited above refer to the entire civilian labor force in Surry, regardless of where they work. Some Surry residents commute to jobs out of town while many residents from other towns commute to work in Surry. The 1990 U.S. Census reported a mean travel time of 18 minutes for Surry residents, which is the same time Hancock County as a whole. While 74 percent drove to work alone, about 13 percent worked at home or walked to work. Most of the remaining persons used carpools.

e. Major Employers

Small-scale businesses are very important to the economy of towns such as Surry. Many of these businesses are home-based. A partial list of businesses in town is shown in Table B.5. It is important that the comprehensive allow businesses to operate while also protecting the owners of surrounding properties and managing impacts such as noise and traffic. This issue will be addressed in the *Goals and Objectives* section of the comprehensive plan update.

Table B.5 A Partial List of Businesses in Surry, 2003	
Atlantic Builders, Inc.	Stanley G. Saunders
Bay Market	Surry Engineering Associates
Borealis Press	Surry Gardens
C.R. Kane & Son	Surry Inn
David Warren, Professional Forester	Surry Kennels
Esposito Welding	Surry Small Engine Service
K.J. Dugas, Construction	Waterline Marine
Lobster Shack	Westmac Enterprises
Morgan Bay Builders	Woodland Studios, Inc.
Ray McDonald, Rotary Mowing and Tilling	
SOURCE: Surry Comprehensive Planning Committee (please note that this list is partial and subject to change)	

C. HOUSING

1. Purpose

A comprehensive plan should contain a thorough analysis of a town's housing trends. Critical issues include housing conditions, affordability, and the projected rate of new house building. Specifically, this section aims to:

- a. describe recent trends in Surry's housing stock in terms of the types and number of units created;
- b. discuss housing affordability; and
- c. project future housing needs.

2. Key Findings and Issues

While Surry's housing stock grew at a 20 percent rate between 1990 and 2000, it did not grow as fast as was projected in the 1991 comprehensive plan. The number of second homes increased at a far slower rate than year-round dwellings. As is the case in much of Hancock County, it is difficult for families to find affordable first-time home purchase opportunities. The number of year-round occupied dwellings is expected to increase to 775 by 2015, a 41 percent increase from the year 2000.

3. Recent Housing Trends

a. Total Number of Year-round and Seasonal Units

The number of year-round dwelling units in Surry increased by about 32 percent (from 437 units to 575) between 1990 and 2000 (see Table C.1). The 1992 Comprehensive Plan predicted that there would be 602 year-round units by 2000. The town's housing stock thus grew at a slower rate than expected while its population grew at a faster rate. This is reflective of a younger population with more persons per households. By contrast, year-round housing stock in Hancock County increased at a nearly 15 percent rate between 1990 and 2000, which is less than half the rate of growth in Surry.

There was an approximately 4 percent increase in the number of seasonal units between 1990 and 2000. This is slower than the 20 percent increase for Hancock County. As of 2000 there were an estimated 338 seasonal homes in Surry, which is fewer than the 394 units projected for 2001 in the 1991 plan.

Table C.1
Change in Total Dwelling Units
Surry and Hancock County: 1980-2000

		1980	1990	2000	% Change '80-'90	% Change '90-'00	% Change '80-'00
S U R R Y	Year- Round	342	437	575	27.8%	31.6%	68.1%
	Percent of Total	54.8%	57.3%	63.0%			
	Seasonal	282	325	338	15.2%	4.0%	19.9%
	Percent of Total	45.2%	42.7%	37.0%			
	Total	624	762	913	22.1%	19.8%	46.3%
H A C H O N C O U N T Y	Year- Round	16,944	20,260	23,273	19.6%	14.9%	37.4%
	Percent of Total	69.4%	66.7%	65.8%			
	Seasonal	7,484	10,136	12,081	35.4%	19.2%	61.4%
	Percent of Total	30.6%	33.3%	34.2%			
	Total	24,428	30,396	35,354	24.4%	16.3%	44.7%

Source: U.S. Census

b. Housing Unit Type

Housing unit type data are important in determining if there is a range of housing types available to residents and potential residents. Younger persons and those with lower incomes need an alternative to the single-family house. Table C.2 shows that about 94 percent (713 units) of the dwelling units in Surry were single-family homes in 1990. There were only three duplex units and no multi-family dwellings.

There were 46 mobile homes. The total number of mobile homes increased by about 65 percent between 1980 and 1990. This is a somewhat faster rate of increase than the 58 percent rate for single family homes. Mobile homes, however, still accounted for only 6 percent of the year-round dwellings. As mentioned in the 1991 plan, towns must allow mobile home parks in some parts of town in order to comply with state law.

Table C.2 Change in Dwelling Unit Types Surry: 1980 & 1990¹					
Total Dwellings	1980		1990		1980-1990
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Percent Change
Single Family	297	86.8%	713	93.6%	58.3%
Duplex	16	4.7%	3	0.4%	-433%
Multi-Family	13	3.8%	0	0%	---
Mobile Homes	16	4.7%	46	6.0%	65.2%
Total Units	342	100%	762	100%	55.1%

Source: U.S. Census
¹**Note:** 1980 figures are for year-round only. 1990 are for year-round and seasonal.

c. Renter and Owner-Occupied Housing

While there are no data presently available from the 2000 U.S. Census on housing types, there is information on renter and owner occupancy. Many of the renter-occupied units may be single-family homes. In 2000, about 16 percent of the year-round units in town were renter occupied and the balance was owner-occupied. While this is a smaller proportion of renter-occupied units than the 24 percent figure for Hancock County, the number and percentage of rental units in Surry did increase between 1990 and 2000. In 1990 rental units accounted for about 12 percent of all units and the total number increased by nearly 96 percent between 1990 and 2000.

Table C.3 Estimated Tenure of Occupied Year-round Housing (does not include seasonal and vacant units) 1990 & 2000 Surry & Hancock County							
		1990		2000		1990-2000	
S U R R Y		Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Percent Change	
		Renter-Occupied	46	11.6%	90	16.3%	95.7%
		Owner-Occupied	351	88.4%	461	83.7%	31.3%
		Total Occupied Units	397	100.0%	551	100.0%	38.8%
C O U N T Y		Renter-Occupied	4,466	24.3%	5,314	24.3%	19.0%
		Owner-Occupied	13,876	75.7%	16,550	75.7%	19.3%
		Total Occupied Units	18,342	100.0%	21,864	100.0%	19.2%
Source: U.S. Census (1990 CPH-1-21, Tables 10+11,) 2000, initial print-outs							

One indicator of housing supply is vacancy rates, the percentage of units that are vacant at any one time. In 1990, Surry had a 2 percent vacancy rate for owner-occupied homes compared to a 2.1 percent rate for Hancock County. Normally, a 2 percent vacancy rate is considered desirable for such units. A lower rate may mean that there are insufficient units for sale, indicating a possible housing shortage. A significantly higher rate may mean a depressed housing market. Surry's vacancy rate is within the acceptable range. In 2000 the rate was 2.1 percent compared to 1.9 percent for the county. There was thus little change since 1990.

While there was a 2.1 percent vacancy rate for rental housing in 1990, this rate had increased 6.3 percent by 2000. A 5 percent vacancy rate is normally considered desirable for rental housing to allow people reasonable opportunities to find lodging. Surry's 2000 rate was above the 5.9 percent rate for Hancock County. The vacancy rate, however, does not necessarily mean that the vacant units offered affordable rents.

d. Housing Conditions

Housing is generally rated as standard and substandard. A standard home is one that is in good condition with basic amenities such as adequate heating, complete plumbing and kitchen facilities. A substandard house usually either requires repairs beyond normal maintenance or lacks some basic amenities. Information on housing conditions is important since a community with a large number of substandard dwellings means that many residents are living in poor and possibly unsafe conditions.

While there are no data on the number of homes that are substandard due to overall

condition, the U.S. Census has data on basic amenities. According to the 1990 Census, 18.5 percent of the dwellings in Surry lacked complete plumbing compared to 5.8 percent of those in Hancock County. This figure, however, includes second homes. The extent of year-round homes without complete plumbing cannot be determined from these data. It is likely, however, that the majority of these units are second homes given the large number of seasonal “camps” around the town’s various ponds.

Table C.4 Housing Units Lacking Complete Plumbing, Surry and Hancock County 1990		
	Number	Percent
Surry	141	18.5%
Hancock County	1,752	5.8%
Source: 1990 Census CPH-L-83, Table 4		

Another indicator of overall housing conditions is water supply and sewage disposal methods. Here again, Surry is worse than the county average. About 26 percent of the units in Surry depended on a water source other than a well or public or private system, compared to 7 percent of the units in Hancock County. Generally, such units depend on a spring or an open source of water that may be unsafe. Because the data report on all housing units, some of these units may be seasonal camps that get their water from a fresh water pond and would thus not be considered substandard.

Table C.5 Source of Water Surry and Hancock County, 1990				
	Surry		Hancock County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Public system or private company	10	1.3%	7,570	24.9%
Individual drilled well	435	57%	17,437	57.4%
Individual dug well	117	15.3%	3,127	10.3%
Other	200	26.2%	2,262	7.4%
Total	762	100%	30,396	100%
Source: 1990 Census: CPH-L-81, Table 4; CPH-L-83, Table 4				

Approximately 6 percent of Hancock County dwellings disposed of their sewage by a method other than a septic tank, cesspool, or public sewer, compared to only 17% percent of the units in Surry (Table C.6). This means that unhealthy conditions may exist, such as discharges of untreated sewage into water bodies. The overall proportion of such units in Surry is quite small. There are matching state grant monies available through the Maine Department of Environmental Protection's Small Community Grants Program to help install acceptable disposal systems.

Table C.6 Sewage Disposal Surry and Hancock County, 1990				
	Surry		Hancock County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Public sewer	--	--	7,084	23.3%
Septic tank or cesspool	631	83%	21,557	70.9%
Other	131	17%	1,755	5.8%
Total	762	100%	30,396	100%
Source: 1990 Census: CPH-L-81, Table 4; CPH-L-83, Table 4				

A home is also considered substandard if it is overcrowded, having more than one person per room. In 1990, 1 percent of the occupied year-round units in Surry had more than one person per room. This is less than the 1.9 percent rate for Hancock County.

4. Affordable Housing

Affordable housing is a concern for most coastal Maine towns. While even middle-income households are affected by the high cost of housing, it is a particular problem for very low-income and low-income households (Table C.7). According to 2000 figures, a family of four in Hancock County would be considered very low-income if it earned \$18,805 or less, and low-income if its income were at or below \$30,100. These figures are updated periodically by the state. According to the 1990 Census, about 33 percent of Surry's household's were very low-income or low-income.

Table C.7	
Definitions of Household Incomes	
Very Low Income	annual income is less than or equal to 50% of the County median family income
Low Income	annual income is more than 50% but less than or equal to 80% of the County median family income
Moderate Income	annual income is more than 80% but less than or equal to 150% of the County median family income
Source: Maine State Planning Office	

For comprehensive planning purposes, the State of Maine defines affordable housing as decent, safe, and sanitary living accommodations that are affordable to very low and low-income households. To be considered affordable, such housing should cost less than 30 percent of income for renters and less than 33 percent of income for homeowners. The state encourages all towns to aim toward the goal that 10 percent of all new housing is affordable to very low-income and low-income groups.

Data from the Maine State Housing Authority (MSHA) indicate affordable housing is a problem in the Ellsworth area housing market of which Surry is a part. MSHA includes Mount Desert Island and both inland and coastal towns adjoining Ellsworth in its housing market. In 1998 the median sales price for a home was \$110,000, which was a 1.16 ratio of the state median. Yet, incomes were 92 percent of the state average. The area thus has higher housing costs and lower incomes than the state as a whole.

MSHA uses an affordability index to compare the cost of housing to incomes. An index of 1.00 would indicate that household incomes were sufficient to allow the purchase of the average priced house. The Ellsworth housing market has an index of 0.78, which is well below the ideal. Housing affordability is thus a problem in Surry.

5. Dwelling Unit Projections

It is important for planning purposes to know the number of dwellings likely to be built in the future. Demand for land and public services will be determined in part by how many homes will be built. The number of year-round homes needed in the future can be estimated by dividing the projected household population by the projected household size.

As seen in Table C.8 a total of 775 year-round households are expected by the year 2015, a 224-unit increase (or 41 percent) over 2000. The household population figure is derived from the high population projection cited in the Population chapter. This projected household size for 2015 is assumed to be the same as for 2000 (see Table A.4 in that same chapter).

Given recent trends in Surry, it is likely that most of these units will be single-family homes. These figures, however, do **not** include seasonal homes. While there is no reliable way to project the number of second homes that will be built, their rate of construction has slowed in

recent years and is likely to continue to be slow as Surry becomes more of a year-round community.

Table C.8 Projected Year-round Occupied Dwelling Units, Surry		
	2000*	2015
Projected Population Residing in Households	1,361	1,791
Projected Household Size	2.47	2.31
Projected Occupied Dwelling Units	551	775
* Note: 2000 figures are actual numbers from the U.S. Census.		
Source: Analysis by the Hancock County Planning Commission		

6. Regional Housing Issues

The major regional issue is affordable housing. It is difficult for a single town to address this issue on its own. Surry may thus want to work with other communities in Hancock County to explore options to improve the supply of affordable housing.

D. MUNICIPAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES

1. Purpose

A comprehensive plan should contain an analysis of municipal service and facility needs that the town faces. This analysis is important for two reasons. First, municipal service costs affect the tax base. Second, there is an interrelationship between town services and overall growth patterns. Growth affects demand for services and new services can help shape where future growth occurs. This chapter presents a brief overview of various services in town.

2. Key Findings and Issues

Surry faces several municipal service and facility issues. Elementary school enrollment grew by about 40 percent between 1990 and 2000, but has been declining in recent years. The fire department faces an overcrowded building and a shortage of volunteers. The town office, which shares a facility with the fire department, is also overcrowded. Town services are thus feeling the effects of recent population growth.

3. Fire Department

a. Current Conditions

Fire protection in Surry is provided by the 20-member volunteer fire department. Normally, two of these volunteers are available to respond to calls during the working day. These volunteer resources are supplemented by mutual aid arrangements with adjoining towns. The department foresees no need for paid staff at this time since it averages about 27 to 35 calls a year. The number of calls for service a year has fluctuated since 1993. No correlation is apparent with town population growth.

The department is, however, concerned about continued population growth during a time when it is getting increasingly difficult to recruit volunteers. Volunteer recruitment is already difficult due to the many training requirements. For example, fully trained Fire Fighter One (FF1) certification requires over 100 hours of training for initial certification. This amount may increase to 200 hours. This makes it difficult for the department to have adequate personnel with which to fight fires.

The fire department is presently housed in the municipal building, which it shares with the town office. This facility is overcrowded. The department must share a training room with the town office and thus can hold training sessions only when the room is not needed for town government functions or else meet in the vehicle storage area. There are presently four vehicles stored in three bays and a forestry truck is kept outside, behind the station.

There is no fire suppression system for the building. The department would like to have space for a bunk room in the event that on-call staff are needed at some point in the future as well as more storage space, a training area and a chief's office with secure storage for records. It would also like to add a heated shed for storage of the vehicles presently stored outside. Since

the facility is centrally located, no need is foreseen for any branch stations.

Current fire fighting equipment appears adequate. Another fire truck will be needed in the next ten years. The fire chief maintains that a ventilation saw and a positive pressure fan are presently needed. Other needs include upgraded radios and telephone equipment, new hand tools, fire hose, turn out gear and a lap top computer. The maintenance costs of the current utility truck are increasing each year and it needs to be replaced with a new vehicle.

The average response time to a call in Surry is ten minutes. It takes about fifteen minutes to reach the most remote part of town. The department has difficulty traveling on many camp roads during the spring due to mud and insufficient width. Additional fire ponds or dry hydrants are needed around outer Toddy Pond, the village area and along the Surry Road. It has been difficult to maintain some of the existing water sources due to problems with the DEP. More study is needed of just where in town water supplies for fighting purposes are inadequate.

b. Future Needs

The department will need a larger facility in the next few years. If there is an increase in calls for service due to population growth, it may also need to consider hiring day staff. The training requirements for these staff would make this step very costly.

4. Municipal Building and Government

a. Current Conditions

Town government functions are conducted in the municipal building, which was built in 1986. As mentioned above, the building also houses the fire department. Apart from the three bays for fire equipment, there is a boiler room and a meeting room. There is also a vault and offices for the assessors/select board members, the CEO/planning board and the administrative assistant. Other areas include a public service counter, an open work area and a lobby.

The building is overcrowded. The current meeting room and workspace areas are proving to be inadequate. There is also a shortage of storage space and voting functions have been moved into the firehouse because the current meeting room is too small for this purpose. The public service counter area needs to be expanded or redesigned to facilitate two transactions at the same time. The entrance and hall widths and door configurations may not meet Americans with Disabilities standards.

The positions of administrative assistant to the selectmen, treasurer, tax collector, clerk, registrar of voters, excise collector and agent for general assistance administrators are held by one person. The position of deputy for several of these positions is held by another person, who also provides clerical support for various town boards and committees. Funding has recently been authorized for a part-time third person to assist with many duties.

The workload of the town office staff has increased over the past decade, but until the recent authorization for a part-time third person, the staffing level has not kept up with that workload increase. Various tasks, including some critical to town operation such as financial reporting, filing of both permanent and short-term records, personnel policies and emergency management planning, have not had proper time and attention in recent years.

b. Future Needs

Given the current inadequacies of space and staffing, some changes will be necessary. A municipal building committee was formed in the summer of 2002, which is working on an analysis of space needs and a proposal for expansion of the building to meet those needs. A town government futures committee should also be formed to consider what changes, if any, should be made to the organizational structure of Surry's government. Although changes may not be necessary in the near term, if Surry continues to grow as rapidly in the coming decade as it has in the recent past, there should be a mechanism in place for considering whether the current organization continues to meet the town's needs adequately.

5. Education

a. Current Conditions

Surry is part of School Union 92, which also serves Trenton, Lamoine, Hancock, Eastbrook, Waltham, Otis and Mariaville. Students attend grades K-8 at the Surry Elementary School and attend high school on a tuition basis. The town provides bus service to George Stevens Academy in Blue Hill and Ellsworth High School. Students, however, may use tuition payments for any accredited school.

The elementary school has twelve class rooms and consists of a main building of 17,000 square-feet and an annex of 2,000 square-feet. While School Union officials have no information on the rated capacity of the building, no capacity problems have been noted. The building should be adequate for the projected enrollment over the next five to ten years.

Historic enrollment trends are shown in Table D.1. As seen, enrollment increased steadily during the early to mid-1990s, but has declined in the past few years. In the spring of 2003, there were 135 students enrolled compared to 116 in 1991, this represents a 16 percent increase. There were, however, 28 percent fewer students in 2003 than the 161 students enrolled in 1996. This means that even though the town has seen a rapid increase in its year-round population, it is undergoing a period of declining school enrollment. This is typical of most coastal towns in Hancock County.

Table D.1 Surry School Enrollment Trends	
Year	K-8 Enrollment
1991	116
1992	117
1993	144
1994	148
1995	151
1996	161
1997	142
1998	145
1999	159
2000	142
2001	147
2002	141
2003	135
SOURCE: School Union 92, April 1 enrollment data	

b. Current and Future Needs

While the overall facility appears adequate, some maintenance issues need to be addressed. These include repairs to the roof and the siding. The parking areas need to be re-paved. Interior air quality issues must also be addressed.

6. Roads and Public Works

Roads and public works functions are overseen by the road commissioner. There is a five-year road maintenance plan that sets the overall direction for road improvements and re-paving. Nearly all town roads are paved and the town attempts to assure that they are re-paved every five to seven years. Most road maintenance functions are provided on a contractual basis. Snow plowing is done by private contractors. The town does not have its own public works department.

One major problem noted by the road commissioner is the difficulty of plowing Toddy Pond Road. A more general problem is that the road system was not designed to withstand the heavy truck traffic that it now carries. However, truck weight policy is primarily set by the state, rather than the town, so that little can be done on the local level to address this problem.

7. Recreation

Recreation programs in Surry are coordinated by the Surry Recreation Committee. Activities in town include Little League baseball, softball and t-ball. There are pee-wee basketball and soccer groups. The school gym is open for children on Sundays and there are cub scout and girl scout groups. Further information on recreation is found in Appendix I, pages 88-89. The Gatherings Campground referred to in that section has since closed.

