



## Long Range Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC+)

**Thursday, March 28, 2013**  
**Minutes**

**Attendance:**

Name	Present	Name	Present	Name	Present
Rebecca Casey	-	Bud French	√	Hugh Coxe	√
Paul Bergkamp	√	Kurt Klebe	-	Jim Thibodeau	-
Steve Hendry	-	Sandra Lipsey	√	Julie Motherwell	√
Rachel Reed	-	Sam Rudman	√	Steve Walker	√
Claudia King	√				

**Council Liaison:** -  
**Staff present:** Theo Holtwijk  
**Others present:** -

The meeting was called to order by Sam Rudman at 7:00 PM.

### **1. Review of Draft Land Use Chapter**

The committee reviewed the comments submitted by Jim Thibodeau regarding the draft land use chapter policies and strategies. There was a discussion if the Town was flexible enough regarding its permit applicants. Some felt the Town was not flexible enough. Upon discussion the draft policies and strategies were by and large left unchanged. GPEDC will be added to policy #1.

There was a discussion concerning which groups in the past had worked on ordinance amendments. CPAC, LPAC's predecessor, had a big role in that. The CDC has prepared the Route 1 amendments. Staff takes on ongoing smaller amendments. Ordinance amendments may be a large part of the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan.

The committee then reviewed the proposed actions. Communitywide action #5 will be clarified that it focuses on procedural ordinance aspects, while #6 focuses more on policy issues. Action #11 (risk of sea level rise) was assigned to the Public Works Director.

For Growth Area recommendation #1a, Theo mentioned that Ethan had suggested adding a corresponding density increase, if that was the committee's intent. The committee agreed with that.

There was much discussion on Rural Area action #1 (increasing open space from 30 to 50%). There was a sense that this issue, which was revised in 2011, was not yet settled. The committee decided to add a density-neutral impact provision to that action and agreed that language in the chapter itself needed to be expanded to address this issue. Steve wondered what the rationale of 50% was, versus 30%, or any other number. There was a discussion how the difference in percentages could be expressed visually. Bud wondered if house size could be affected by protecting more open space. There was recognition by the committee that this had been a divisive issue in the community and that a consensus should be forged. Picking a number such as 50% would in all likelihood replay the debate of 2010-11, which the committee wanted to avoid.

Sandra felt that the committee throughout its work had been very consistent and strong in its intent to create growth and rural areas with different density intent. She did not want to lose that and felt that the land use chapter should reflect that intent. The committee agreed to step away from a specific percentage recommendation for open space and instead recommend that tools should be examined that would accomplish protection of the rural area.

This led to a discussion what the goals for the rural area were. Was it to prevent more development or to create more open space? Hugh stated that development as a land use was more efficiently handled in the growth area. Hugh felt that the goal was to protect the function and character of the rural area. The committee concluded that the current density and open space provisions in the ordinance should be examined to ensure that they preserved rural character. This could include a review of Gorham's density transfer fee system and other examples. Theo stated that Transfer of Development Rights mechanisms were often mentioned as well, but that these have proven hard to implement, especially in small areas.

Regarding Rural Area action #3, Paul felt that the plan should focus on incentivizing that 2/3rds of new growth would be in the Growth Area instead of capping 1/3rds of growth for the rural area. Hugh explained the rationale for growth caps. They are typically related to the pace of development and the ability of communities to handle that. They have been applied town-wide, but recent thinking is to focus more on placing a cap on rural areas as typically less infrastructure is required and more services are available in growth areas. So, if a community felt that the pace of development in its rural area was faster than desired, a growth cap may be an appropriate tool. He noted that the annual number of allowable units is typically calculated on a rolling, historical average of the last five or so years.

Sandra stated that she felt the committee had been very consistent, that the committee should not necessarily pull away from its recommendations, but also should avoid making people needlessly upset over specific language.

Theo will take stab at revising the chapter to include the committee's discussion.

## **2. Minutes**

The draft minutes of March 14, 2013 were approved with the revision in section 4 that "Some typos exist and will be corrected."

### **3. Schedule**

The committee reviewed the updated schedule. Theo had a meeting with the Town Manager to discuss how staff and Council feedback could best be obtained. The committee liked the revised schedule and picked some potential dates to meet with staff and/or Council: May 8, 16, 20, or 21. It was willing to meet as soon as 4:00 Pm if that helped to accommodate others. May 9 is planned for a discussion on outreach. Theo will work on getting some dates finalized.

### **4. Other Business**

Julie offered to take the comments that had been received on the draft vision from Becca, Claudia, and herself and make a comparison of them for committee review. The committee appreciated that and agreed to discuss the vision at the next meeting.

The committee also provided a preliminary order of the inventory chapters for the final package.

Theo handed out a letter from Greater Portland Landmarks requesting suggestions for its Places in Peril program and suggested that members contact Landmarks directly if they thought of something.

### **5. Next meeting**

The committee agreed to meet again on April 11, 2013 at 7:00 PM.

The meeting was adjourned around 9:30 PM.

Draft minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, March 29, 2013