



Long Range Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC+)

Thursday, April 25, 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 at 7:03 PM.

1. Review Revised Vision

The committee reviewed the vision which had been revised by Julie. Sandra felt that the statement did not end on a high note. Bud suggested adding back in as the last sentence: "We call it 'home.'" The committee discussed the vision and agreed to add the suggested sentence. The ending may be further revised at a later date. Theo will reinsert the revised vision in the plan. The committee expressed its appreciation to Julie for working on this.

2. Minutes

Upon a motion by Sandra and second by Steve H., the draft minutes of March 28 and April 11 were approved as written.

3. Review Potential Sewer Expansion Map

Theo explained how the sewer expansion map had evolved and stated he was seeking feedback on the latest version. The committee agreed that the latest draft best represented the message that the committee wanted to convey. It was acknowledged that any parcel could be on sewer (depending on how much one wanted to invest), but that gravity sewers were the most cost-effective and efficient way to do that. The map showed that there was potential in the growth zone to do that. Showing a similar potential in the rural area was a message that the committee did not want to send and, therefore, the map did not show

those areas. Sam noted that the earlier version of the map had caused some concern with the Town's sewer consultant as it implied a lot of future growth, especially in the rural area, that may not be realistic. Theo added that the Sewer District superintendent had concerns as well as the map implied a lot of future growth, which would require significant expansion of sewer facilities (more than what the Town was planning on). The earlier map showed more of a build-out scenario, something that may never happen or at least would take a long time. It may be sending the wrong message.

Paul felt that the revised map showed that the committee preferred to limit sewer expansions to the growth area. There was a discussion whether not showing sewer potential in the rural area was avoiding a conflict or reality. Kurt felt that if such potential was shown, it would stick in people's minds, which is not the message that committee wanted to send. The committee concurred that it was OK to show only the areas that have potential for most efficient sewerage, as the committee wanted to be conservative in using Town services. The preferred way to do that was through gravity sewers limited to the growth area. This would not preclude sewerage any parcel in the rural area.

Sandra did not like showing the growth boundary as a dashed line. Theo explained how that line had evolved. The preference had been to show a zone, rather than a boundary line. The location of the boundary was relatively fluid, cuts through properties, and is expected to be fine-tuned in the zoning mapping phase. Page 24 of Volume I showed these areas as zones. Theo discussed this with the mapping consultant and such shading causes problems as the colors overlap with other indicators. The committee considered alternative ways to indicate the edge of the growth area, but ultimately agreed to keep the dashed line as is. The dashed line will be made consistent between maps.

4. Review Revised Maps

In reviewing some of the other maps, Steve W. wondered why the growth boundary was repeated on various maps and what the message was that the committee was trying to convey. The committee discussed the rationale for that. There was a suggestion to not show developable land in the rural area, but that was rejected because the committee did not want to send the message that there would not be any growth in the rural area.

The committee discussed the colors used, the specifics of certain parcels, and revisions to the title of the 1990-2011 growth map. The committee also discussed the growth area should be called the "proposed" growth area as it does not exist yet. The argument against the word "proposed" was that the plan is expected to last 10 years and upon Council adoption, the growth area would no longer be proposed. Paul wondered what the point was that the committee wanted to make with the 1990-2011 growth map. Kurt replied that growth had occurred throughout town between 1990 and 2011. With a growth boundary in place these development patterns would have been different, and upon adoption, will be different. The map showed that there was land available for that. In essence, the map showed growth patterns. The discussion went back to the question if the growth area should be called "proposed" or "preferred," or left as is. Becca preferred to be keeping it concise and not add any adjectives. In conclusion, the committee agreed to add "designated" to the mention of growth and rural areas on all maps and in the text, as that seemed to correspond to language the former State Planning office has been using.

5. Ad Hoc Zoning Committee Appointment

Theo mentioned that the recent Ad Hoc Zoning Committee proposal was implementing one of the committee's action items. Rachel agreed to be the committee's representative on the Ad Hoc Zoning Committee. The committee gratefully accepted Rachel's offer.

6. Comprehensive Plan Package

Theo walked the committee through the two-volume package and requested input on the introduction as that was new text. He also requested review of any other section to make sure the text was clear and did not have errors. He suggested that the final document could have additional illustrations as well as illustrative quotes from the survey comments, where those made sense. It might help make the plan more readable.

7. Next Steps

The committee will conduct three feedback sessions in May. All sessions are from 4 PM to 6 PM. Additional sign-ups for those sessions by committee members were noted. Theo will incorporate the revisions from tonight and then send the packages out to the reviewers. He also mentioned that the reviewer at the State of Maine was willing to give an informal review of the draft plan and offer comments before the plan is finalized.

The next regular meeting is May 9th. The committee will discuss any follow-up from the May 8 feedback session and discuss public outreach.

8. Other Business

There was no other business.

9. Next meetings

The committee agreed to meet again on May 8, 2013 at 4:00 PM for feedback session 1 and May 9, 2013 at 7:00 PM for its regular meeting.

The meeting was adjourned around 9:10 PM.

Draft minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, April 26, 2013