There are boys and girls baseball fields of about one acre each at the Surry school. Both fields are in need of proper drainage and reseeding. There is inadequate spectator seating and proper dugouts for players are needed at both fields. The committee sees a need for an ice skating facility. It would also like to institute a pee wee hockey program and undertake adult social and athletic programs.

The town continued to improve the Osgood lot, located behind the town office, as this plan was going to print. The facility consists of an athletic field designed to accommodate soccer, softball and baseball. It also features walking trails.

The committee also feels that its scope needs to be defined. More community involvement would enhance the ability of the committee to provide services. Time commitments from volunteers would allow the committee to provide more services.

There have been several changes in outdoor recreation conditions since 1991. First, there has been increased posting of land for hunting and fishing restrictions. This includes some parcels held in conservation easements. Second, there has been greater ATV use, which has prompted complaints from some property owners.

Third, the access road to Patten Pond has been improved and some additional parking has been added. Fourth, the 1991 plan didn't mention a town-owned parcel on Toddy Pond. Due to the small size of this parcel and its limited access, its potential is limited to hand carry in launching of small canoes and kayaks.

E. VILLAGE ASSESSMENT

1. Purpose

The Surry village is one of the defining characteristics of the town. Encouraging development in traditional New England villages is now seen as a major way to reduce the impacts of sprawl. A village area that has adequate services and provides a good quality of life could attract growth that may otherwise occur as scattered, low-density development in rural parts of town. This section presents an analysis of the current village area and identifies major issues. This analysis will serve as the basis for future village development policies.

2. Key Findings and Issues

Overall, the village area is aesthetically appealing with many attractive buildings and good views of the water. There are, however, several factors that limit its use as a walkable community. First, there are no sidewalks and cars travel along Route 172 at high rates of speed. This does not make the village pedestrian friendly. Second, there is no public water and sewer system serving the village; this limits the density of development that can be permitted there. Third, building size restrictions are discouraging compatible development in the village area.

3. Defining the Village Area

The village is not a legally recognized entity. While there is presently a Village Zone in the unified development ordinance, the boundary of this zone can be changed based on the recommendations of the comprehensive plan and an amendment voted upon at town meeting. Ideally, the village area, as designated in the comprehensive plan, should contain sufficient land to allow for future development adjacent to the existing built-up area. The village area is shown on Map 1.

4. Existing Conditions

This analysis focuses on infrastructure such as the transportation system and other public facilities, buildings and landscaping. All these are important components of any strategy to make the village area attractive as an area for future growth. This analysis is based on field surveys done by the comprehensive planning committee.

a. Infrastructure

The village is centered on Route 172. This road handles a substantial amount of through traffic. While there is a 35-mph speed zone through the village, enforcement of this limit is spotty since the town must depend on the overworked State Police and County Sheriff. The high speed of traffic, combined with the lack of pedestrian sidewalks, limits the attractiveness of the village as a pedestrian-friendly community.

Presently, there are no pedestrian cross-walks. Committee members have suggested that a crosswalk be added from the school to the town office and from the town park to the road leading to the town landing. Also suggested, was at the junction of Routes 176 and 172 and at

the 172-North Bend Road intersection. There were sidewalks in the village area in the early 1950s. They were removed due to the widening of Route 172. The current right-of-ways may be inadequate to allow the building of sidewalks on both sides of the road.

Areas identified by comprehensive planning committee members as needing sidewalks included from the school to the center and from Enterprise Lane to North Bend Road. Also mentioned was from Memorial Park to the town hall on both sides of the road. Another suggestion was along the road to the town landing and connecting the town park east to the Post Office and west to the Bay Market. Sidewalks would be presently difficult to install along Route 172 due to poor drainage. This problem must be addressed by the Maine Department of Transportation.

The village could also be enhanced by some pedestrian walkways. For example, a walkway could be between the town wharf and the old Kane house. The walkway could also along the shore and to the stream near Route 176.

The committee also noted several traffic-related safety problems. A general problem was vehicles backing out from driveways into traffic. Another was poor visibility from the North Bend Road facing toward Ellsworth.

The village area faces some seasonal parking problems. These include the area in front of Surry Gardens and along the road at the Carrying Place. The village, however, also has several public parking lots. These include the town park (6 spaces), the town landing (15 spaces), the town office (15 spaces) and the school (40 spaces). There are limited opportunities for on-street parking and parking is prohibited along the North Bend Road near the school. There are no designated “park and ride” lots where residents could park their vehicles and either carpool or use public transportation.

There is no public water or sewer system serving the village area or any other part of Surry. This limits the development potential of the village since all waste water disposal must be by individual septic system. There are several concentrations of poor soils that limit the placement of new septic systems. Soils potential ratings for development are shown on Map 2.

Many towns have taken steps to enhance their village areas by creating “a gateway.” This may be as simple as a large sign indicating that the entrance to the village. Some towns have created small gardens, installed flag poles, picnic areas and similar measures. At this point, there is no specific gateway for Surry.

b. Buildings and Structures

Public buildings are an important part of any village. People need a reason to come to a village and buildings such as the town office, school and post office are important drawing factors. As mentioned in the *Public Facilities and Services* chapter, the town office/fire station complex is overcrowded. The current post office is also overcrowded. Any village development scheme should assure that these facilities remain in the village area and, if possible, in walking distance of each other.

There are also several buildings of historic interest. These include the old fire house/school house on Toddy Pond Road, the old town hall on Route 172 and the Rural Hall. Other structures of high historic value include the Methodist Church and the old Cash and Carry store. There are also many private homes that are well-preserved and date from the nineteenth century.

Some towns have undertaken programs to encourage homeowners to have their properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Local historical societies have often helped with these endeavors. Listing does not restrict what the owner may do with the property, but it does offer limited protection from acquisition of the property from any project that uses state or federal funds. If the exterior of a property is altered it could be removed from the Register.

Overall, the buildings in the village area appear to be in good condition. There are only minor cases of homes in poor repair or other cases of blight. Most of the problems could be addressed by general clean-up.

Signs are another factor in assessing village character. The committee noted few problems with signs during its analysis. It was suggested that the signs at the town office and school could be made more attractive. Some towns have also developed specific sign standards for their village areas. These may involve a common theme in terms of materials used, size and color that differ from other parts of town.

Due to the presently limited commercial development in the village area, there have been few problems with lighting from commercial operations affecting surrounding properties. If the town does take steps to encourage further commercial development in the village area, it may want to review its lighting standards. This could involve assuring that measures are in place to minimize high intensity commercial lighting shining onto an adjoining property.

c. Landscaping and Aesthetics

Any village development plan should take steps to assure that it remains aesthetically pleasing. One way this can be accomplished is by having adequate public green spaces and landscaping. Preservation of scenic views is also important to protecting a high quality environment.

The Surry village already has many aesthetically pleasing features. These include Memorial Park and the town wharf area. One scenic view noted by committee members was at the Carrying Place toward Mount Desert Island. Others included the town landing, various fields around the village and the view from the Bay Market. The view from the Route 176 intersection with 172 and the brook along side of Toddy Pond Road were also mentioned.

The committee also identified several areas that could benefit from additional landscaping. These included the area around the town office, the town landing area and adjacent to the school. It was also suggested that more trees be planted along Route 172 and around the historical society building. Another option to enhance the village area would be construct additional public green spaces.

d. Land Use Ordinances and Land Limitations

In assessing the viability of the village as a growth area it is important to examine current land use ordinance standards to determine if they inhibit compatible village development. Land characteristics must be examined in two ways. First, to assure that soils and other conditions are adequate to support growth. Second, there must be an amount adequate of vacant land to accommodate additional growth.

Under current zoning, much of what could be called the village area is zoned Village. There is a minimum lot size of one acre, and a 20 percent lot coverage requirement (the major provisions of the UDO are summarized in Appendix II). If soil conditions are adequate, a 20 percent lot coverage bonus and lot size reduction may be granted. Conditions for granting the bonus include making provisions for public access to open space, landscape plantings along the street frontage and when building designs are consistent with the predominant architectural features of a traditional village. According to the planning board, this provision has been rarely, if ever, used.

Permitted uses in the Village District include small-scale commercial, one and two-family homes, bed and breakfasts and civic uses. Prohibited uses include multi-family dwellings, industrial and wholesale. Basically, the district is set up to permit small-scale uses.

It would be easier to attract growth to the village if lot sizes were smaller. This would be more practical if safe waste water disposal and drinking water arrangements could be assured. While a public water or sewer system would be very costly, there are options for smaller shared community systems co-owned by several property owners. One option would be to allow a smaller lot size (such as one-half acre) subject to approval by the local plumbing inspector.

The restriction on multifamily developments may also inhibit growth in the village. As in most of Hancock County, affordable housing is an issue in Surry. A small-scale apartment complex in walking distance of the school and other village facilities could enhance the sense of community. Another option would be to allow apartments in currently unused or underused spaces. For example, apartments could be put on the upper floors of commercial buildings or the ells and barns or houses.

If the town were to pursue this option it would need to have zoning standards to minimize conflicts between multi-family and other uses. These may include provision of adequate off-street parking and vegetative buffers. It may also want to impose a limit on how many units may be built in one development.

A review of soils maps and lot sizes indicates that the village is a mixture of soils rated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service as having a moderate and low potential for residential development. This means that while the development potential of some parcels may be limited, others should be able to accommodate residential uses. There are also some parcels with sufficient land to allow further subdivision.

e. Recent Development Trends in the Village Area

A review of tax records indicates that there were an estimated 212 properties developed throughout Surry between 1991 and 2001. According to assessment records, thirteen parcels were developed in the area presently zoned as the Village District. Only a small portion of recent growth has thus occurred in the village. The development that has occurred in town has been widely scattered. In addition to continued development on properties fronting saltwater and the various lakes in town, development has continued along the major roads.

F. RURAL ASSESSMENT

1. Purpose

This section reviews development trends in rural areas and discusses options for increasing protection of Surry's rural areas. This analysis is a balance to the assessment of the village area. It also examines what measures the town might take to increase the attractiveness of its other growth areas (outside of the village) as presently designated in the comprehensive plan. While no specific recommendations are included in this section, it will serve as the basis for the goals and objectives and the future land use plan.

2. Key Findings and Issues

While the purpose of growth areas is to attract the majority of new development in a town, most development over the past ten years has been in the rural areas. There are presently few regulatory distinctions between growth and rural areas. The town needs to designate growth areas that are more likely to attract growth.

3. Defining the Rural Areas

The 1991 comprehensive plan defined the rural areas as all parts of town except the village, the Blue Hill Road zone and the Meadow Brook zone. The current UDO (unified development ordinance) divides the rural areas into the Rural and the Forestry and Agricultural districts. The rationale for having two rural zones is to distinguish between areas along or adjacent to existing roads where development is more likely to occur and those more remote areas. The Rural District covers the former areas. The Forestry and Agricultural District covers more remote areas where forestry is likely to be the main activity. Future development is more likely to occur in the Rural District. The zoning distinctions between the two districts are summarized in Appendix II.

4. Evaluation of Recent Development Trends

Development trends may be evaluated by reviewing assessing and building permit data. Assessment records show that there were a total of 212 parcels developed between 1991 and 2001. The HCPC was able to match 199 of these parcels with the tax maps. It was further possible to link 194 of these parcels to the land use districts. The results of this analysis are shown on Table F.1.

Table F.1 Summary of Parcel Development by Land Use District: Surry 1991-2001		
Land Use District	Parcels	Acreage*
Village	13	141
Roadside Commercial	4	47
Residential Growth	1	44
Forest and Agriculture	10	188
Rural	166	1,879
Total	194	2,298
*NOTE: Acreage refers to the size of the parcel developed, a 40-acre parcel might contain a single home and thus be subject to further development.		
SOURCE: Analysis of tax records by the HCPC		

As seen, only one parcel was developed in the Residential Growth District and thirteen in the Village District. This means that the majority of growth has occurred in the rural areas. The town has been unable to guide much growth to the areas designated for growth in the 1991 comprehensive plan.

Town building permit data for new construction are shown in Table F.2 and Map 3. While these data do not show permits granted by district, they do show the breakdown of permits by building type and between shoreland and inland. Of the 212 permits issued, 62 or about 29 percent were within the shoreland zone. This is to be expected given the high demand for shorefront property.

The most common form of construction is the single family home. They accounted for 158 units or nearly three-quarters of all permits issued. This is consistent with a community that is attracting relatively high value homes. According to the 2000 Census, the median value of a single-family home is \$103,500, which is just under the \$108, 600 median for Hancock County as a whole.

Table F.2 Summary of Permits Granted for New Construction, Surry 1991- 2002	
Permit Type-Inland	Number
Apartment	6
Camp	3
Commercial	3
Mobile Home	30
Single Family Residence	108
Total Inland	150
Permit Type Shoreland	Number
Apartment	1
Camp	9
Commercial	0
Mobile Home	2
Single Family Residence	50
Total Shoreland	62
Total Shoreland and Inland	212
SOURCE: Analysis of building permit records by the HCPC	

5. Evaluation of Current Measures to Discourage Development in Rural Areas

The UDO presently makes relatively few distinctions between the residential growth and rural areas. For example, the Residential Growth District and the Rural District both have the same road frontage requirements. While a minimum lot size of 40,000 square-feet is required in the Rural and the Forest and Agricultural Districts, one acre is required in the Growth District. Since the Rural District standards count only “net development areas” (that exclude land features such steep slopes and hydric soils) in the minimum lot size calculations and the Growth District standards count all land, lot sizes will be generally larger in the two rural districts.

Many towns, however, have a much greater lot size distinction between rural and growth areas. For example, some towns have set a five-acre minimum lot size for the most remote rural areas. These provisions may be supplemented by greater lot setback requirements from existing town roads in rural areas and longer road frontage requirements. Such measures have the effect of the reducing the number of curb cuts and mitigating the visual impact of new development on the community.

There are, however, other ways to discourage growth in rural areas. For example, the 1991 plan recommended that there be a building permit limitation for the rural districts. This would restrict the number of permits issued each year in rural areas to a percentage of the total. This proposal was never implemented.

Development in rural areas can also be limited through net density restrictions. These are different from minimum lot size requirements in that they also limit the overall density of a development rather than just lot sizes. For example, a subdivision may be required to have a density of one unit per five acres. Individual lot sizes may be specified (for example: one to two acres), but no more than ten units may be developed on a 50-acre parcel. This is an effective way to limit density without creating overly large lot sizes that may result in a lower density form of sprawl.

Another option would be to enact stricter standards to protect against phosphorus loading in lake watersheds. Phosphorus is a naturally occurring element that affects lake water quality by causing algae to bloom and increasing oxygen levels. Stormwater runoff from anywhere in a lake watershed can result in more phosphorus going into a lake and the disruption of natural vegetation increases the amount of phosphorus loading.

The town could enact phosphorus loading standards for single lot development in lake watershed rural areas. These could limit the amount of vegetative clearing on lots and have standards that minimize the amount of stormwater runoff. These standards would supplement the standards in the subdivision ordinance, which do not cover single lot development. The subdivision standards could be revised to specify that surface water drainage standards be based on a 25-year storm event. This is the standard presently used in the site plan review standards.

Another way to distinguish between growth and rural areas is to establish more detailed cluster zoning provisions in rural areas. Clusters could be made mandatory for subdivisions of ten or more units. In growth areas, there is already a density bonus of 20 percent. This provision has not been used. This allows a developer to build 20 percent more units than would be possible on a comparable parcel in one of the rural areas. These measures, combined with higher net densities in rural areas, would give developers more incentive to develop in growth areas.

The current UDO allows a number of uses in the rural areas that may not be considered traditional rural uses while not allowing certain uses in growth areas that are more appropriate to a higher density area. For example, multi-family housing is allowed in the Rural District but not in the Residential Growth District or the Village District. Some commercial uses such as convenience stores and motels are also allowed in the Rural District. The town may want to consider restricting uses in rural areas to single and two-family residential, home occupations and natural resource- dependent uses. Examples of the later would include farm stands, nurseries, mineral extraction and saw mills.

6. An Assessment of Growth Areas Outside of the Village

The purpose of the Roadside Commercial District is primarily for larger scale commercial development that would not be compatible with the scale of the village and requires good road access. The present height limitation in this district is 35 feet. A higher limitation could allow more development in growth areas. Any change in height standards should be reviewed by the fire department to assure that fire fighting equipment is adequate to fight fires in taller structures.

Highway access to the Roadside Commercial District is through Route 172. The speed limit for much of this portion of Route 172 is 55 mph. Extensive curb cuts onto this road pose a possible traffic hazard and may require a reduction in the posted speed limit. The town may want to consider enacting more detailed highway access requirements, which would require greater sharing of curb cuts and other measures to increase the distance between driveways.

While the Highway Commercial District is primarily for commercial and other non-residential uses, the Residential-Growth District is aimed at encouraging residential development. As mentioned above, only one parcel was developed in that District between 1991 and 2001.

One option would be to designate growth areas adjacent to the existing village. Consideration should be given to adding some growth areas with salt water views as these tend to be popular home building sites. These could include some areas adjacent to the village. These could be designated as residential growth areas so they remain distinct from the village, which is more likely to have small-scale mixed uses.

G. SUMMARY OF OTHER SECTIONS

1. Purpose

The town of Surry contracted with the HCPC to update certain sections of the 1991 plan. This update did not address transportation, fiscal capacity, natural and marine resources, agricultural and forest resources and historical resources. The section summarizes the major changes that have occurred in these sections since 1991. For more detailed information, the reader is referred to the relevant sections of the 1991 plan.

2. Transportation

Traffic in town is increasing. State-sponsored traffic counts show that the average annual daily traffic on the Newbury Neck Road increased by 57 percent between 1991 and 1998 (from 450 to 710 vehicles). On Route 172 at the Route 176 intersection, traffic increased from 3,290 in 1991 to 4,430 in 1996, a 32 percent increase.

There have been some changes in the traffic problem areas noted in the 1991 plan (see Transportation section of Appendix I for relevant information included in the 1991 plan). The store at the corner of the North Bend Road and Route 172 is now gone, which has improved this intersection somewhat. It is still difficult for a plow truck to exit onto Route 172 from North Bend Road safely. Excessive speed through the village area is still a problem, as is parking during peak business times at Surry Gardens nursery.

Parking has been added at public landing on Patten Pond, the Newbury Neck beach area and in the Surry Opera area at Morgan Bay corner. However, usage continues to increase at Newbury Neck and there are still some problems with visibility at Morgan Bay corner. There has been no change in the parking situation at the old town hall, the Rural Hall and the Grange. Parking has been expanded at the Surry Elementary School.

The Morgan Bay Bridge has been replaced. While the expanded seawall at the Carrying Place on Newbury Neck has helped reduce erosion and flooding problems, further improvements are needed. There is, however, little room to create additional parking spaces. The town now has a new salt sand storage shed.

3. Water and Marine Resources

a. Marine Resources

The 1991 version of the Marine Resources chapter is found on Pp. 74-80. Since then the ban on shellfishing along Newbury Neck has been lifted. It is sometimes reinstated when there are operational problems at the Ellsworth sewage treatment plan. Overall, there is little shellfishing in Surry. Since 1991, three overboard discharges have been eliminated on Contention Cove. The town continues to work with the DEP to address the remaining overboard discharges.

Commercial fishing is very limited since the bay is so far from open water. The seabed near the harbor has a very limited draft that restricts boat access. This could be improved with dredging but low tide conditions would still be a problem. Presently, it's even hard to launch a kayak under certain tidal conditions.

Most of those with commercial fishing licenses in town fish elsewhere. The only commercial waterfront use is one pier off of the Newberry Neck Road. It consists of about 0.03 acres and there is no room for expansion. It is zoned shoreland rural and lies within the road right-of-way. This means that it cannot be connected with another parcel. It is used by a local boat building company to tie boats and a lobster sales operation. Most of the lobsters are delivered by truck from elsewhere. According to the, waterways commission, there are only eight lobster boats operating out of Surry and even fewer people engaged in other types of commercial fishing. Given the very limited commercial fishing in town, there are no conflicts between commercial and recreational boating. As the town grows, additional public access points may be needed.

The town pier is used primarily for launching boats. The ramp is too narrow and in deteriorating condition. Most boats are docked at nearby moorings. While there are two to three boat building operations that use the facility to launch boats, most of the users are recreational. The pier adjoins the village district, in which commercial uses are allowed. This means that supporting commercial operations for marine-related uses are permitted. There is no need to enact water dependent use zoning since the pier is town-owned and thus already protected. The town pier and adjoining town-owned area consists of about one acre. This offers protection from adjoining uses and means there is room to expand pier operations.

The town presently has no mooring regulations. No problems have been identified with current mooring arrangements to date. If the town continues to grow, there may be a need for mooring regulations in the future.

As mentioned in the *Village Assessment* chapter, the town is exploring landscaping improvements adjacent to the town pier. These could be part of an overall strategy to make needed improvements to the pier and adjoining areas. There are matching state grant funds available for harbor improvement projects.

Given the amount of residential shorefront development that has taken place in Surry, it is important that any future development of commercial access assure that there is minimal conflict between uses. This may involve assuring that there is adequate off-street parking and buffering between residential and marine-related uses.

b. Water Resources

The water resources conditions in 1991 are summarized on pages 76-80. There has, to date, been no sign of milfoil or any other invasive species in the town's lakes. It is important that the town continue to monitor the situation, however. Similarly, the town needs to monitor phosphorus levels in all lakes. There are already citizen groups monitoring lake water quality on Toddy and Patten Ponds. The UDO's current subdivision standards have phosphorus control measures based on the DEP manual, A Technical Guide for Evaluating New Development.

These should be adequate for the foreseeable future.

Table G.1 shows the current DEP data on the town’s lakes. The suggested guidelines for phosphorus level of protection are based in part on the lake’s water quality, its vulnerability to phosphorus loading and the expected amount of development in the lake watershed. Development anywhere in a lake watershed can result in increased phosphorus runoff into a lake. These impacts can be mitigated through use of measures such as erosion control and retention of existing vegetation.

Table G.1 Characteristics of Great Ponds Surry										
POND	DDA (in acres)	ANAD (in acres)	AAD	GF	D	F	WQC	LOP	C	P
Toddy Pond	1265	150	1115	0.25	279	19.24	good	h	1.00	0.069
Lower Patten Pond	1838	180	1658	0.25	415	27.07	good	h	1.00	0.065
Upper Patten Pond	1233	125	1108	0.2	222	11.88	mod-sensitive	h	0.75	0.040
SOURCE: Maine Department of Environmental Protection										
DDA	Direct land drainage area in Township in acres									
ANAD	Area not available for development in acres									
AAD	Area available for development in acres (DDA – ANAD)									
GF	Growth Factor									
D	Area likely to be developed in acres (FG x AAD)									
F	lbs. phosphorus allocated to towns share of watershed per ppb in lake									
WQC	Water quality category									
LOP	Level of Protection (h=high (coldwater fishery); m=medium)									
C	Acceptable increase in lake’s phosphorus concentration in ppb									
P	lbs. per acre phosphorus allocation (FC/D)									

Since 1991, the town has continued to work with the DEP in removing overboard discharges. Two have been removed in the past few years and two more in adjoining areas of Trenton and Ellsworth. There are four remaining discharges in the town. Progress is thus being made in addressing this particular water quality threat.

The only public water systems in Surry are those serving the elementary school and the Surry Inn. Under state law, these systems are defined as public since they are in facilities open to the public. It does not mean that they are publicly owned.

The recharge area around the school is owned by the school so that it is like that any development that would threaten water quality would occur. One possible concern is that pesticide spraying of the playground could cause problems. The recharge area around the Surry Inn is owned by the Inn, so no further development is likely.

As in the case in much of Hancock County, the quality and quantity of ground water supplies is not known. The town does not have the money to undertake a major geological assessment of its groundwater resources. An assessment would be most effectively undertaken on a regional basis since aquifers cross town and county lines. There are presently no funding sources for such a study. This means that the town must focus its concerns on the highest volume of users such as subdivisions of 20 or more units. However, there may be cases where subdivisions of fewer units may face ground water supply problems. The best to determine if there is a problem is to review the history of supply from existing wells in the area.

4. Natural Resources

Perhaps the most significant change is that mapping of natural resources has improved through the Beginning with Habitat program (see Appendix I for original chapter). The Conservation Commission is discussing how best to use these new mapping data. Their use by the town will be facilitated by the availability of computer mapping hard and software at the town office. It is important to protect these areas.

According to these maps, Surry has Bald Eagle Essential Habitat, Deer Wintering Areas, Inland and Tidal Wading Bird and Waterfowl Habitat and one rare animal. Any project within an essential habitat area that requires a municipal or state permit requires review by the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW). While this review rarely stops a development, state biologists work to modify the project to minimize impacts on the habitat. The town may want to take measures to assure that no high density land uses take place near this habitat.

As the town continues to grow many of its wildlife and other natural resources could be disrupted. For example, a large block of habitat could be fragmented by a subdivision or a deer wintering yard could be disturbed. There are two general ways that the town can reduce the likelihood of such problems occurring. First, it can be sure that major areas of rare natural features are included in designated rural areas in the future land use plan. Second, it can require subdivision and planning board applicants to identify key natural features in their submission materials to the planning board. This allows the planning board to be aware of these features and to suggest mitigating measures that may minimize harm to these features. For example, there could be some changes in proposed lot lay out of location of impervious surfaces.

As mentioned in the 1991 plan, Surry has many high-value wetlands. There have been no substantial changes to these wetland areas since that time. These wetlands are protected by laws such as shoreland zoning. The comprehensive planning committee and planning board have noted no deficiencies with current protection measures.

Fisheries habitats are another important resource. One fishery issue is the illegal

introduction of large mouth bass at Lower Patten and Toddy Pond. Small mouth bass have also been introduced into Lower Patten Pond. These species can threaten existing fish populations. The threat is similar to that of invasive plant aquatic species as discussed under Water Resources.

An important fisheries resource is two high value streams; Meadow and Patten Stream. According to the MDIFW, Meadow Stream supports a population of wild brook trout and supports a modest sport fishery. It may also support a limited fishery for sea-run brookies (“salters”). There is also evidence of wild landlocked salmon, brown stock and brook trout.

These streams are also important for their alewife runs. In view of their fisheries values, it is important to protect these streams and their tributaries. Alewife runs are presently inhibited by beaver dams. This is a major issue on Patten Stream. The man-made dam on Mill Pond is now removed. Since the any destroyed beaver dams are likely to be rebuilt, fish ladders would be of no value.

Scenic resources as identified in the 1991 plan are shown in Section G.4 of Appendix I. There have been no changes in these areas since 1991. As the town continues to grow, there is greater risk that some of these resources may be damaged by development. Some of the views listed in Appendix I are already protected. Some are from state highways where the road meets the shore so there is no room for development to obscure the view. View number six (the Carrying Place) is partially protected and views four (Morgan Bay) and seven (open fields on Route 176) are not protected. The town’s subdivision ordinance standards (section V.5.G of the UDO) encourage the protection of scenic areas identified in the comprehensive plan. Subdivision plans are required to have structures impede as little as possible on views from existing structures, public roadways and the natural environment.

Surry participates in the National Flood Insurance Program. This program offers federally subsidized flood insurance to property owners in towns that have a flood plain ordinance adopted per state standards. The areas subject to this zoning are shown on the flood plain map. According to 2001 State Planning Office data, there were thirteen flood insurance policies in effect in Surry. There is no record of any repetitive loss and claims have been minimal. There have been only four claims since 1991 for a total value of \$21,012. The state flood plain management ordinance standards change periodically and it is important that the town assure that its standards remain up to date. Historically, Surry has maintained NFIP standards consistent with state requirements but has not exceeded these requirements.

5. Agricultural and Forest Resources

Forest land remains the primary use of undeveloped land in Surry. While not all land used for forestry is placed in the tree growth taxation category, the acreage held in this classification did increase between 1991 and 2002 (for information from the 1991 plan, see page 71). In 1989 there were 99 parcels held under tree growth for a total of 6,743 acres compared to 80 parcels in 6,972 acres in 2002. Areas presently held in tree growth are shown on Map 5. (*need to complete*) The decrease in the number of parcels is probably due to new state restrictions that make it harder for smaller parcels to be held in the tree growth classification. According to Maine

Forest Service records, a total of 5,662 acres of forest land was harvested between 1991 and 1999. These data do **not** include any harvesting that is not subject to state reporting.

As of early 2004, there were 17 parcels of 75 acres or more that were held in tree growth. These amounted to 4,582 acres. This figure does **not** include parcels in tree growth that are under 75 acres that are counted in the total town acreage held in tree growth. While most parcels were held by individuals, three were held by corporations. These amounted to 1,452 acres or about 32 percent of the total. Ten of the non-corporate owners were from out of town. This means that a good portion of the land held in tree growth is held by non-residents.

One forestry issue is the possible liquidation sale of larger parcels of forest land. There has been some discussion of several large parcels in rural, remote areas being sold as residential subdivisions. There has already been a subdivision of a small portion of an 800-acre block of forested land into seven lots. The average lot size was three acres. Given the amount of land held in corporate ownership or by non-residents, further subdivisions of this type are possible.

These sales may be preceded by major timber harvesting projects that could increase erosion and sedimentation in lake watersheds. This in turn could lead to a deterioration of lake water quality, which could affect shorefront property values and the tax base. Preserving forest land is also important to protecting large blocks of habitat and the rural character of the town.

The town presently receives copies of applications for timber harvesting that are submitted to the Maine Forest Service. The CEO monitors these operations locally. There is some concern about the level of enforcement for timber harvesting and vegetative clearing within the shoreland areas that are subject to Resource Protection zoning. Additional local enforcement may be needed.

At the time the 1991 plan was being drafted there was one 68-acre parcel held under the farmland taxation classification. As of 2001 there were three parcels held under this classification with a combined total of 57 agricultural acres and 46 woodland acres. There were also two parcels held under the open space classification for a total of 58 acres. As of early 2004, there were three parcels held under this classification for the same total of 58 acres. While efforts are underway countywide to re-invigorate agriculture, there are presently only two working farms in Surry. There thus has not been a significant change in agricultural resources since the 1991 plan was prepared.

Forestry in Surry is more than large blocks of rural land. Trees are also important in the more built-up areas of town. This is particularly the case in the village area where trees add to the overall scenic character. In addition, provide shade in residential areas and along rural roads. Tree conservation is an important part of local planning.

The town is already undertaking measures to retain its shade trees and encourage tree planting. The tree committee has overseen tree planting in town-owned areas.- The Surry garden club has done some tree planting and undertaken some beautification projects.

6. Historical Resources

There have been no significant changes since 1991. The Maine Historic Preservation Commission (MHPC) reports that, as of 2001, there were no historic buildings listed on the National Register of Historic Places. There were also no historic archaeological sites listed.

The MHPC recommends that a comprehensive survey of Surry's historic above-ground resources be undertaken. The focus of this survey would be to identify properties that may be eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. There is also discussion of this idea in the *Village Assessment* chapter. The MHPC also suggests that future historic archaeological work could focus on the first wave of Euro-American settlement and early mills, shipyards, mining operations and farmsteads.

There are six prehistoric sites in town. The term "prehistoric" refers to sites that predate written history, which coincided in Surry with the arrival of white settlers. These sites are coastal shell middens or scatters of stone tools.

7. Fiscal Capacity

As with any rapidly growing community, there have been some significant changes in the town's tax revenue and expenditure patterns.

a. Municipal Valuation

Total town valuation, as reported in the town reports, increased from about \$109.2 million in 1993 to \$131.1 million in 2002 (see Table G.2). This is a before inflation increase of 20 percent. However, when adjusted for inflation there was a nearly 9 percent decrease. In other words, the overall municipal valuation has not kept up with inflation.

The trend for the state valuation, which is used by the county to assess taxes and for state reimbursement formula, shows a more significant increase. Before inflation state valuation increased from about \$103.1 million in 1993 to \$149.5 million in 2002. This represents a before-inflation increase of about 45 percent. When adjusted for inflation, there was about a 16 percent increase. A revaluation is expected to be completed during 2003 or early 2004, which would temporarily eliminate the gap between the state and municipal valuation figures.

Table G.2 Trends in Valuation Surry 1993-2002					
Year	State Valuation	%Change from previous year	Municipal Valuation	% Change from previous year	Ratio Municipal/State
1993	\$103,150,000	N/A	\$109,232,343	N/A	1.059
1994	\$111,550,000	8.1%	\$111,300,829	1.9%	0.998
1995	\$115,200,000	3.3%	\$113,005,292	1.5%	0.981
1996	\$119,500,000	3.7%	\$116,070,215	2.7%	0.971
1997	\$123,100,00	3.0%	\$117,619,610	1.3%	0.955
1998	\$127,050,000	3.2%	\$120,163,355	2.2%	0.946
1999	\$130,000,000	2.3%	\$120,316,939	0.1%	0.926
2000	\$137,350,000	5.7%	\$124,123,503	3.2%	0.904
2001	\$140,950,000	2.6%	\$127,530,960	2.7%	0.905
2002	\$149,500,000	6.1%	\$131,155,421	2.8%	0.877
Ten Year Change	\$46,350,000	44.9%	\$21,923,078	20.1%	
Ten Year Change adjusted for inflation	\$16,436,500	15.9%	-\$9,754,301	-8.9%	

Note 1: State Valuations are amounts used by Hancock County to assess the county tax, and for calculations for various state reimbursements such as education funds.

Note 2: Municipal Valuations are amounts used by local assessors as basis for the tax commitment. Any adjustments by supplemental tax or abatement are not included.

Note 3: Figures from both sources include Real Property (Land & Buildings) and Personal Property. Excluded are non-taxable properties and amounts for veterans, homestead exemptions, etc., and values exempted because of the Tree Growth Classification.

Source: Municipal Reports

b. Tax Commitment

Valuation trends are best compared to tax commitment trends. As seen in Table G.3, commitment increased from \$1.1 million in 1993 to \$1.9 million in 2002. This represents a before-inflation increase of 74 percent and an after- inflation rate of about 39 percent. This is significant since the tax commitments faced by the town have increased at a much faster rate than both state and municipal valuation.

Table G.3 Trends in Tax Commitment Surry 1993-2002	
Year	Tax Commitment
1993	\$1,103,247
1994	\$1,207,619
1995	\$1,226,110
1996	\$1,294,186
1997	\$1,429,081
1998	\$1,451,515
1999	\$1,497,949
2000	\$1,545,340
2001	\$1,747,174
2002	\$1,973,893
Percent Change 1993-2002	78.9%
Percent Change Adjusted for Inflation	38.7%
SOURCE: Municipal Reports	

c. State School Aid Trends

Some municipal expenditures are supplemented by categorical state subsidies. State aid for municipal education is a prime example. Under the current state school funding formula, towns with a high valuation and relatively low enrollment receive a small proportion of state aid.

Table G.4 summarizes state school aid trends in Surry. As seen, the state subsidy decreased from \$226,916 in 1993 to \$124,159 in 2002. This decrease is even more noticeable on a per pupil basis. In 1993 when Surry had 144 k-8 students there was a \$1,576 per pupil subsidy. By 2002, with 141 students, it had decreased to \$881.

Table G.4 Trends in General State School Aid Surry 1993-2002		
Year	State School Aid	Average Enrollment Aid Per Pupil
1993	\$226,916	\$1,576
1994	\$176,922	\$1,195
1995	\$172,365	\$1,141
1996	\$177,036	\$1,100
1997	\$142,452	\$1,003
1998	\$144,393	\$996
1999	\$185,348	\$1,166
2000	\$108,995	\$768
2001	\$88,294	\$601
2002	\$124,159	\$881
Percent Change 1993-2002	-82.8%	-44.1%
Percent Change Adjusted for Inflation	-135.8%	-56.7%

SOURCE: Municipal Reports

d. Major Expenditure Categories

Table G.5 summarizes major town expenditures by category. As seen, all categories increased at a rate well above inflation with the exception of debt service. The largest percentage increases were in county tax, public safety and health and welfare. It should be noted that health and welfare, while a large percentage increase was a low numerical increase. The greatest numerical increases were in public works and education expenditures.

Table G.5 Summary of Major Town Expenditures by Category Surry 1993-2002				
Category	1993 Amount	2002 Amount	Percent Change	Change Adjusted for Inflation
County Tax	\$50,440	\$100,583	99.4%	54.6%
General Government	\$99,425	\$155,986	56.9%	21.6%
Public Safety	\$22,190	\$43,810	97.4%	53.0%
Public Works	\$176,450	\$230,055	30.4%	1.1%
Health & Welfare	\$11,476	\$23,151	101.7%	56.4%
Education	\$1,000,955	\$1,823,206	82.1%	41.2%
Debt Service	\$51,347	\$47,931	-6.7%	-27.6%

SOURCE: Town audit reports

Table G.6 shows some details of school expenditure trends. While total expenditures increased at an after-inflation rate of about 81 percent, special education costs increased by about 973 percent. These are costs over which the school system has little control. As of 2002-2003, special education expenditures accounted for about 24 percent of all school costs. Special education costs and various fixed school costs make it difficult to prevent expenditure increases even if overall enrollment is decreasing.

Year	Total Expenditures	Special Education Expenditures	High School Tuition	K-8 Students (Oct. 1)	9-12 Students (Oct. 1)
92-93	\$909,701	\$41,141	\$231,852	144	49
93-94	\$1,048,957	\$85,698	\$262,521	143	53
94-95	\$1,100,823	\$82,757	\$104,772	162	52
95-96	\$1,146,281	\$104,772	\$263,209	162	52
96-97	\$1,247,887	\$118,578	\$339,548	146	67
97-98	\$1,252,763	\$122,684	\$323,241	147	64
99-00	\$1,395,503	\$145,869	\$391,942	154	60
00-01	\$1,519,293	\$189,120	\$418,350	146	73
01-02	\$1,685,293	\$275,206	\$466,926	147	73
02-03	\$1,907,712	\$453,368	\$502,423	136	75
Total Change	\$998,011	\$412,227	\$270,571	-8	26
Inflation Multiplier	\$734,197.71	\$400,296.11	\$203,333.92		
% Change	109.7%	1002.0%	116.7%	-5.6%	53.1%
% Change Adjusted for Inflation	80.7%	973.0%	87.7%		

SOURCE: School Union 92

e. Summary

The fiscal analysis data show that there has been a steady increase in expenditures that far exceeds the pace of increases in valuation. This means that Surry residents are facing an increasing property tax burden. Since further population growth is expected, this trend is likely to continue.

H. INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS SUMMARY

1. Purpose

This section summarizes the major issues facing Surry. Its particular focus is changes that have occurred since the last comprehensive plan was adopted in 1991. The summary for each section is taken verbatim from the *Key Findings and Issues* section of the Inventory and Analysis.

2. Key Issues Facing Surry

Surry continues to experience rapid population growth and a fast rate of home construction. This has led to increased traffic and more demands on town services. Tax spending has increased at a faster rate than the valuation. There is the potential of further development in remote areas if some major pieces of timberland are sold as residential subdivisions. Specific trends are discussed below.

3. Population

Surry's population increased by about 36 percent between 1990 and 2000. This was a faster rate than was projected in the 1991 comprehensive plan. At a time when the median age in Hancock County as a whole is increasing, the median age in Surry is decreasing. The town thus has a younger population than many Hancock County towns.

4. Economy

Surry has an economy similar to Hancock County as a whole. Its unemployment rate has been slightly lower than the county's in recent years. The town's labor force has been increasing steadily in recent years. This is a sign of a growing population.

5. Housing

While Surry's housing stock grew at a 20 percent rate between 1990 and 2000, it did not grow as fast as was projected in the 1991 comprehensive plan. The number of second homes increased at a far slower rate than year-round dwellings. As is the case in much of Hancock County, it is difficult for families to find affordable first-time home purchase opportunities. The number of year-round occupied dwellings is expected to increase to 775 by 2015, a 41 percent increase from the year 2000.

6. Public Services and Facilities

Surry faces several municipal service and facility issues. Elementary school enrollment grew by about 40 percent between 1990 and 2000, but has been declining in recent years. The fire department faces an overcrowded building and a shortage of volunteers. The town office, which

shares a facility with the fire department, is also overcrowded. Town services are thus feeling the effects of recent population growth.

7. Village Assessment

Overall, the village area is aesthetically appealing with many attractive buildings and good views of the water. There are, however, several factors that limit its use as a walkable community. First, there are no sidewalks and cars travel along Route 172 at high rates of speed. This does not make the village pedestrian friendly. Second, there is no public water and sewer system serving the village, this limits the density of development that can be permitted there. Third, building size restrictions are discouraging compatible development in the village area.

8. Rural Assessment

While the purpose of growth areas is to attract the majority of new development in a town, most development over the past ten years has been in the rural areas. There are presently few regulatory distinctions between growth and rural areas. The town needs to designate growth areas that are more likely to attract growth.

9. Other Local Trends

Traffic in town is increasing. State-sponsored traffic counts show that the average annual daily traffic on the Newbury Neck Road increased by 57 percent between 1991 and 1998 (from 450 to 710 vehicles). On Route 172 at the Route 176 intersection, traffic increased from 3,290 in 1991 to 4,430 in 1996, a 32 percent increase.

The town is facing increased costs for all items, particularly education. While total education expenditures increased at an after-inflation rate of about 81 percent, special education costs increased by about 973 percent. These are costs over which the school system has little control. As of 2002-2003, special education expenditures accounted for about 24 percent of all school costs. Special education costs and various fixed school costs make it difficult to prevent expenditure increases even if overall enrollment is decreasing.

10. Key Regional Issues

Surry faces several issues that might be addressed most effectively on a regional basis. This may involve cooperation with other towns on joint ventures. One important regional issue is the economy. In order to promote a strong regional economy, towns need to work together in developing and implementing a regional economic development strategy.

A second issue is the high cost of housing to young working families. Here again, a regional approach is needed. A third issue is managing the increased rate of traffic. Addressing this issue requires Hancock County as a whole dealing the issue of congestion and highway improvements.

PART II

A. Goals, Objectives and Implementation Strategies

B. Future Land Use Plan

II.A. GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND IMPLEMENTATION

1. Purpose

This section presents goals and objectives for the town of Surry. Goals are general statements for the town's future and are followed by more specific objectives. As will be seen, these goals and objectives are highly interrelated. While this plan contains some highly specific recommendations, residents are reminded that planning is an on-going process. To assure flexibility in the event of unforeseen circumstances, periodic updating of these goals may be necessary.

2. Overall Vision

As we begin the next ten years, the people of Surry intend:

- ◆ To continue to be a town that welcomes new people, values old traditions, and preserves its natural environment;
- ◆ To maintain its keen sense of community and friendliness;
- ◆ To assure that its village area remains a thriving place that attracts compatible residential and commercial development;
- ◆ To protect its rural areas from development that would unduly increase sprawl and detract from its aesthetic appeal;
- ◆ To honor and encourage human diversity;
- ◆ To provide a sound education and healthy environment for its children;
- ◆ To manage its growth so as to preserve and protect its natural environment, scenic areas, historic character and rural nature;
- ◆ To welcome small businesses that blend unobtrusively and compatibly with the existing character of the town, minimize traffic impacts and create local jobs; and
- ◆ To preserve the town meeting form of government and honor everyone's right to participate in town affairs.

3. Goals and Objectives

A. POPULATION GOAL

Surry aims to grow in an orderly manner that encourages a diversity of age groups and residents. This shall be accomplished by assuring a mixture of housing and attracting new sources of employment.

Implementation Strategy: This will be accomplished through the measures discussed under 3.B (Economy) and 3.C (Housing).

B. ECONOMY GOAL

While Surry does not wish to become a major employment center, it aims to create more local jobs and supports a healthy regional economy. This shall be accomplished through the following specific steps:

1. Creating an economic development committee to oversee efforts to diversify the local economy and participate in regional economic development efforts;

Implementation Strategy: The Selectmen appoint a committee

Responsible party/deadline: Selectmen/By 2005

2. Assuring that any changes to land use regulations retain adequate land zoned for commercial and light manufacturing operations;

Implementation Strategy: This will be addressed through the Future Land Use Plan

3. Assuring that the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) contains adequate performance standards to minimize the off-site impacts of business operations. This shall be accomplished through buffering requirements and standards for lighting, dust, noise, glare and related nuisances; and

Implementation Strategy: After adoption of the plan, the planning board shall undertake the revisions to the UDO that are recommended in the plan.

Responsible party/deadline: Planning board/2004-2005

4. Working with regional economic development groups such as, but not limited to, the Eastern Maine Development Corporation and the Coastal Acadia Development Corporation in regional economic development planning efforts.

Implementation Strategy: The economic development committee sends representatives to attend meetings of these various groups and, if positions are available, appoints representatives to their boards.

Responsible party/deadline: Economic development committee/ on-going

C. HOUSING GOAL

Surry aims to have a diverse, safe, decent and affordable housing stock that helps assure that people of all ages and income levels can live in town. This shall be accomplished through the following specific steps:

1. Revise the UDO to allow duplexes and multi-family dwellings of up to eight units per two acres in the village area provided that adequate provisions are made for water supply and sewage disposal. This will also involve revised UDO standards to require adequate off-street parking and vegetative buffering from surrounding properties. These dwellings may be created from existing buildings (such as barns);

Implementation Strategy: This will be part of the UDO revision process.

2. Create standards in the UDO to allow accessory dwelling units in all zones. These would be allowed attached (including within the current building) or adjacent to primary dwellings without requiring additional lot area or road and shore frontage than normally required for a single family home if water and septic disposal arrangements were adequate, adequate off-street parking were provided and the accessory dwelling did not exceed 800 square feet of floor space or one-third of the floor area of the living area primary dwelling, whichever was greater. Only one accessory dwelling would be permitted per primary dwelling unit. At least one of the units must be owner-occupied at the time of creation of the accessory unit;

Implementation Strategy: This will be part of the UDO revision process.

3. Retain the current mobile home park standards in the UDO;

Implementation Strategy: No further action is necessary.

4. Since providing affordable housing for young working families is a regional issue participate in regional affordable housing endeavors; and

Implementation Strategy: The plan recommends that the Selectmen appoint a housing committee to participate in both regional and local endeavors that address this issue.

Responsible Party/Deadline: The Board of Selectmen appoints a committee/By 2005

5. Work with the Maine State Housing Authority and other groups involved in affordable housing technical assistance to initiate a first-time home subdivision of five to ten units in Surry in one of the town's growth areas that would be targeted at young, working families.

Implementation Strategy: The housing committee contacts agencies such as the Maine State Housing Authority, the Hancock County Planning Commission and the Washington Hancock Community Agency to learn what sources of technical assistance and grants are available.

Responsible Party/Deadline: Housing committee/2005-2006

D. PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES GOAL

Surry aims to provide its residents with adequate public facilities and services in manner that minimizes increases in property taxes. As much as possible it aims to schedule major capital expenditures so that they are spread out over several years.

Specific policies shall include:

1. Fire Protection: The town aims to provide all residents and tax payers with an adequate level of fire protection. This shall be accomplished by creating a five-year capital improvement plan for the fire department that establishes priorities and the years that various improvements are recommended to be undertaken. Specific issues to be addressed include:
 - a. Expanding the fire station building to include adequate space for a fire chief's office, secure file storage, a training room, a bunk room and a heated storage area for vehicles presently stored outside. All fire department expansion plans shall be coordinated with those for expanding the town office portion of the building;
 - b. Installing a fire suppression system for the municipal building/fire station;
 - c. Acquiring fire fighting equipment such as a ventilation saw, a positive pressure fan, new hand tools, fire hose, replacement radio and telephone equipment, turn out gear and a lap top computer;
 - d. Replacing the current utility vehicle with a new unit;
 - e. Undertaking a study of water supplies for fire fighting purposes and identifying those areas of town where supplies are inadequate. These areas shall be noted by the fire department in its review of subdivision and site plan review applications. Developers in areas where water supplies are inadequate shall be required to install dry hydrants, cisterns or other arrangements approved by the fire chief; and
 - f. Monitoring population growth and demands on service on a five-year basis to assess if some change in staffing arrangements such as, but no limited to, sharing paid day staff with surrounding towns is needed.

<p>Implementation Strategy: Steps 1. a-d will be addressed by the capital improvement plan. Step 1.e will involve the fire department mapping areas where water supplies have proven inadequate and supplying this information to the planning board. Step 1.f will involve a five-year review when the department's capital improvement plan is updated.</p>
--

<p>Responsible Party/Deadline: Fire department/on-going</p>
--

2. Municipal Buildings and Government: The plan supports measures to

Surry Comprehensive Plan: IIA. Goals, Objectives and Implementation

assure the sound functioning of town government and providing an adequate facility for all town office functions. This shall be accomplished through the following specific steps:

- a. Coordinating the municipal building needs assessment and expansion with that of the fire department. The plan recommends that the expansion include additional meeting, storage and work space areas and a renovated public service counter. All renovations undertaken shall assure that the entire building meets American with Disabilities Act standards;
- b. Reviewing the current town government structure and assessing if any changes are needed regarding committee organization and duties of appointed and elected staff; and
- c. Continue to assure adequate staffing and equipment for municipal government functions.

Implementation Strategy: 2.a will be accomplished through the building study committee already underway; 2.b and 2.c will occur by the Selectmen and various town committees on an on-going basis.

Responsible Party/Deadline: Selectmen and town committees/on-going

- 3. Education: Surry aims to provide all its children with a quality education at an affordable price. The plan supports the adequate maintenance and upgrade of the school facilities as needed.

Implementation Strategy: This will occur through the annual budgeting process on an on-going basis.

- 4. Roads and Public Works: The plan supports the continuation of current road maintenance and plowing arrangements with a periodic evaluation of their adequacy. The plan also supports addressing hazardous intersections and related threats to traffic safety. Priorities shall include, but are not limited to the following intersections:
 - a. Toddy Pond/Route 172;
 - b. North Bend Road/Route 172; and
 - c. Patten Pond Road/North Bend Road.

Implementation Strategy: For roads that are state responsibility the Selectmen contacts the Maine Department of Transportation to request that these projects be included in the MDOT six-year plan. For local roads, the improvements are incorporated into the town's road improvement plans.

Responsible Party/Deadline: Selectmen or administrative assistant/on-going

5. Recreation: The plan supports the adequate provision of recreational facilities and programs. It recommends the following specific steps:
 - a. Undertaking measures to upgrade the school baseball fields such as drainage improvements, dugouts for the players and spectator seating;
 - b. Creating an outdoor ice skating facility;
 - c. Assuring that any town-sponsored efforts to acquire land conservation easements provide some public access for fishing, hunting, hiking and other low impact activities;
 - d. Supporting the continued development and maintenance of the athletic field, trail and related facilities at the Osgood lot; and
 - e. Instituting other programs for both adults and children. This will be contingent upon recruiting more volunteers and developing an overall recreational services and facilities plan.

Implementation Strategy: Step 5.a will occur through regular support of these items in the annual school budget development process. Step 5.b will occur through the recreation committee identifying funding sources for a facility and exploring design options for a facility that will be usable under area winter weather conditions. This will be part of on-going land conservation efforts Steps 5.d & e will be part of the long-range planning of the recreation committee.

Responsible Party/Deadline: Recreation committee will provide primary leadership/on-going.

E. VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT

The plan supports measures to enhance the attractiveness of the village and adjoining areas as a pedestrian friendly neighborhood that will attract more residential development in the future. This shall be accomplished through the following measures:

1. Land Use Ordinance Revisions: Allow lot sizes of one-half acre per single family residential unit in the village area if water supply and wastewater disposal provisions that meet state and local requirements are in place;
2. Village Infrastructure Investment Program Implement a comprehensive improvement program of village infrastructure, which includes, but is not limited to, sidewalks, drainage improvements, landscaping, benches, gateway improvements and bicycle facilities. Full implementation of this program is contingent upon available grant funding;
3. Historic Preservation: The plan recommends that the historical society work with interested home owners to have eligible dwellings placed on the National Register of Historic Places; and

4. First-time Homebuyer Subdivision: The plan recommends that the town work with the Maine State Housing Authority and an interested private developer in creating a 5 to 10-subdivision in the village area that offers home purchase opportunities for young working families at below market rates.
5. Flexible zoning provisions: The plan recommends that the Surry UDO be revised to incorporate incentives and provisions for development that enhance neighborhood and community character. These standards would allow the imposition of performance standards to ensure neighborhood compatibility, harmonious land use relationships, healthy mix of land uses, protection of soil and water quality and maintenance of the traditional character of the neighborhood.
- 6.

Implementation Strategy: E1 & E.5 will be accomplished through revisions to the UDO. E.2 will involve creating a village improvement committee to work with the Selectmen to oversee this process. Among other sources, it is recommended that the town seek a Gateway grant. E.3 will depend upon the historical society working with the Maine Historic Preservation Commission. E.4 will involve the Selectmen creating a committee to work with the Maine State Housing Authority and the community at large to assure that good quality homes are built in a manner compatible with the village character and that the homes will have necessary resale terms to assure that they remain priced at below market rates.

Responsible Party/Deadline: The selectmen ask for authorization to create the committees and appoint the members. The planning board oversees the revisions to the UDO after adoption of the comprehensive plan.

F. GENERAL LAND USE ORDINANCE REVISIONS

The plan supports a general “fine tuning” of the town’s land use ordinance to clarify some of the ambiguities. These following revisions are recommended:

Implementation Strategy: All land use changes will be accomplished through revisions to the UDO

Responsible Party/Deadline: The planning board oversees the revisions to the UDO after adoption of the comprehensive plan.

1. Definition of Terms. In order to reduce confusion over various terms used in the UDO, there needs to be a complete review of the current definitions and identification of those terms that have proven particularly troublesome to the planning board and other users of the ordinance. As much as possible, ambiguous terms shall be revised;
2. New Lot Creation: To assure that all lots meet minimum town standards, revise the UDO to require that all new lots be subject to planning board approval;
3. Standards for Driveways: In order to assure emergency vehicle access to all residential properties and to minimize erosion, implement driveway standards that assure adequate width, avoid steep slopes and minimize storm water runoff

and phosphorus loading into a water body;

4. Lot Frontage Standards: Require that lots that are unable to meet required road frontage standards due to their location at the dead end of an access road, a cul-de-sac or a cluster development meet an alternative minimal dimension standard. This standard shall require the lot to have a minimum dimension of 150 feet by 150 feet someplace on the lot in addition to meeting the minimum lot size requirement of the underlying district. For lots in the village area, the minimum perpendicular dimension shall be 100 feet by 100 feet someplace on the lot in addition to meeting the minimum lot size. The current municipal requirement of having driveways 20 feet apart shall remain in place as shall all applicable subdivision standards;
5. Shoreland Zoning Standards: The following changes to the shoreland standards are recommended:
 - a. Minimum Lot Size for Commercial Uses: establish the same minimum lot size for uses adjacent to both tidal and non-tidal areas (60,000 square-feet).
6. Subdivision Review Standards: The plan recommends that the following change be made to the subdivision review standards:
 - a. Definition of Subdivision: Assure that the definition of subdivision is consistent with that mandated by state law.
7. Expansion of Commercial Uses in the Village: The plan recommends that the current list of permitted and prohibited commercial uses in the village area be allowed to continue with current lot coverage requirements but eliminate the building square-footage requirements. Agricultural and horticultural uses will be allowed to have up to 60 percent lot coverage. No permit for any new use or expansion shall be granted unless the applicant can provide adequate off-street parking to the planning board's satisfaction.
8. Allowing of Agricultural Uses: The plan recommends that the UDO be revised to state explicitly that agricultural/horticultural uses are allowed in all zones except those portions of the shoreland zone where they are explicitly prohibited by DEP standards.

G. WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY SITING ORDINANCE

The plan supports enactment of a wireless telecommunications facility ordinance that is consistent with state and federal standards and that preserve, to the maximum extent feasible, the town's rural character and minimizes visual and related aesthetic impacts of towers.

Implementation Strategy: The planning board reviews the draft standards being developed by the wireless committee and suggests any changes it feels are appropriate before recommending it

be placed on the town meeting warrant. If the ordinance involves requiring different standards for different zone (beyond meeting state minimum shoreland zoning requirements, the comprehensive plan will be amended to support these changes.

Responsible Party/Deadline: planning board/2005

H. TRANSPORTATION GOAL

Surry aims to have a transportation system that promotes the safe and efficient movement of people, goods and services through the town. This shall be accomplished through the following specific objectives:

1. Parking: The plan supports measures to assure that there is adequate parking that minimizes conflicts with traffic and pedestrians. To minimize adverse traffic and safety impacts from parking at private businesses, the plan recommends that the current standards of the Unified Development Ordinance be reviewed to assure that off-street parking requirements for new businesses and expansions of existing operations are adequate.

Implementation Strategy: The parking standards are reviewed as part of the overall process of revising the UDO.

Responsible Party/Deadline: The planning board oversees the revision of the UDO. The UDO parking standards review will occur at the same time as the other UDO revisions.

2. Speeding: The plan recommends that the town undertake measures to reduce incidents of speeding in the village area. This shall be accomplished by contacting the Sheriff's department and asking for increased patrols of the village.

Implementation Strategy: The selectmen meet with the Sheriff's department and discuss options to increase patrols.

Responsible Party/Deadline: The selectmen/2004

3. Road Improvement Planning: In order to promote the sound and efficient planning of road improvements, the plan supports the continuation of the current five-year road plan. Implementation of this plan shall be coordinated with the overall capital investment plan for the town.

Implementation Strategy: This is a continuation of current policy

4. Addressing Traffic Hazards: The plan recommends that the town work with the Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT) to address hazardous intersections with state roads. (*See Public Facilities and Services Goal E.4*)

Implementation Strategy: See E.4

5. Access Management: The plan recommends that the UDO be revised to assure it

is consistent with the latest MDOT recommended access management standards. These standards shall include:

- a. Requiring shared driveways or access roads for commercial, multifamily and other development likely to generate major volumes of traffic;
- b. In cases where shared driveways or access roads are not presently practical, grant permits for temporary commercial driveways until adjacent driveways are developed. At this time the temporary driveway would be closed and shared access required; and
- c. When a proposed land use is on a corner lot, require that access be limited to the road that has a lower volume of traffic.

Implementation Strategy: This will be addressed in concert with the other UDO revisions

- 6. Promotion of Alternative Modes: The plan supports the following measures to facilitate walking, bicycle use, car pooling and public transportation:
 - a. seeking matching grant funds for sidewalks, pedestrian crosswalks and bicycle facilities in the village area (*see Village Development Goal F.2*);
 - b. work with the MDOT to assure that future improvements to Route 172 and other state roads in Surry have sufficient shoulders to accommodate bicycles safely;
 - c. participate in regional efforts to expand the park and ride lot system presently being developed on and adjacent to Mount Desert Island; and
 - d. Support efforts to expand both general and subscription bus services throughout Hancock County.

Implementation Strategy: 6.a will be addressed through Goal F.2; 6.b-d involve on-going contact with the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) to assure that the town's needs are addressed when developing regional transportation priorities. This will involve responding to RTAC surveys and when, necessary, attending hearings and participating in discussions through other means.

Responsible Party/Deadline: Selectmen/on-going

I. WATER RESOURCES GOAL

Surry aims to protect its surface and ground water resources from contamination and take measures to ensure that they are available for the long term use and enjoyment by residents and visitors. This shall be accomplished through the following objectives:

- 1. Lake Watershed Protection: The plan supports the following measures to minimize phosphorus loading into lake watersheds:

Surry Comprehensive Plan: IIA. Goals, Objectives and Implementation

- a. continue enforcement of phosphorus loading standards in the UDO and maintain a data base in the town office of current phosphorus conditions in the town's various lakes. The standard of protection for each lake watershed shall be based on the recommended level of protection in Table G.1. If an increase in phosphorus loading is noted, the town shall contact the Lakes Division of the DEP and explore possible changes to the current UDO standards. It is recommended that these changes include adding provisions to manage phosphorus loading for single lot development not subject to subdivision review;
- b. educate lake watershed property owners about lawn maintenance techniques and other measures that help minimize phosphorus runoff;
- c. retain current shoreland zoning standards along lake and wetland areas;
- d. continue with lake water quality monitoring efforts;
- e. ensure that all town landings, parking areas and other facilities adjacent to a lake are designed in a manner that minimizes the storm water runoff of contaminants into a water body; and
- f. retain the majority of lake watershed areas as rural or transitional in the Future Land Use Plan to assure that development rates in this part of the town remain low.

Implementation Strategy: 1.a: The planning board will work with the DEP Lakes Division in developing a tracking system to assess changes in water quality and explore sample single lot standards for phosphorus control from other towns and draft recommended changes to Surry's UDO; 1.b: the town administrative assistant contacts the DEP Lakes Division for copies of educational material that can be distributed to watershed property owners; 1.c: this is a continuation of current efforts; 1.d: the town administrative assistant contacts the Hancock County Soil and Water Conservation District (and/or other organizations) to obtain copies of best management design and operational practices for waterfront facilities; 1.e: this is addressed through the future land use plan.

Responsible Party/Deadline: responsible parties are indicated above/2005-2006

- 2. Ground Water Protection: The plan supports the following measure to protect the quantity and quality of ground water resources in Surry:
 - a. require that any new or expanded use subject to subdivision or site plan review that would likely place demands on the water table to the point that water supplies on other properties were threatened be required to submit a ground water assessment to the planning board. The purpose of this requirement is to assure that the development minimizes adverse impacts on existing wells on nearby properties. This provision would apply in cases where there is a history of water supply problems in surrounding

Surry Comprehensive Plan: IIA. Goals, Objectives and Implementation

properties. If the ground water assessment reveals that the water supplies in adjoining properties are threatened, the planning board may require measures to reduce the density of the development or that other sources of water be sought. At a minimum, the planning board would require that test wells be drilled and ask for results of yield tests on existing wells from adjoining properties.

- b. in conjunction with other Hancock County towns, seek grant funding to conduct an in-depth study of ground water conditions throughout the county.

Implementation Strategy: The selectmen contact the Hancock County Planning Commission and request that this topic be the topic of a future regional meeting of town officials.

Responsible Party/Deadline Board of selectmen/ 2006-2007

- 3. Surface Water Quality: The plan supports the following measures to protect the quality of surface waters in Surry:
 - a. Continue to work with the DEP in eliminating any remaining overboard discharges;
 - b. Educate waterfront property owners about the maintenance of septic systems; and
 - c. Work with county-wide groups to protect Surry's water resources from invasive species such as, but not limited to, milfoil and hydrilla.

Implementation Strategy: 3.a: This is a continuation of current policy and involves working in cooperation with the DEP and the Hancock County Planning Commission; 3.b: The code enforcement officer obtains copies of educational materials from DEP and other sources. These are mailed or otherwise distributed to waterfront property owners; and 3.c: The planning board refers local lake associations to any regional task force that is created to address invasive species.
--

Responsible Party/Deadline: 3.a: selectmen/on-going; 3.b: CEO/2004; 3.c: planning board and lake associations/2004-2005
--

- 4. Public Water Supplies: The plan recommends that the town protect the water supply serving the school by assuring that any pesticide or herbicide spraying is limited and is a strictly supervised.

Implementation Strategy: The select board contacts the school committee and recommends that the school undertake such measures

Responsible Party/Deadline: Select board, school committee & school union/2005

J. MARINE RESOURCES GOAL

Surry supports measures to protect and enhance its marine resources and assure that they will be available for use by future generations. This shall be accomplished by the following specific measures:

1. Public Access: assuring adequate maintenance of current public access sites; and

Implementation Strategy: This is a continuation of current policy and is addressed by assuring that there are adequate funds for operation and maintenance. It is also assured by seeking matching grant funds for refurbishment of the town wharf, (see the Capital Investment Plan).

2. Shellfish Areas: working with the Department of Marine Resources to undertake measures to minimize the frequency of closures of shellfishing areas.

Implementation Strategy: The selectmen continue their current contacts with the Department of Marine Resources.

3. Mooring plans: periodically review the need for mooring plans.

Implementation Strategy: If the harbor committee or harbor master notes a shortage of moorings, they develop recommended mooring standards for adoption by the town.

Responsible party/deadline: harbor committee and harbor master/when problem emerges

4. Bay dredging: In order to improve boat access, the plan recommends that town undertake measures to dredge the bay area adjacent to the town wharf,

Implementation Strategy: The town contacts the Army Corps of Engineers and requests that this project be placed on the dredging list. It raises the local funds necessary for the project and includes the dredging project in the Capital Investment Plan.

Responsible party/deadline: harbor committee and harbor master/initial contact 2004, target date for dredging, 2010

7. Marina uses: In order to assure adequate opportunities for the development of commercial marinas, the plan recommends that these uses be allowed in shoreland areas that are not zoned Resource Protection. To minimize conflicts with abutting residential uses, the plan recommends that there be adequate on-site parking and that there be vegetative buffers between the marina and adjoining uses. These buffers must be sufficient to shield the view of the marina. In addition, all marina uses would be required to meet noise, light and related nuisance standards. All existing shoreland standards would remain in effect.

Implementation Strategy: This will occur as part of the land use ordinance changes

Responsible party/deadline: The planning board undertakes in consultation with the DEP

shoreland zoning unit to assure that any changes meet state shoreland zoning standards./2005

K. NATURAL & SCENIC RESOURCES GOAL

Surry aims to protect and enhance its natural and scenic resources through the following measures:

1. Beginning with Habitat: promoting the full use of the *Beginning with Habitat* data by having digital and hard copies of these maps in the town office and arranging a meeting with the appropriate state officials to learn how these maps can be used in reviewing development proposals and protecting key natural resources. Whenever practical, include concentrations of wildlife resources in rural areas as shown in the future land use plan. It would not be practical to include those concentrations of wildlife resources in rural areas in cases where these resources are near existing public roads and concentrations of development;

Implementation Strategy: The planning board and conservation commission contact the Hancock County Planning Commission and ask it to arrange a meeting with the *Beginning with Habitat* group.

Responsible Party/Deadline: planning board and conservation commission/2005

2. Rural Habitat and Scenic Area Protection: working with area land trusts to have large expanses of undeveloped land in remote areas and key scenic areas be protected by targeting these areas for the voluntary acquisition of conservation easements from interested landowners. The town will also retain its current subdivision review standards that help preserve scenic views (section V.5.G).

Implementation Strategy: The planning board contacts area land trusts to arrange a meeting to discuss how such a process could be initiated.

Responsible Party/Deadline: planning board/2005

3. Alewife Restoration: The plan supports measures to encourage the restoration of alewife fisheries in Surry.

Implementation Strategy: The selectmen or its designee contacts the Maine Department Marine Resources to discuss what steps could be undertaken to restore alewife runs.

Responsible Party/Deadline: The selectmen or its designee/2005

4. Fisheries habitat: The plan recommends that the town undertake the following measures to protect and enhance its fisheries habitat:
 - a. assure that non-point source water pollution measures are enacted and enforced (see Water Resources Goal);
 - b. contact the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW) and ask

Surry Comprehensive Plan: IIA. Goals, Objectives and Implementation

for assistance in informing residents of the threats posed by the illegal introduction of fish species;

- c. increase the stream protection zoning structure set back for Meadow and Patten Streams to 100 feet and assure rigorous enforcement of all shoreland zoning standards; and
- d. in order to sustain and restore alewives, arrange a meeting with the MDIFW to explore what steps need to be taken to eliminate permanently beaver dams on Patten Stream and promote restocking.

Implementation Strategy: 4.a: see Water Resources goals; 4.b; the selectmen or its designee contact the MDIFW and ask for information materials to be placed in the town office in the area where fishing licenses are issued; and 4.c this will take place as part of the overall revisions to the Unified Development Ordinance 4.d The selectmen arrange a meeting
--

Responsible Party/Deadline: 4.b, Select board/2005; 4.c: planning board 2005-2006; 4.d selectmen or designee/2006
--

- 5. Flood Plain Management: The plan recommends that the town retain its flood plain management ordinance and update it when recommended by the Flood Plain Management staff of the State Planning Office.

Implementation Strategy: The planning board contacts the State Planning Office to determine if any changes are needed to the flood plain management ordinance
--

Responsible Party/Deadline: planning board/every two years starting in 2005.

- 6. Habitat protection measures: The planning board revises its subdivision and site plan review applications to assure that applicants identify all potential sites or features subject to MDIFW review and/or sites that are identified in the Beginning with Habitat maps. This information shall be used by the planning board to assure that its current *Preservation of Significant Wildlife Habitat* provisions (section V.5.I of the UD0) are used to the fullest extent.

Implementation Strategy: The planning board reviews its current application forms and revises them to include these checklist items.

Responsible Party/Deadline: planning board/ 2005.
--

L. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCE GOAL

Surry supports the continued enhancement and protection of prime agricultural and forest resources through the following specific measures:

- 1. Promotion of Locally Grown Food: support regional efforts to find new

Surry Comprehensive Plan: IIA. Goals, Objectives and Implementation

markets for locally grown foods and assist farmers in marketing and promotion efforts;

Implementation Strategy: This effort is underway by the Hancock County Planning Commission.

2. Major Timber Harvesting Operations: continue current monitoring practices of major timber harvesting operations. This involves:
 - a. the town receiving a copy of all Maine Forest Service timber harvesting applications that occur with Surry and the CEO conducting periodic inspections of these harvesting operations; and
 - b. monitoring areas where liquidation timber harvesting is occurring and working with area land trusts (*see Natural Resource Goal L.2 above*) to have these areas a priority for the acquisition of voluntary conservation easements from interested landowners.

Implementation Strategy: 2.a: this is a continuation of current policy, 2.b: see L.2

3. Enforcement: assure that timber harvesting and vegetative clearing standards in the Resource Protection zone are enforced adequately.

Implementation Strategy: This involves assuring that the selectmen support efforts by the code enforcement officer to enforce these standards.

4. Retention of major blocks of forested land: The plan promotes the retention of major blocks of forested land. This shall be accomplished by the following specific measures:
 - a. provide information on the use of the tree growth, farm and open space program by including information about that program in the annual town report and a notice at the tax collector's desk;
 - b. developing an informational brochure informing land owners about the state income tax credit for forest management plans and resources available (such as local foresters) to assist landowners in developing forest plans. Notice of this brochure would be included in the town report and would be posted at the tax collector's desk, where copies would be available;
 - c. including large blocks of forested land in the low density Rural District (see Future Land Use Plan);
 - d. including forested lands as priority targets for acquisition of land conservation easements. As a condition of easements, sound forest management practices shall be employed on all protected properties.

Implementation Strategy: 4.a & 4.b: the information will be shown as recommended; 4.c: This will be addressed through the future land use plan; 4.d see M.2

Responsible Party/Deadline: 4.a & 4.b: selectmen or designee/2006 4.c: planning board/2006; 4.d

5. Tree planting/retention: The plan recommends that the town undertake the following measures to plant and retain trees:
- a. institute standards to the zoning, site plan review and subdivision ordinances to minimize the cutting of existing trees during the site development process and to require the planting of new trees when deemed practical by the planning board;
 - b. as part of the village revitalization program, undertake tree planting measures; and
 - c. support the tree committee in its beautification efforts.

Implementation Strategy: 5.a: this will be accomplished through amendments to the land use ordinances; 5.b: the town seeks an Urban Forestry grant from the Maine Forest Service; 5.c: the select board assures that vacancies on this committee are filled and asks the committee to submit a report for the annual town report.

Responsible Party/Deadline: 5.a: planning board or designee/2005 5.b: select board/2006; 5.c select board/on-going

M. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The plan supports the continued protection and enhancement of Surry's historical and archaeological resources. This shall be accomplished by continued support and implementation of the historical and archaeological resources goals articulated in the 1991 plan. (*see also Village Development goal F.3 above*). The relevant (paraphrased) goals from the 1991 plan are:

- 1. Ask the historical society to direct a survey of both above ground historical resources and archaeological resources;

Implementation Strategy: The planning board contacts the historical society and asks that it undertake such a survey with technical assistance from the Maine Historic Preservation Commission.

Responsible Party/Deadline: Historical society, work initiates in 2005

- 2. Undertake measures to increase protection of the town's key historical sites in the Unified Development Ordinance by adding a provision to the subdivision ordinance to give the planning board the authority to require a professional assessment of historic and pre-historic resources deemed relevant by the Maine Historic Preservation Commission

Surry Comprehensive Plan: IIA. Goals, Objectives and Implementation

and to enact standards that may include requiring the modification of the proposed site design to minimize disruption of these resources, adjust the timing of construction so that these resources may be examined more thoroughly and limiting the extent of excavation.

Implementation Strategy: These changes will be address through changes to the Unified Development Ordinance.

Responsible Party/Deadline: This would occur along with the other revisions to the UDO.

N. FISCAL CAPACITY GOAL

In order to moderate the rate of future property tax increases, Surry promotes long-range fiscal planning and policies to minimize the fiscal impacts of new development. This shall be accomplished through the following specific policies:

Implementation Strategy: Unless otherwise noted, all these policies will be implemented in the same manner as other changes to the Unified Development Ordinance.

1. discouraging major residential subdivisions in the rural areas that will create excessive demands for town services while generating comparatively little tax revenue;
2. actively seeking state and federal grants to pay for at least a portion of new facilities. Such projects shall be listed in the capital investment plan;

Implementation Strategy: This shall be accomplished by the on-going seeking of grants as they become available and the establishment/maintenance of capital reserve funds for the anticipated projects in addition to the changes in the Unified Development Ordinance. The proposed lower density requirements in the rural areas (see Future Land Use Plan) will limit the possible number of major subdivisions.

3. maintaining and expanding the town’s capital investment plan. The plan recommends that it be updated on annual basis;

Implementation Strategy: This involves a continuation of the current capital investment plan.

4. assuring that the town conducts a revaluation at sufficient intervals.

Implementation Strategy: The selectmen and the assessors meet every five years to determine if a revaluation is necessary.

Responsible Party/Deadline: Selectmen take lead/2007.

5. periodically review school costs to determine if further consolidation of school facilities with adjoining communities is cost-effective and educationally sound.

O. CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN

The capital investment plan (CIP) summarizes major capital expenditures that the town anticipates undertaking. Like the rest of the comprehensive plan, the CIP is advisory in nature. Final recommendations on funding each year are still made by the selectmen and budget committee and are subject to approval by town meeting vote. Capital expenses are defined as items with a useful life of at least five years that cost at least \$10,000. They are distinct from operational expenditures such as fuel, minor repairs to buildings and salaries.

Capital expenditures may be funded in several ways. One is a single appropriation from a town meeting warrant article. Another is annual contributions to a capital reserve fund. A third is borrowing through bonds or loans. A fourth is a grant, which usually require a local match.

Anticipated capital expenditures as of 2004 are shown on Table II.1. These include both recurring expenditures such as annual highway repairs and one-time expenditures such as a new municipal building/fire station facility. All expenditures are shown in 2004 dollars and are subject to inflation.

The need for most of these expenditures is explained in the Municipal Services and Facilities and Marine Resources sections of the Inventory and Analysis. Options for the new municipal building are being determined as the plan goes to print. The fire truck estimate for 2008 is based on the replacement of aging equipment. The recreation reserve fund is primarily to help fund further improvements to the Osgood lot property and adjoining trails. The anticipated date of the next revaluation is expected around 2009, but will depend on how much change there is in property values between the completion of the current revaluation (2003-2004) and then. While no specific plans have been proposed for the school, based on past experiences it is likely that some improvements will be needed.

Table II.1 SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED CAPITAL EXPENDITURES, 2004-2010		
ITEM	COST	YEAR/METHOD OF FINANCING
Annual road improvements	\$150,000 p.a.	Annually/ 1,5
Fire Truck	\$125,000	2008/ 2,4
Municipal Bldg/Fire Station upgrade	\$750,000	2007/ 4
Town Dump Truck	\$50,000	2009/2
Bay dredging	\$80,000	2010/2,3
Wharf refurbishment/beautification improvements	\$25,000	2005/ 2,3
Gateway Grant	\$10,000	2005/ 1,3
Recreation reserve fund	\$5,000 p.a.	Annually/2
School Improvements	\$500,000	2009/4
Revaluation	\$70,000	2007/1

Key: 1. Direct appropriation; 2. Capital reserve fund; 3. Matching state grant; 4. Bond; 5. State Highway Block Grant. Costs represent total cost, a portion of which may be paid by grants (for example, \$8,000 town for wharf refurbishment, \$17,000 grant, a similar breakdown is expected for the bay dredging)

P. REGIONAL COORDINATION GOAL

Surry encourages regional coordination when it is of mutual benefit to all parties involved. Specific regional coordination recommendations were cited elsewhere in this section. Rather than repeat them here, the appropriate policies are identified below.

SUMMARY OF POLICIES REQUIRING REGIONAL COORDINATION	
Topic	Supporting Policies
Economy	B.1, B.4
Housing	C.4
Transportation	H.6
Water Resources	I.3
Agricultural & Forest Resources	L.1

Q. CONSISTENCY OF SURRY’S POLICIES WITH THE STATE GOALS AND COASTAL POLICIES

The Maine State Planning Office, per the requirements of the Growth Management Act, evaluates plans for their consistency with the ten growth management goals and the nine coastal policies. The consistency of each state goal and policy with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan is summarized in the matrixes below.

MAINE'S GROWTH MANAGEMENT GOALS	
1.	To encourage orderly growth and development in appropriate areas of each community, while protecting the State's rural character, making efficient use of public services and preventing development sprawl.
Related Policies:	A, F.1-F.8, E.1-E.4, O.1-0.5
2.	To plan for, finance and develop an efficient system of public facilities and services to accommodate anticipated growth and economic development.
Related Policies:	D.1-D.5, H.1-H.6, O.1-0.5
3.	To promote an economic climate that increases job opportunities and overall economic well being.
Related Policies:	B.1-B.4
4.	To encourage and promote affordable, decent housing opportunities for all Maine citizens.
Related Policies:	C.1-C.5
5.	To protect the quality and manage the quantity of the State's water resources, including lakes, aquifers, great ponds, estuaries, rivers and coastal areas.
Related Policies:	I.1-I.3
6.	To protect the State's other critical natural resources, including, without limitation, wetlands, wildlife and fisheries habitat, sand dunes, shorelands, scenic vistas, and unique natural areas.
Related Policies:	K.1-K.2
7.	To protect the State's marine resources industry, ports, and harbors from incompatible development, and to promote access to the shore for commercial fishermen and the public.
Related Policies:	J.1-J.2
8.	To safeguard the State's agricultural and forest resources from development which threatens those resources.
Related Policies:	L.1-L.3
9.	To preserve the State's historic and archeological resources.
Related Policies:	M.1-M.2
10.	To promote and protect the availability of outdoor recreation opportunities for all Maine citizens, including access to surface waters.

MAINE'S COASTAL POLICIES	
1. Port and harbor development. Promote the maintenance, development and revitalization of the State's ports and harbors for fishing, transportation and recreation.	
Related Policies:	Not applicable
2. Marine resource management. Manage the marine environment and its related resources to preserve and improve the ecological integrity and diversity of marine communities and habitats, to expand our understanding of the productivity of the Gulf of Maine and coastal waters, and to enhance the economic value of the State's renewable marine resources.	
Related Policies:	I.3, J.1-J.2
3. Shoreline management and access. Support shoreline management that gives preference to water dependent uses over other uses, that promotes public access to the shoreline, and that considers the cumulative effects of development on coastal resources.	
Related Policies:	F.5, L.3
4. Hazard Area Development. Discourage growth and new development in coastal areas where, because of coastal storms, flooding, landslides or sea level rise, it is hazardous to human health and safety.	
Related Policies:	(This is addressed through existing shoreland and floodplain ordinances)
5. State and local cooperative management. Encourage and support cooperative state and municipal management of coastal resources.	
Related Policies:	J.2
6. Scenic and natural areas protection. Protect and manage critical habitat and natural areas of state and national significance and maintain the scenic beauty and character of the coast even in areas where development occurs.	
Related Policies:	K.2
7. Recreation and tourism. Expand the opportunities for outdoor recreation and encourage appropriate coastal tourist activities and development.	
Related Policies:	B.4
8. Water Quality. Restore and maintain the quality of our fresh, marine and estuarine waters to allow for the broadest possible diversity of public and private uses.	
Related Policies:	I.3, K.3

<p>9. Air Quality. Restore and maintain coastal air quality to protect the health of citizens and visitors and to protect enjoyment of the natural beauty and maritime characteristics of the Maine coast.</p>

<p>Related Policies: H.6</p>

II.B. FUTURE LAND USE PLAN

1. Introduction

This future land use plan presents a vision of what Surry residents want their town to be in the future. It builds upon the future land use plan prepared as part of the 1991 plan. It aims to achieve a balance among the wishes of residents to preserve rural character and historic and natural resources, while also being a welcoming community by allowing reasonable opportunities for future growth, population diversity and job opportunities. Through careful planning, Surry can accommodate all anticipated growth while also avoiding the excessive increases in property taxes that can result from poorly planned development.

Specifically, this section:

- a. estimates the amount of land needed for future growth;
- b. proposes a future development scheme for Surry; and
- c. recommends growth, transitional and rural areas.

2. Land Needed for Future Development

It is important to base the future land use plan on an estimate of how much land will be needed for various uses. While there is no precise way to predict acreage, some general estimates can be made. These are based both on population trends and more casual observations.

a. Residential Acreage

The Housing chapter of the Inventory and Analysis estimated that there would be 224 additional year-round new dwelling units in Surry by 2015. To allow for some flexibility in the event of an unexpected growth spurt and to plan for a few more years of growth, the plan will assume that the town will have a maximum of 350 additional dwelling units by 2015. While this presently appears unlikely to occur, it reduces the likelihood of any planning decisions made by the town providing insufficient residential acreage and restricting growth. Under current average lot size requirements of about one acre per unit, this means that 350 additional acres of residential land will be needed by 2015.

The dwelling unit projection in the Housing chapter is for year-round units only. However, at least a portion of the new units built may be built initially as second homes. This trend is unlikely to have a significant impact on the total number of units built. First, the number of second homes built in recent years has been very limited (*see the Housing chapter*). Second, a good portion of these homes may be converted eventually to year-round use.

b. Commercial/Industrial Acreage

Commercial development in Surry has occurred slowly. It is difficult to predict future development trends. There is, however, ample vacant land in the area presently zoned Roadside Commercial. This area will likely accommodate all future commercial and industrial growth that occurs in town by 2015.

c. Rural Undeveloped/Conservation Acreage

Rural, undeveloped land is defined as land that is not presently developed but has no restrictions that preclude it from being developed in the future. The majority of the town's 24,000 inland acres are rural undeveloped. Exact figures are not available, but the major developed land use is residential (913 acres in 2000 or about 4 percent of all inland acreage). Commercial and other built-up uses constitute a small portion of the total developed land. The major land use in town is likely to remain rural, undeveloped. This means that the town has ample room to accommodate new development but it also means that there are significant opportunities for sprawl-related problems. Some of this vacant land has soils that severely limit their development potential. According to maps prepared by the Natural Resources Conservation Service, about 6,000 acres in Surry have a "very low suitability" for development (see Map 2).

Conservation acreage is defined as land that is either temporarily or permanently protected from development. An example of a temporary protection would be the placement of a parcel in tree growth or farm and forest tax classification. An example of land permanently protected would be land held in a conservation easement or land held by a public entity such as a town forest.

According to tax assessor records, there are about 6,972 acres in town are presently (2002) held in tree growth acreage. Another 285 acres are held in open space classification and 50 acres as farm land. These parcels are protected for at least the short run.

While it is not possible to project the future acreage in these categories, at some increase is likely. For example, the Blue Hill Heritage Trust is working to acquire additional easements. Many landowners across Hancock County have expressed interest in protecting their land from further development.

3. A Future Development Scheme for Surry

The following paragraphs present the future land use scheme envisioned for Surry. In many respects, it aims to preserve the town as it is today while also allowing adequate opportunities for future growth. It aims to keep the rural areas relatively rural, encourage growth in the village and minimize environmentally incompatible development. However, it also recommends measures to facilitate development of housing aimed at younger families and to provide areas for growth outside of the village.

a. The Village

The plan recommends a minor expansion of the current village district as shown on the Future Land Use map. The village would remain one of the town's primary growth areas. The plan recommends that the current minimum residential lot size in the village of one acre be reduced to one-half acre for single family dwellings when it is possible to install a wastewater disposal system and water supply in accordance with state standards. Realistically, most development on lots this small will probably require some sort of centralized waste water disposal system such as a shared septic system. As mentioned in the Housing goals, the plan also recommends that multi-family housing (three or more units per building) of a limited scale be allowed in the village area (see Housing Goal C.1).

There would also be changes in the commercial use standards for the village district. These are described in under the Land Use Goals and Objectives. These changes would facilitate the expansion of current commercial uses by allowing those uses with additional acreage greater opportunity to expand. This ability to expand is important in encouraging the village as a center of small-scale retail activity.

b. The Shoreline

The plan recommends that provision be made to allow marina-type uses in tidal areas not subject to Resource Protection zoning. No other changes are recommended to the districts or boundaries of the areas subject to shoreland zoning.

c. Transitional District

The plan recommends that those portions of the current Rural District, as shown on the Future Land Use map, be rezoned as a Transitional District. The purpose of this district is to accommodate residential development. The current uses allowed in the Rural District in the UDO will be allowed in this district except for multi-family. The minimum lot size will be one acre. Subdivision roads that are dead-ends will be allowed to be up to 1,500 feet in length.

d. Residential Growth Areas

As mentioned in the Rural Area Assessment chapter, only one unit was built in the Resident Growth District as designated in the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) between 1991 and 2001. Another unit was built during 2002. The plan recommends that new residential growth areas be created. These are shown on the Future Land Use map. The plan recommends that the current list of permitted uses for this zone be retained with the exception that multifamily uses would be allowed subject to the same standards as recommended in the Village District. Minimum lot sizes of one-half acre

would be allowed for single family homes if soil conditions permitted. Dead-end subdivision roads will be allowed to be up to 1,500 feet in length.

e. Roadside Commercial District

No changes are recommended to the boundaries or the standards of this area.

f. Rural Areas

The plan recommends that the boundaries of the current Farm and Forest District plus other remote, roadless areas as shown on the Future Land Use map be designated as Rural Areas. The purpose of this district is to retain remote areas as low density rural and avoid the expense of extending town services such as fire protection and school buses into remote areas. These areas will not include any land within 1,500 feet of any Great Pond or within 1,500 feet of a major road unless otherwise indicated on the Future Land Use. Concentrations of existing development, even in relatively rural parts of town are not included as Rural.

A minimum lot size of four acres of net developable land will be required for all development in this district. Land owners unable to meet this minimum will be allowed one division of land after the effective date of this ordinance. New dead end roads serving residential development will be subject to a 1,000-foot maximum length. This provision shall **not** apply to roads used for timber harvesting, farming or mineral extraction that do not serve residential developments or to private driveways. Unless a cluster development is employed, the minimum road frontage will be 200 feet and a front yard setback of 75 feet will be required.

The list of permitted uses for the Farm and Forest District will continue to be allowed with some minor changes. First, no new commercial uses will be allowed apart from home occupations and uses that are farm and forest dependent. Examples of the latter include saw mills and operations essential for agriculture such as farm equipment storage. Second, new multi-family uses would be prohibited.

4. Growth and Rural Areas

The Village, Residential Growth and Roadside Commercial District would be the designated growth areas if the comprehensive plan were adopted as presently proposed. The Rural Areas would be rural areas. The shoreland areas are considered a separate category since there are already many restrictions on the types of development allowed in those areas. Due to the intensity of development in shoreland areas, they cannot be considered rural, but their environmental fragility means that they are not suitable for significant growth either. The Transitional District would be neither growth nor rural.

5. Measures to Distinguish Growth and Rural Areas

The plan recommends several measures to limit growth in rural areas and facilitate growth in growth areas. First, the Rural Areas have a minimum lot size of four acres, a 1,000-foot limitation on new, dead end roads serving residential development and new restrictions on multifamily and commercial development. The proposed dimensional requirements and related information are shown in Table II.2 (see the end of this section). The acreage in each proposed zone is shown on Table II.3.

The plan also proposes some non-regulatory techniques to distinguish between growth and rural areas. For example, it recommends that the Conservation Commission work with the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife to identify and protect key habitat parcels by seeking conservation easements from interested landowners. An incentive to encourage growth in growth areas is the recommendation that the town work with the Maine State Housing Authority to create a first-time homebuyer subdivision in the village area. This will not only help younger families find affordable purchase opportunities, but also bring more people into the growth areas. Another incentive is the Village Infrastructure Development Program (see Goal E.2)

6. Summary

A review of development trends since 1991 shows that the plan adopted that year met with minimal success in encouraging growth in growth areas. The update proposes more measures to assure that more growth is channeled to growth areas and less to rural areas.

The true test of any plan is time. The plan thus recommends that growth trends be reviewed on an annual basis by mapping where new development takes place. Five years after adoption of the plan, the town will determine what percentage of total new residential units have been built in growth areas. If less than 65 percent of development has occurred in growth areas and 20 percent in the transitional areas, the plan recommends that these policies be reviewed.

In order to evaluate these policies, the plan recommends that the selectmen ask the code enforcement officer to record the location of permits for new residential construction by growth, rural and transitional areas. The breakdown of permits will be reported each year in the town report. If the target percentages are not achieved over the five-year period from the adoption date of the revised land use ordinances based on the plan's recommendations, the plan recommends that the selectmen appoint a comprehensive plan review committee to propose new growth management measures.

Table II.2 Summary of Proposed Inland District Standards, Surry						
District	Minimum Residential Lot Size	Road Frontage	Maximum Cul-de-sac length	Multi-family allowed	Commercial Forest and Ag	Mobile Home Parks allowed
Residential	20,000 ft ²	100 ft.	1,500 ft.	Y	Y	Y
Roadside commercial	1 acre	200 ft	1,500 ft	Y	Y	Y
Village	20,000 ft ²	100 ft	1,500 ft	Y	Y	N
Transitional	40,000 ft ²	150 ft	1,500 ft	N	N	N
Rural	4 acres	200 ft	1,000 ft	N	Y	N
Resource Protection	40,000 ft ²	150 ft	1,000 ft	N	N	N
Stream Protection	40,000 ft ²	150 ft	1,000 ft	N	N	N

Surry Comprehensive Plan: IIB. Future Land Use Plan

Recalculation of this table is pending

Table II.3 Estimated Land Acreage in Each Proposed District		
District	Estimated Land Acres¹	Percent
Residential Growth	1,000	4.0
Roadside Commercial	600	2.4
Village	900	3.26
Transitional	9,000	36.0
Rural	10,000	40.0
Resource Protection	2,000	8.0
Shoreland (other)	200	.08
Wetland/Water Bodies	1,300	5.2
Total	25,000	100

¹**NOTE:** Total land acreage shown here may differ from that shown elsewhere in the plan due to different calculation methods and rounding of numbers.

APPENDIX I

RELEVANT PORTIONS OF THE 1991 PLAN

APPENDIX I: RELEVANT PORTIONS OF THE 1991 PLAN

B. LAND USE

The Town of Surry encompasses 25,124 acres or 39.26 square miles, which includes 1,160 acres of lake waters in Toddy Pond and Upper/Lower Patten Pond.

1980 data reveal that of the approximate 24,000 inland acres about 80% was forested, 7% in agriculture, 5% was developed and the remaining 12% being open land, wetlands, marsh and streams.

1. Forest Land

Most of the total estimated forest land (19,200 acres) is located in the northern and western sectors of the town. In this part of town there is an active harvest annually. Due to the proximity of the Champion paper mill in Bucksport, there is a ready softwood market for pulp in addition to a demand for wood chips for energy facilities.

In 1978, there were 1,823 acres registered in Surry under the Tree Growth Tax program. In 1986 8,830 acres (38 parcels) were registered compared with 6,743 acres (99 parcels) in 1989. The State Tree Growth Tax Law was enacted in 1970 to provide property tax relief particularly to large land owners and to encourage good forest management. There is a stiff penalty to the owner if the land is sold or taken out of tree growth. The trend in Surry is that while the registered acreage has been reduced (due partly to sale), more land owners are participating to gain tax savings as land valuations increase.

2. Agricultural Land and Open Space

While many of the open pastures, associated with the small farms that were more common in the early part of the century, have overgrown into forest, blueberry harvesting in Surry remains active and accounts for much of the 1,680 acres estimated in use for agriculture. Two blueberry companies own and manage large land parcels in Surry. Also, over 30 resident owners manage and harvest berries on smaller parcels. The blueberry lands have, however, diminished in recent years since much of it has greater value for development.

There is one farm on Newbury Neck in Surry registered under the Farm and Open Space Law. Beef cattle are raised on this 68-acre farm. Another farm of about 30 acres on Toddy Pond Road produces apples. There are a few other family farms in Surry producing organic and other specialty crops.

3. Residential Land and Subdivisions

All of Surry's residential land is located either along major roadways or on water bodies. Virtually all of the shorefront on Union River Bay has been developed for residential use, albeit at low to moderate densities.

Because of the location of the road, there has been relatively little development on the Morgan Bay side of the Neck. The areas on Morgan Bay that have been developed were developed as subdivisions.

Virtually all of the shoreline on Toddy Pond in Surry is either residential or agricultural. Both of these activities contribute large amounts of phosphorus to the pond. Excessive phosphorus export can lead to algae blooms. Since phosphorus export from development is difficult to correct after the fact, future development in the Toddy Pond watershed should be designed to limit phosphorus export.

There has also been some development in a concentrated area on the lower end of Lower Patten Pond. However, the remainder of land on Upper and Lower Patten Pond in Surry is owned by paper companies and remains undeveloped at this time. A large piece between the two ponds has recently become available for development, but has not yet been sold or subdivided. Since paper companies generally sell their shoreline property first it is likely that Upper and Lower Patten Ponds will see more development in the near future.

Development along roadways is to be expected and in fact local ordinances often encourage it with excessive road frontage requirements. This leads to sprawl, the loss of rural character, and will ultimately cause traffic problems. Like many towns in Maine and elsewhere the distinction between the village center and the rural parts of Surry is disappearing.

4. Commercial Land

There is very little commercial land in Surry. Many of the local businesses are home based, are not land intensive and are located along the main thoroughfare between Ellsworth and Blue Hill. At this point Surry's development, commercial land use is very limited.

5. Wetlands and Marsh

Surry has numerous freshwater wetlands, mostly situated in the northern sector of the Town. A total of 25 wetlands of 10 acres or over have been identified by DEP. These and the town's coastal wetlands are discussed in the Natural Resource Section that follows.

6. Land Ownership

In 1989, there were 1,375 taxed lots in Surry, with or without buildings. Nearly half the lots are 50 acres or less. One third of Surry's total acreage belonged to 13 owners having parcels of 200 acres or more (reference Table BI).

TABLE B.I NUMBER OF OWNERS BY LOT SIZE			
Lot Size (AC)	Of Owners	Of Acres	% Of Total
1,000-2,307	3	4,791	20%
200-1,000	10	3,348	14%
100-200	17	2,198	9%
50-100	52	3,474	14.5%
0-50	1,293	-10,188	42.5%
Total	1,375	24,000*	100%
*Approximate total acres in the Town of Surry SOURCE: Surry Tax Maps			

a. Key Issues

1. Agricultural lands are becoming scarce.
2. Excessive development on Toddy Pond is occurring and development on Upper and Lower Patten Pond may accelerate.
3. Excessive development is occurring on the east side of Newbury Neck.
4. There is a potential for additional large subdivision development on Morgan Bay side of Newbury Neck.
5. Construction on non-conforming lots could present problems, unless strictly enforced.

C. NATURAL AND MARINE RESOURCES

1. Soils

Soils play a critical role in planning for the future of Surry. The ability of soils to support different types of land uses plays an important part in determining where different land uses are located. Soil characteristics will have an impact on the cost involved in building on a site, as well as the impact a certain land use will have on groundwater and other natural resources.

Three Interpretive Soil maps have been developed for Surry. An Interpretive map groups soils into categories according to common properties shared by individual soil types. For example all of the following soils are hydric soils, that is they all share the characteristic of being wet. However, only some of them are considered useful as farmland and they each have a different woodland productivity rating. An interpretive map showing all hydric soils would have all of the hydric soils shaded one color while an interpretive map might show woodland productivity with a different shading pattern for each productivity rating.

TABLE C.1 SOIL TYPES & PRODUCTIVITY RATINGS				
Soil Unit Symbol	Soil Unit Name	Hydric Soils	Prime Farmland	Woodland Productivity
2A	Charles silt loam	yes	yes	medium
28A	Scantic silt loam	yes	no	medium
33B	Lamoine-Scantic complex	yes	no	high
34B	Biddeford muck	yes	no	very low
46B	Brayton fine sandy loam	yes	no	high
SOURCE: Soil Conservation Service, USDA				

The soil unit symbol or name means very little to anyone but a soil scientist. However, interpretive maps based on soil properties are very useful. One of Surry's interpretive soils maps shows Prime Farmland and Woodland productivity. Much of what is in Tree Growth in the northwestern part of town is rated for high forest productivity. Much of the land rated for high farmland productivity is either forested or has been developed. A large piece of open land half way to Blue Hill on Route 176 is rated as prime farmland.

Another interpretive map shows soil potential for low-density development. On this map soils are rated very high to very low in terms of suitability for development. This rating system was developed by looking at the type of corrective measures needed to overcome soil limitations for single family homes with subsurface waste disposal and paved roads in a development. Soils are rated based on the degree of site modification and associated costs needed to make the soil satisfactory for subsurface waste disposal, house building and roads.

Much of the area on Newbury Neck is rated as having a low potential for development. One area at the end of Newbury Neck is not yet developed and is rated as having a high

potential for development.

Soil around the center of town is generally rated as being low to very low in terms of suitability for development. There are, however, a few pockets of good soils near the Village. A large portion of land west of the North Bend Road is rated as having medium to high potential for development. Another large piece of land near the center of town rated as having a high potential for development is located north of the Ellsworth Road and east of the North Bend Road. Land on Route 176 towards Orland has considerable land rated as having medium and high potential for development.

The limitations for development map shows erodible soils, steep slopes, floodplain soils, sand and gravel aquifer soils and hydric soils.

2. Water Resources

a. Water Quality Classifications in Surry

In classifying water bodies in the State, the legislature had three (3) objectives:

1. that the discharge of pollutants into the waters of the State be eliminated where appropriate;
2. that no pollutants be discharged into any waters of the State without first being given the degree of treatment necessary to allow those waters to attain their classification; and
3. that water quality be sufficient to provide for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish and wildlife and to provide for recreation in and on the water.

b. Class B Waters

Class B is the 3rd highest classification for streams and tributaries. This classification applies to all streams and tributaries in Surry.

Class B waters need to be of such quality that they are suitable for the designated uses of drinking water supply after treatment, fishing, recreation in and on the water, industrial process and cooling water supply, hydroelectric power generation and navigation, and as habitat for fish and other aquatic life.

According to the water classification law, the habitat shall be characterized as unimpaired. Discharges to Class B waters shall not cause adverse impact to aquatic life in that the receiving waters shall be of sufficient quality to support all aquatic species indigenous to the receiving water without detrimental changes in the resident biological community.

c. Class SB Waters

Class SB is the 2nd highest classification for marine waters. Union River Bay and Blue Hill Bay are both Class SB.

According to the Water Quality Classification Law, Class SB waters shall be of such quality that they are suitable for the designated uses of recreation in and on the water, fishing, aquaculture, propagation and harvesting of shellfish, industrial process and cooling water supply, hydroelectric power generation and navigation and as habitat for fish and other estuarine and marine life. The habitat shall be characterized as unimpaired.

Discharges to Class SB waters shall not cause adverse impact to estuarine and marine life in that the receiving waters shall be of sufficient quality to support all estuarine and marine species indigenous to the receiving water without detrimental changes in the resident biological community. There shall be no new discharge to Class SB waters which would cause closure of open shellfish areas by the Department of Marine Resources.

The marine waters off Surry's shoreline are rich with marine life.

<u>MARINE LIFE</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
Marine Worms	East Surry Inner Patten Bay
Soft Shell Clams	East of Newbury Neck Road Morgan Bay West Side of Newbury Neck
Quahogs (Hard Clams)	Small parts of soft-shell clam areas
Sea Scallops	Blue Hill Bay Union River Bay
Lobsters	Shallow waters off Newbury Neck and on Union River Bay
Striped Bass	Union River Bay
Rainbow Smelt	Union River Bay
American Eel	Union River Bay, Toddy Pond
Alewifes	Toddy Pond

	Union River Bay Upper Patten Pond to Lower Patten Pond to Patten Stream
Atlantic Salmon	Union River Bay

d. Class GPA Waters

Class GPA is the sole classification assigned to great ponds which includes Toddy Pond and Upper and Lower Patten Ponds.

Again, according to the Water Quality Classification Laws, Class GPA waters shall be of such quality that they are suitable for the designated uses of drinking water after disinfection, recreation in and on the water, fishing, industrial process and cooling water supply, hydroelectric power generation and navigation and as habitat for fish and other aquatic life. The habitat shall be characterized as natural.

Class GPA waters are described by their trophic state (a measure of the lake's likelihood of producing an algae bloom) based on measures of the chlorophyll transparency, total phosphorus content, flushing rate and other such criteria. Class GPA waters are to have a stable or decreasing trophic state, subject only to natural fluctuations and shall be free of man-induced algae blooms which impair their use and enjoyment.

The law again states that there shall be no new direct discharge of pollutants into Class GPA waters. Discharges into these waters, which were licensed prior to January 1, 1986, shall be allowed to continue only until practical alternatives exist. No materials may be placed on or removed from the shores or banks of a Class GPA water body in such a manner that materials may fall or be washed into the waters. Also, no change of land use in the watershed of a Class GPA water body may, by itself or in combination with other activities, cause water quality degradation which would impair the characteristics or cause an increase in the trophic state of downstream GPA waters.

The Toddy Pond watershed ultimately drains into the Penobscot River. However, the Upper and Lower Patten Pond watersheds, and the remainder of the land area in Surry, drain into the Union River Bay.

High intensity development on the shoreline as well as the entire Patten Pond drainage basin impacts the water quality and the integrity of the Union River Bay marine habitat. Whenever land is cleared, runoff containing nutrients, foreign material, chemicals, bacteria, etc., has an easier time reaching the water. Clearing of land goes hand in hand with development which has a permanent impact on marine water, groundwater and surface water as well as on the area's visual assets.

Improvements to the marine habitat could be made by:

1. Eliminating all discharges to water or treating discharges such that the water quality of the discharge is higher than the body of water into which it is discharging.
2. Encourage buffer strips to be planted in areas where the natural vegetation has been removed.
3. Encourage good site design for all new development to minimize any additional runoff from the development to any water bodies.

3. Wetlands

A wetland is a location where the ground water table surfaces. It is characterized by water-loving plants and water-retaining soils. The Town of Surry has a number of wetlands that are frequently inundated and saturated by surface and/or ground water.

Marshes, swamps, bogs and fens are all wetlands, each with its own particular characteristics. Sometimes there is a mixture of types. Not only do these areas protect against erosion and store excess floodwaters, but also some of them are among the most productive ecosystems in Surry. Whether a wet area is a marsh or a bog, can be determined, by learning the plants associated with each.

The Emerton Heath is approximately 200 acres. It sits between Morgan Bay Road and Newbury Neck Road, and is surrounded on all sides by woods. It is a bog - but because water flows from it into Emerton Brook, it is a bog with some characteristics of a fen.

Another extensive freshwater marsh habitat is located on the property of Laredo Carter on the Toddy Pond Road. A great number of birds make use of this marsh including Osprey (nesting), Hooded Merganser, Great Cormorant, Black Duck, Kingfisher, Bald Eagle, Canada Goose, Killdeer, and Great Blue Heron. Another Surry area that provides valuable marsh habitat is Patten Stream outlet at lower Patten Pond, which also is a favored duck habitat.

Bogs hold water and do not usually give it up. Even in times of drought, bogs release only about 1% of their water to the surrounding land. The water is held deep in the peatbeds of the bog. And the peat, which decomposes very slowly in this acidic and anaerobic environment, becomes, in effect, a historical record. Bogs can reveal plants and animal species that are thousands of years old. Because bogs are nutrient-poor, and do not have mineral-rich flowing water the way fens and streams do, only a few plants that have adapted to such a sterile environment thrive here. The pitcher plant is one -it takes its nutriment from the insects in the air around it, rather than from the ground.

4. Morgan Bay

An ecosystem of high value in the Town of Surry is one consisting of Morgan Bay, the

salt-water marsh at its head, and Emerton Heath.

Emerton Heath is a pristine example of a northern bog that nourishes the marsh by way of Emerton Brook and three other streams. The Heath may be the origin of ground water that feeds the wells of the residences down the slope along Patten Bay.

Morgan Bay and its marsh provide a viable habitat for an unusually large variety of life forms. Partly this is due to the absence of major development (and the pollution and disruption that come with it) in the entire watershed. Some of the rarer forms of crustaceans and mollusks may have been able to establish populations in Morgan Bay because of its shallow depth, which allows for solar warming and the nutrient producing marsh.

In 1984, a portion of Morgan Bay was placed on the State Register of Critical Areas because of the quahog breeding areas located there. Most of the common types of clams can be found in the bay, as well as some species of Mollusks not commonly found north of Cape Cod. There is at present a proposal being considered to expand the critical area designation to include horseshoe crab breeding sites. Morgan Bay and Hog Bay in Hancock (the only other breeding site in this area) mark the northern range limit of the horseshoe crab.

5. Fisheries

For many year alewives were taken commercially (by permit from the Town of Surry) on Patten Pond and along Patten Stream. In 1984, this practice was discontinued because of the small number of fish returning to these waters. In a period of five years the number of fish taken dropped from 320 bushels to 32 bushels. No satisfactory explanation has been found for this drop in population. Patten Pond has been restocked with alewives and there are plans to place fish ladders along the stream.

6. Shellfish

Clam flats are located in Surry along the South shore of Patten Bay, along the Union River Bay and Morgan Bay shores of Newbury Neck, and at the head of Morgan Bay.

The clam flats on Patten Bay have been closed for many years. So far, there seems to be no concrete information about the cause of the pollution problems. There is speculation about possible direct discharges of septic effluent or malfunctioning septic systems both on the bay itself as well as further up Patten stream. More data need to be gathered regarding this issue. Part of the problem may be intensive residential development in the village area where soils are not well suited for development. This area slopes fairly rapidly down to the bay. Access roads and streets leading to the Bay provide access for channelized runoff that reach the Bay fairly easily.

At the moment, only the clam flats on the Morgan Bay side of Newbury Neck are open. The Department of Marine Resources has done testing of the flats, and those located on the East side of the Neck are expected to open sometime in 1990 or 1991. Those flats were closed due to lack of water quality information.

In 1987, there were 108 resident and non-resident non-commercial licenses issued by the Town of Surry. The Town has never issued commercial licenses. In the recent past there have allegedly been a great number of commercial diggers illegally working the flats in Surry.

7. Public Access to Salt Water

At present there are two locations that the Town maintains for public access to salt water.

The Town landing is located in the center of the village just off route 172. A ramp allows small boat access to Patten Bay. The build up of the bar at the mouth of the harbor has greatly limited the use of the landing.

The Carrying Place is a stretch of gravelly beach on Union River Bay located on the Newbury Neck road about 4 1/2 miles from the village. It is used exclusively during the summer for swimming and picnicking.

TABLE C.2

PLANTS AND WILDLIFE IN EMERTON HEATH

Plants:

- Sphagnum
- Heaths: cranberry, leather leaf, highbush blueberry, black highbush blueberry, sheep laurel, bog laurel, bog rosemary, creeping snow berry
- Pitcher Plant
- Cotton Grass (many species)

Amphibians and Reptiles:

- Wood Frog
- Northern Red-bellied Snake
- Eastern Garter Snake
- Northern Water Snake

Birds:

- Tree Swallows*
- Warblers: Tennessee, Yellow-humped, Palm*
- Brown Creeper
- Red-winged Blackbird
- Flycatchers: Olive-sided, Yellow-bellied
- Sparrow: White-throated, Savannah, Lincoln's*
- Red-shouldered Hawk, Boreal Chickadee*, Gray Jay, Spruce Grouse, Ruffed Grouse* prefer to nest in or near peatlands

Mammals:

- Northern Flying Squirrel*
- Red Squirrel
- Hoary Bat
- Voles*: meadow, boreal redback
- Woodland Jumping Mouse*, Meadow Jumping Mouse
- Southern Bog Lemming*
- Shorttail Weasel
- Southern Short Hare*
- Fisher
- Porcupine
- Bob Cat
- Moose
- White Tail Deer

prey items

Deer Yards have recently been identified for Surry by the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife. This information is displayed on the Land and Resource Use Plan Map.

In summary, the soils maps indicate that certain soil types in Surry Village are not highly suitable for development, however some land adjacent to the North Bend Road is rated as having medium to high potential for development. Directing new development to these areas would ensure the maintenance of a village area, close to services and located on fairly good soils. Farmland is scarce in Surry, and most of the prime farmland soils are currently forested. For this reason, the parcels of open land on prime farmland soils deserves special attention. The marine waters in Surry do not meet their SB classification because of the clam-flats that are closed. The water quality problems in Patten Bay need to be assessed. Also, Surry has many valuable wetlands that deserve special protection. Surry has entered into the National Flood Insurance Program and adopted a Flood Plain Ordinance in 1987. Existent flood plains are identified on the zoning map.

8. Key Issues

- a. Certain soil types in the Town of Surry are limiting to development while other soil types are important resources that should not be lost to development.
- b. Wildlife resources of the Town need to be carefully protected.
- c. Land with soils having high potential for development are limited within the present village center.
- d. High value forest land is an important resource needing some level of protection.

- e. Marginal forest lands need to be carefully harvested in order to protect water quality and to assure a sustainable yield.
- f. Shellfish beds in Patten Bay are an important economic resource that could provide a livelihood for some.
- g. Assuring the integrity of Surry's Marine wildlife and shellfish habitat requires a high quality of marine waters.
- h. Wetlands are important to the ecology of the region, the quality of groundwater and the health of waterfowl.
- i. The water quality of Upper and Lower Patten Ponds and Toddy Pond needs to be maintained.
- j. Aquifers, the Town's sources of drinking water, need protection.
- k. Lower Patten Pond may be a potential source of water for the town.

E. TRANSPORTATION

1. Traffic Problem Areas

There are in the Town of Surry many areas that create parking and access problems both seasonally and year-round. The largest year-round problem is in the center of Town, where the store is located on the corner of 172 and the North Bend Road. There is inadequate parking available, and what parking there is interferes with viewing distances in and around the intersection. While a parking ordinance for this sector was enacted in 1991, the need for off-street parking areas must be stressed as this area grows.

There is also a problem with excess speed in this same area with through traffic from Blue Hill and Ellsworth. A flashing overhead light would be useful to indicate that this can be a dangerous and congested spot, especially early in the morning and at 5:00 p.m.

North Bend Road: The area of the Public Landing on Patten Pond on the North Bend Road appears to have a sufficient parking at this time. Although this is a small area people seem to be accommodated very well.

Surry Gardens: There is no designated roadside parking for this business. The frequent overflow of customers makes this a dangerous entrance, especially in the spring and summer. Although there is a small parking area for the facility it is not large enough to meet the demand. Antique stores in the area also use the same roadside area for parking.

Newbury Beach Area: During the summer months parking and access on the Newbury Neck road near the beach area is a problem. Beach goers manage to park on both sides of the road even though the town has signage allowing parking on only one side of the road. Parking needs to be improved in this area.

Morgan Bay Corner: The home of the Surry Opera Company is in this area. There is very little parking for visitors that use the facility. On Route 176 there is a 90 degree curve near the Opera Company, allowing for very limited visibility. Since this is a State Aid Road, the Town should meet with the Department of Transportation to see what assistance might be available to alleviate this problem. The intersection of the Morgan Bay Crossroad is also on this corner. A very steep hill comes onto this intersection with little visibility. The Maine Department of Transportation should be approached about assisting to rebuild the intersection. The Opera Company needs to arrange for an off-street parking area for the accommodation of opera goers.

Surry Rural Hall: This facility is used only occasionally for various functions in the summer months. Again the users of this building use the shoulders along the main highway for parking while attending functions. Because of the limited use of this building and the excellent visibility on this section of road there is, at present, no major problem.

Old Fire House: Located on the corner of Route 172 and Route 176 the old Fire House appears to have sufficient parking area for usage at this time. However, if the building were expanded to accommodate additional use parking could become a problem.

Grange Hall: The Grange Hall does have a parking lot that takes care of the need. The roadside on the main highway is used occasionally for overflow parking. The facility is used only one night a week.

Grammar School: The school area has a parking lot that accommodates the average flow of traffic. The only time that parking overflows to the roadside is for school or town events at the gym at the school.

2. Surry Roads

a. State Aid Roads

The roads listed below are 100% maintained by the Maine Department of Transportation during the summer season. The total mileage of state aid roads is 13.61 miles. During the winter season the Town of Surry has the responsibility for plowing and sanding these roads. Any extra maintenance during the period (potholes, bumps, etc) is the responsibility of the MDOT. The Town does receive some reimbursement for the plowing and sanding through the Road Block Grant Fund.

- Toddy Pond Road (Route 176) from intersection of Route 172 to the Orland Town Line - 7.45 miles.

- Morgan Bay Road (Route 176) from intersection of Route 1¹/_Z to the Blue Hill Town Line - 3.59 miles.

- North Bend Road (State Aid #5) from intersection of Route 172 to the Ellsworth Town Line - 2.57 miles.

Route 172 from the Ellsworth Town Line to the Blue Hill Town Line is a State highway and is 100% maintained by the MDOT, summer and winter.

b. Town Roads

The Town's roads are:

- Ridge Road: (Upper Murphy Road/Jellison Road) from the North Bend Road to the Jellison residence - .034 miles.

- Lower Murphy Road (Alline Road) from North Bend Road to the end of the Town Way - 0.15 miles.

- Patten Pond Road: from intersection of North Bend Road to a point 200 feet beyond the former Newall Haynes residence - 1.13 miles.

- Cunningham Ridge Road: from intersection of Toddy Pond road (Route 176) to the

former Charles Saunders residence - 0.60 miles.

- Newbury Neck Road: from intersection of Route 176 (Morgan Bay Road) to the main gate of the Huber residence - 8.96 miles.

- Morgan Bay Cross Road: from the Newbury Neck Road to Route 176 Morgan Bay Road - 1.07 miles.

- Lorado Carter Road: from Route 176 (Toddy Pond Road) to a point just beyond the so called Gold Stream culvert - 0.25 miles.

- Village Cemetery Road: from Route 172 to the end of Town Way 0.37 miles.

- Town Wharf Road: from Route 172 to the Town Wharf - 0.15 miles.

The total mileage for all Town roads is 13.02 miles.

All Town roads are 100% maintained by the Town, summer and winter. The State of Maine does make available for each Town, funds for some of the maintenance of its roads under the "Road Block Grant" program. At the present time the Town of Surry receives a little over \$20,000.00 per year under this program. All other funds for the maintenance of roads must be raised by taxation or appropriated from some other municipal account.

Highway Improvements Which Will Not Be Regular Maintenance Work

1. Morgan Bay Cross Road needs to be rebuilt to a higher standard i.e., a 24 inch gravel base, 20 foot wide pavement (minimum), 3 foot wide shoulders along with an engineered drainage system.
2. Morgan Bay Bridge needs to be replaced. Needed is a larger diameter aluminum culvert, which should also be longer to give a better road width. A 20 foot wide travel way with 4 foot wide
3. Shoulders to the face of a new beam type guard rail will be required. 3. A safety project which needs attention is the sharp hill located near the "Old Delafield Farm," on the lower Newbury Neck road. This area needs to be cut down and fill placed on either side, mostly on the northern side of the hill.
4. Carrying Place on Newbury Neck needs major construction with a Sea Wall, of some design, placed to help protect this area in time of high winds and seas.
5. Patten Pond Road needs rebuilding in several areas.
6. Safety Project: More street lighting is needed in the rural areas of Town. All year-round intersections, which serve four or more homes, intersecting with a Town road, should

have street lighting.

3. Summary

Through the year 2000 construction of any new or additional Town roads is not planned. All existing Town roads are in year-round useable condition or better. The task shall be to maintain and improve them. Therefore, road rebuilding and improvement projects shall remain high in the Town list of proposed Capital Needs.

A traffic flow and speeding problem exists near the intersection of Route 172 and North Bend Road, particularly during the summer months. Also, parking congestion has become a problem at Surry Gardens, Newbury Neck Beach and the Surry Opera Company site.

Public bus service operates from Ellsworth City through Surry to area Towns. Passengers are mostly elderly who seem to enjoy the ride. The bus stop in Surry Village was terminated allegedly due to lack of passengers. The Surry folks seem to have friends or neighbors with whom they ride or use the local taxi service set up for this purpose. However, There may likely be future needs on short notice for Surry citizens using public transportation.

4. Key Issues

1. Excess speed and traffic congestion are problems that now exist near and around the village center.
2. There is inadequate parking in the following locations: Surry Gardens Nursery in the Village; the Newbury Neck Beach; and the Morgan Bay Road corner adjoining the Surry Opera Company Theatre.
3. The Town should support public transportation initiatives in order to assure that alternate means are available under critical conditions such as fuel shortages.

G. CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. Historic Resources

There are many sites in Surry which have their place in history as previously discussed, and which contribute to the history of the Town. Most of the structures such as churches and schools have "faded away" but some sites such as cemeteries remain. While these resources are not of national or state-wide significance, they are important to Surry's heritage.

The Surry Town Hall, built in 1828, remains intact under the care of the Surry Historical Society, having been moved to its present site in 1847 as the result of annexation of a portion of Surry to Ellsworth about that time. While the building and site belong to the Town, this structure is not eligible for listing in the "National Register of Historic Places" since it has been moved from its original site.

Listed are local sites of public interest, some of which are described in local historic publications:

Site of the proposed railroad through Surry, as depicted in the S.F. Colby Atlas dated 1881. It was to cross Toddy Pond 'narrows" into Orland, but was never constructed.

An early settler's cemetery off North Bend Road; also six old cemeteries located nearby original settlements and now maintained by the Town.

Site of the original Methodist Church in Surry Village; and the nearby Baptist Church now used and maintained as the Methodist Church.

The Surry "Theatre", a large barn and home complex near the Surry Village, where summer performances were popular in the early 90s. The structures remain intact and the site is used as a private residence.

Sites of Steamboat Wharves in Contention Cove and also nearby "High Head" on Newbury Neck. These provided for a popular method of travel by summer visitors before arrival of the automobile.

The original Town Landing, a wharf area on Patten Bay near the Village center, used formerly for shipping logs and lumber, and now maintained as a boat launch area. The site is now owned by the Town.

2. Archaeological Sites

The Maine Historical Preservation Commission has recorded five archaeological sites in Surry, indicating they are coastal shell middens or scatters of stone tools. Their locations appear to be along the shore in the Newbury Neck area, each site being on privately-owned land. Area residents are aware of certain sites, and conclude that some have been subject to

high tides and seas, also, that others may have become submerged. There appear to be no local records of these sites, although local citizens recall visits from one or more archaeologists a number of years ago.

It is essential that these sites as recorded and any like sites discovered be protected as a natural resource of the Town.

3 Recreation

a. Public and Private Recreation Facilities

The Town has rights of public access to a sand beach of about 600 feet on Union River Bay, known as "Carrying Place Beach" located on a southwesterly cove on Newbury Neck. The beach has become increasingly popular during the summer months. Since the parking area is limited, at times there is a traffic problem. 71% of those responding to the Public Opinion Survey favored the Town making improvements to Carrying Place Beach. Town officials are continuing efforts to obtain additional parking facilities nearby.

b. Public Landing

This is a former harbor wharf area, of about 1 1/2 acres near the Town village. There is now a concrete launch ramp, limited to smaller boats due to a nearby bar crossing the former harbor entrance. The grounds include picnic and parking areas and a gravel access road.

c. Patten Pond Public Boat Launch Site

This wooded site of 8 acres was purchased by the Town with State assistance in about 1980 and is located near the Lower Patten Pond dam and Patten Stream inlet. A gravel access road leads to the shore with parking nearby. The facility has a high activity level during summer months, and provides the only public access to that pond.

d. Toddy Pond Public Boat Launch Site

This is a State-maintained site in the adjoining Town of Orland, about 6 miles from the Surry shore area. The site has a large parking area sufficient for present use, but likely inadequate over the next 10 years. Surry officials have identified a tax-acquired lot of about 1/2 acre, on the Pond as a potential launch site, pending title review and suitability of the lot. Eighty percent of those polled in the recent Public Opinion Survey felt that the Town should provide and maintain rights of way for public access to the shore.

e. Other Recreational Opportunities

The "Gatherings", a family-operated Campground, is located along the Patten Bay shore in East Surry. This 16 acre woodland can accommodate 110 campsites. Its facilities include a large recreation building with snack bar. The owners report maximum capacity

accommodation during the months of May thru October.

The Surry Elementary School grounds of about 8 acres include a ballfield suitable for Little League activities. The School Committee has established a reserve fund for improvements to a second ballfield over the next two or three years.

Townspople, through public opinion polls, have identified the need for an athletic field in Town. The Selectmen have identified a tax-acquired lot of about 26 acres near the school, which may be suitable for such purposes if title, access, drainage and other factors are determined to be favorable.

4. Scenic Resources

There are many scenic spots in Surry that leave a warm Impression in the hearts of visitors and residents alike. Visual resources are an important part of Surry's character and need to be preserved along with other important local resources. The most notable road-accessible, scenic spots are as follows:

1. View from Route 172 where Patten Stream enters Patten Bay.
2. View from Route 172 of Patten Bay at Contention Cove near the Surry Inn.
3. View of the Village just past the fork on the Neck Road.
4. View of MDI from the Morgan Bay Road on the big curve.
5. View of the salt marsh and the head of Morgan Bay at the crossroads.
6. The Carrying Place and other spots on Newbury Neck.
7. The open fields on 176 near the Orland Town Line.

Eighty-one percent of those responding to the Public Opinion Survey felt that it was important to protect scenic and natural areas in Town, and 86% of the Town's people surveyed felt the Town should take action to preserve Surry's rural image.

Preservation of these and other scenic resources will be important in maintaining the rural character of Surry.

5. Key Issues

- a. The Town should ensure the continued upkeep and protection of those natural resources under its jurisdiction, and encourage property owners to assist in their protection.

- b. The Town should develop a detailed inventory of historic sites/buildings and map their location.
- c. An assessment of archaeological sites is needed.
- d. An assessment of recreational resources of the Town (and area) is needed in order that funds may be appropriated properly.

APPENDIX II

**SURRY UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT
ORDINANCE**

SUMMARY OF KEY PROVISIONS

SECTION V. LAND USE DISTRICTS AND REQUIREMENTS

V. LAND USE DISTRICTS & REQUIREMENTS

1. VILLAGE DISTRICT

Purpose:

The purpose of the Village District is to:

- (1) provide an area for additional growth within the Town of Surry; while maintaining the traditional character of the existing village;
- (2) encourage a variety of single and two family housing and light commercial uses that are compatible with the scale and intensity of uses found in this area;
- (3) promote pedestrian travel and street life by encouraging houses, shops, workplaces and public places in close proximity;
- (4) support ways which equitably and efficiently serve pedestrians, cyclists and drivers;
- (5) minimize visual and functional conflicts between residential and non-residential uses within and abutting the District;
- (6) promote a pattern of development which permits an efficient delivery of municipal services.

Permitted Uses with a Permit from the Code Enforcement Officer:

- (1) Residential: single family, detached dwelling units, two family dwellings, accessory residential uses, including home occupations, and accessory structures consistent with permitted uses.

Permitted Uses Subject to Site Plan Review:

- (1) commercial: retail uses of 3000 square feet or less, professional offices and personal services shops of less than 2000 square feet, mixed use structures or developments containing dwelling units and other permitted commercial uses no more than 1000 sq.ft., craft shops, flower and vegetable stands growing or making articles for sale at retail on the premises, bed and breakfast inns having three or less rooms for rent.
- (2) Civic: schools, libraries, churches, Town offices and services and related uses.
- (3) bed and breakfast inns; having more than three rooms for rent;
- (4) nursery schools and day care centers
- (5) restaurants

Prohibited Uses:

- (1) including no multi-family, industrial uses, wholesale, manufacturing
- (2) uses which attract high volumes of vehicular traffic (any access with more than 200 vehicle trips per day but less than peak hour volume of 50 vehicle trips or greater)
- (3) commercial animal breeding or care unless carried out within the home as a home occupation
- (4) shopping centers
- (5) convenience stores with or without gasoline service pumps are exempt from (2) above and are permitted subject to Site Plan Review

Dimensional Requirements per Principal Structure or Dwelling Unit:

SECTION V. LAND USE DISTRICTS AND REQUIREMENTS

- (1) minimum lot size: 1 acre
- (2) minimum road frontage: 100 feet
- (3) minimum yard setback requirements: front (portion of the lot which abuts a public road) - 60', side - 15', rear - 25'
- (4) maximum building height: 35 feet
- (5) maximum lot non-vegetated coverage: 20%
- (6) lots and uses proposed in the shoreland zone area shall comply with the shoreland areas dimensional requirements

Other:

- (1) Provided soil conditions are suitable for the proposed use as determined by a qualified soils scientist, an additional 20% lot coverage bonus and lot size reduction may be granted by the Planning Board when provision is made for public access to open space or other special features of the site, when landscape plantings (shade trees and other plant materials in accordance with section V.4.16) are provided along street frontage occupied by the proposed use in the Village District., and when building designs are in keeping with the predominant architectural features of a traditional village.
- (2) Cluster developments are encouraged on the best soil types for any given lot within this District, in accordance with the provisions of Section V.4.2.

2. ROADSIDE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

Purpose:

The purpose of the Roadside Commercial District is to provide an area within the Community which is conveniently located with respect to transportation and municipal services, and where other conditions are favorable to the development of business; and at the same time, carefully planned to avoid traffic congestion and other problems from over development along roadways and to prevent undesirable conflicts with residential uses. The purpose of this District is also to provide space for more intensive commercial uses that are not compatible in the Village area and that require large areas of land, high levels of traffic and/or access to major road ways.

SECTION V. LAND USE DISTRICTS AND REQUIREMENTS

Permitted Uses & Uses Subject to Site Plan Review Procedures:

(Because of the potential impact on the Community of the type of uses for which this District has been established, the Planning Board shall review all uses proposed in this District under its Site Plan Review procedures.)

auto repair, sales	amusement facility, commercial recreation	boarding, lodging
boat building, repair	building materials, retail sales	commercial school
firewood processing	gasoline service station	hotel/motel
indoor theater	kennel, stable, veterinary hospital	neighborhood convenience store off-street
	parking and loading facilities	
offices: business, professional, medical	publishing, printing	restaurant
retail business	service	business
shopping center	wholesale business	recycling operations
sawmill	transportation, communication facilities	warehousing and storage
church, synagogue, parish house civic,	community centers, clubs	day care
convention centers		
government office, group homes, hospice,	medical care	museum, library
nursing homes hospital,		
public, private school	public utility facility	animal breeding or care
campground	cemetery	farm stands
forestry		
golf course		
accessory structures		

Prohibited Uses:

- (1) Heavy industry, processing, manufacturing, compounding, treatment, assembly, or other industrial uses; over 60,000 sq. ft. in floor area
- (2) junkyards, salvage operations, automobile graveyards;
- (3) storage of explosives, hazardous wastes and/or poisonous gases or known toxic materials, in amounts beyond immediate needs; (immediate needs - small quantities of substances used in day to day operations);
- (4) bulk oil and fuel storage tanks, except those allowed as part of the operation of a permitted use;
- (5) animal and fish processing, packaging/storage operations.
- (6) trucking distribution terminal
- (7) Residential: single family, detached dwelling units at a density of more than one dwelling unit per five acres

Dimensional Requirements per Principal Structure or Dwelling Unit:

- Minimum Lot size: 1 acre
- Minimum Road Frontage: 200 feet
- Minimum Setbacks: front yard - 60', side yard - 10', rear yard - 10'
- Maximum Building Height: 35 feet
- Maximum Lot coverage: 50%

Other:

- (1) The Town recognizes that regulating the maximum number of curb cuts relative to the length of available highway frontage limits the number of conflict areas and provides turning drivers more time and distance to execute their maneuvers. The result is not only a reduction in the frequency of conflicts, but also the severity of conflicts is decreased because deceleration requirements are lessened. Therefore the number of new curb cuts per mile of highway in this

district is generally limited to one per lot of record at the time of enactment of this ordinance. Additional curb cuts may be allowed, but no more than one additional per mile, and only upon Planning Board review under the provisions of Section V.1.2.

- (2) Parking areas shall be designed and landscaped, in accordance with Section V.5.16., and so as to fit harmoniously within the landscape. In meeting this requirement applicants are encouraged to build small areas devoted to parking, which are located to the side or rear of proposed structures in relation to abutting roads and are separated by appropriate landscaping to avoid building large parking areas along the highway.
- (3) Signs. See Section V.5.5.

3. RESIDENTIAL GROWTH DISTRICT

Purpose:

The purpose of the Residential District is to provide an area within the Town of Surry for moderate density residential uses.

Permitted Uses with CEO or Planning Board Permit:

- (1) single family dwellings and modular homes;
- (2) two family dwellings;
- (3) manufactured housing.
- (4) home occupations
- (5) accessory structures consistent with permitted uses

Permitted Uses Subject to Site Plan Review:

- (1) day care centers
- (2) neighborhood convenience stores
- (3) mobile home park subdivisions

Prohibited Uses:

- (1) commercial & industrial uses

Dimensional Requirements per Principal Structure or Dwelling Unit:

- (1) Minimum lot size: one acre
- (2) Minimum road frontage 150'
- (3) Minimum setbacks: front yard - 60', side yard - 15', rear yard - 15'
- (4) Maximum building height: 35 feet
- (5) Maximum coverage by structure: 25%

Other:

SECTION V. LAND USE DISTRICTS AND REQUIREMENTS

- (1) If a project in this District is a cluster subdivision the minimum lot size and minimum lot area per dwelling unit may be reduced by twenty-five percent (25%) if public access is provided to areas designated by the Town as having open space or natural resource value.
- (2) cluster development is encouraged on the best soil types within this District, in accordance with Section V.4.2.

4. RURAL DISTRICT

Purpose:

The purpose of the Rural District is to allow limited residential development along existing Town roads while protecting natural resources and the character of the rural areas. A contiguous, net development acreage area of 40,000 sq.ft. minimum will be required. Road frontage of 150 feet or greater will be required for each developable parcel. Maintenance of a forested buffer zone at least one half the distance of the applicable setback will be required between any dwellings and the roadway.

Permitted Uses with a CEO or Planning Board Permit:

- (1) single family and two family dwelling units
- (2) home occupations
- (3) public buildings
- (4) single family seasonal dwellings
- (5) minor and major subdivisions
- (6) manufactured housing
- (7) accessory structures consistent with the uses permitted

Uses Subject to Site Plan Review:

- (1) multi-family dwellings
- (2) private recreational facilities
- (3) cemeteries
- (4) campgrounds
- (5) mineral extraction, to include gravel pits, quarries, and sand pits
- (6) offices
- (7) motels
- (8) public outdoor recreational facilities
- (9) convenience stores
- (10) nursery & greenhouses
- (11) sale of gasoline in conjunction with retail sales of groceries
- (12) automobile graveyards
- (13) any use of the same general character as above (permitted uses and uses subject to site plan review), consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

Prohibited Uses:

As reprinted 6/8/99

SECTION V. LAND USE DISTRICTS AND REQUIREMENTS

Uses which are not allowed as permitted uses or uses permitted under site plan review are prohibited.

Dimensional Requirements per Principal Structure or Dwelling Unit:

- (1) Minimum lot size: 40,000 sq feet of net development areas as determined in Section V.1.4.
- (2) Minimum road frontage: 150 feet
- (3) Minimum setbacks:
 - a. Front yard - 60 feet
 - b. Side yards - 10 feet
 - c. Rear yard - 10 feet
- (4) Maximum building height: 35 feet
- (5) Maximum lot coverage: 20%

5. FORESTRY & AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT

Purpose:

The purpose of the Forestry and Agricultural District is to designate an area in Town where sound forestry and agricultural management practices will be encouraged and where fragmentation of large tracts of land in agricultural or forestry resource production will be discouraged. Prime forest and agricultural soils, areas currently inaccessible or not in current use, and areas currently being used for commercial forest and agricultural production are the principal criteria used in determining the boundaries for this District. Major subdivisions are prohibited in this District and a contiguous, net development area of 40,000 sq.ft. will be required for permitted uses which include principal structures.

Permitted Uses with a CEO or Planning Board Permit:

- (1) single family and two family dwelling units
- (2) single family seasonal dwellings
- (3) minor subdivisions
- (4) accessory structures consistent with the uses permitted

Uses Subject to Site Plan Review:

- (1) buildings and roadway construction related to commercial agricultural and forestry operations and minor subdivisions
- (2) private recreational facilities
- (3) cemeteries
- (4) campgrounds
- (5) mineral extraction, to include gravel pits, quarries, and sand pits
- (6) public outdoor recreational facilities
- (7) convenience stores
- (8) nursery & greenhouses

SECTION V. LAND USE DISTRICTS AND REQUIREMENTS

- (9) sale of gasoline in conjunction with retail sales of groceries
- (10) automobile graveyards
- (11) any use of the same general character as above (permitted uses and uses subject to site plan review), consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

Prohibited Uses:

Uses which are not allowed as permitted uses or uses permitted under site plan review are prohibited.

Dimensional Requirements per Principal Structure or Dwelling Unit:

- (1) Minimum lot size: 40,000 sq feet of net development areas as defined in Section V.1.4.
- (2) Minimum road frontage: 150 feet
- (3) Minimum setbacks:
 - a. Front yard - 60 feet
 - b. Side yards - 10 feet
 - c. Rear yard - 10 feet
- (4) Maximum building height: 35 feet
- (5) Maximum lot coverage: 20%

- Other:
- (1) Cluster developments on soil types other than prime agricultural soils are encouraged in accordance with Section V.4.2.
 - (2) For parcels that contain only prime agricultural soils, cluster developments on these soils are mandatory with a 50% density bonus to be granted on each lot or dwelling unit by the Planning Board.

6. RESOURCE PROTECTION DISTRICT

Purpose:

- (1) To further the maintenance of safe and healthful conditions and the general welfare; prevent and control water pollution; protect spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird and other wildlife habitat; control building sites, placement of structures and land uses; and conserve shore cover, visual as well as actual points of access to inland waters, and natural beauty.
- (2) To protect the most vulnerable shoreland areas of all water bodies and other areas in which land uses would adversely affect water quality, productive habitat, biological systems, or scenic and natural values, and to discourage development in unsafe or unhealthful areas.

Such areas include, but are not limited to:

- a. Wetlands, swamps, marshes and bogs;
- b. Significant natural areas; and
- c. Areas of significant wildlife habitat.
- d. Other significant areas as identified for protection in the comprehensive plan

SECTION V. LAND USE DISTRICTS AND REQUIREMENTS

Permitted Uses:

See the Land Use Table

Prohibited Uses:

See the Land Use Table

7. STREAM PROTECTION DISTRICT

Purpose:

- (1) To provide a minimal protective buffer area in order to control water quality of the streams and/or their receiving waterbodies or wetlands, and to enhance the recreational and economic value of these areas.

Permitted Uses:

See the Land Use Table

Prohibited Uses:

See the Land Use Table

SECTION V. LAND USE DISTRICTS AND REQUIREMENTS

Table of Land Uses

All land uses activities, as indicated in Table 1, Land Uses in the Town of Surry, shall conform with all of the *applicable* land use standards in this Ordinance and any other applicable state or federal laws and regulations. The district designation for a particular site shall be determined from the Official Zoning Map.

Key to Table 1:

- Yes - Allowed (no permit required but the use must comply with all applicable land use standards).
- No - Prohibited
- PB - Requires permit issued by the Planning Board
- CEO - Requires permit issued by the Code Enforcement Officer
- LPI - Requires permit issued by the Local Plumbing Inspector
- VL - 1. Village
- RC - 2. Roadside Commercial
- GR - 3. Residential Growth
- RU - 4. Rural
- F&A - 5. Forestry and Agricultural
- RP - 6. Resource Protection
- SP - 7. Stream Protection

SECTION V. LAND USE DISTRICTS AND REQUIREMENTS

TABLE 1. LAND USES IN THE TOWN OF SURRY							
LAND USES	DISTRICTS						
	1 VL	2 RC	3 RG	4 RU	5 F&A	6 RP	7 SP
1. Non-intensive recreational uses not requiring structures such as hunting, fishing and hiking	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
2. Motorized vehicular traffic on existing roads/trails	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
3. Forest management activities except timber harvesting	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
4. Timber harvesting	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	CEO ¹	yes
5. clearing of vegetation for approved construction and other allowed uses	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	CEO ¹	CEO
6. Fire prevention activities	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
7. Wildlife management practices	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
8. Soil and water conservation practices	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
9. Mineral exploration	yes ²	yes	yes	yes ²	yes	yes ²	no
10. Mineral extraction including sand/gravel extraction	PB	PB	PB	PB	PB	no	no
11. Surveying and resource analysis	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
12. Emergency operations	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
13. Agriculture	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	PB	yes
14. Aquaculture	yes	yes	n/a	PB	n/a	PB	PB
15. Principal structures and uses A. One and two family residential B. Multi-unit residential C. Commercial D. Industrial E. Governmental and Institutional F. Small non-residential facilities for educational, scientific, or nature interpretation purposes	CEO no PB ⁶ no PB ⁶ CEO	CEO PB ⁵ PB ⁵ PB ⁵ PB CEO ⁵	CEO no no ⁷ no no PB	CEO ¹¹ PB PB ⁹ no no CEO	CEO PB PB ⁶ no CEO ⁶ CEO	no no no no no PB	PB ³ no no no no no PB ³
16. Structures accessory to allowed uses	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO	PB	PB ³
17. Piers, docks, wharfs, bridges and other structures and uses extending over or below the normal high-water line or within a wetland A. Temporary B. Permanent * may need an Army Corps of Engineers permit	CEO PB	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	CEO PB	n/a n/a	CEO PB	CEO PB
18. Conversions of seasonal residences to year-round residences	LPI	LPI	LPI	LPI	LPI	no	LPI
19. Home Occupations	PB ¹¹	CEO	CEO	PB ¹¹	CEO	no	PB
20. Private sewage disposal systems for allowed uses	LPI	LPI	LPI	LPI	LPI	no	LPI

SECTION V. LAND USE DISTRICTS AND REQUIREMENTS

21.	Essential services	PB	PB	PB	PB	PB	PB	PB
22.	Service drops, as defined, to allowed uses	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
23.	Public and private recreational areas involving minimal structural development	CEO	CEO	no	PB ¹¹	CEO	PB	PB
24.	Individual, private campsites	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO
25.	Campgrounds	no	PB	no	PB	PB	no	no
26.	Road and driveway construction	CEO	CEO	CEO	yes ¹²	CEO	no ⁴	PB
27.	Parking facilities	PB	PB	PB	PB ¹¹	PB	no	no
28.	Marinas	PB	n/a	n/a	PB	n/a	no	PB
29.	Filling and earthmoving of <10 cubic yards	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	CEO	CEO

	Land Uses	1 VL	2 RC	3 RG	4 RU	5 F&A	6 RP	7 SP
30.	Filling and earthmoving of >10 cubic yards	CEO	CEO	CEO	yes ¹²	CEO	PB	PB
31.	Signs	yes ¹⁰	yes ¹⁰	yes ¹⁰	yes	yes ¹⁰	no	no
32.	Land subdivisions - minor	PB	PB ⁸	PB	PB	PB	PB	PB
33.	Land subdivisions - major	PB	PB ⁸	PB	PB	no	PB	PB
34.	Structural subdivisions	PB	PB	PB	PB	no	no	no
35.	Mobile Home Park subdivisions	no	PB	PB	no	no	no	no
36.	Mobile Home Parks	no	PB	PB	no	no	no	no
37.	Uses similar to allowed uses	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO
38.	Uses similar to uses requiring a CEO permit	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO	CEO
39.	Uses similar to uses requiring a PB permit	PB	PB	PB	PB	PB	PB	PB

¹ In RP not permitted within 75 feet of the normal high-water line of upper and lower Patten Ponds except to remove safety hazards.

² Requires permit from the Code Enforcement Officer if more than 100 square feet of surface area, in total, is disturbed (shoreland areas only)

³ Provided that a variance from the setback requirement is obtained from the Board of Appeals

⁴ Except to provide access to permitted uses within the district, or where no reasonable alternative route or location is available outside the RP area, in which case a permit is required from the PB

⁵ All permitted activities shall be subject to site plan review. See specific permitted and prohibited commercial and industrial uses in Section V for this district

⁶ See specific permitted and prohibited commercial, governmental and institutional uses in Section V for this district

⁷ Day care centers and neighborhood convenience stores are permitted subject to site plan review

⁸ Land subdivisions, other than mobile home park subdivisions, are permissible only for commercial and

SECTION V. LAND USE DISTRICTS AND REQUIREMENTS

industrial land uses as indicated in Section V for this district

⁹ See specific uses contained in the Rural District in Section V. Commercial Land Uses within the Shoreland Zone are prohibited

¹⁰ Permit required from the Code Enforcement Officer if the proposed sign is associated with an existing commercial use

¹¹ Planning Board permit required if the use is in the shoreland zone. A CEO permit is required otherwise

¹² CEO permit required if the use is in the shoreland zone

NOTE: A person performing any of the following activities in the shoreland zone shall require a permit from the Department of Environmental Protection, pursuant to Title 38 M.R.S.A., Section 480-C, if the activity occurs in, on, over or adjacent to any freshwater or coastal wetland, great pond, river, stream or brook and operates in such a manner that material or soil may be washed into them:

- A. Dredging, bulldozing, removing or displacing soil, sand, vegetation or other materials;
- B. Draining or otherwise dewatering;
- C. Filling, including adding sand or other material to a sand dune; or
- D. Any construction or alteration of any permanent structure.

If a proposed use is within shoreland areas, the blue pages apply;

If a proposed use is within a floodplain, the pink pages apply;

If a proposed use requires site plan review as indicated for each district, the beige pages apply;

If a proposed use is a subdivision, the green pages apply;

* The district requirements required for each zone always apply to any given project.