

**Special Council Meeting**  
**DRAFT Minutes**  
**Monday, September 16, 2013**

**Present:** Councilors Pierce, Anderson, King, Orestis, Farber, Goldberg  
**Staff:** Nathan Poore, Theo Holtwijk  
**Other:** Will Graff, Sam Rudman, Paul Bergkamp, Julie Motherwell, Jim Thibodeau, Bud French

**1. Review proposed agenda and meeting goals**

Councilor Pierce opened the meeting at 5:05 PM and reviewed the agenda and meeting goals. There were no questions or changes to the agenda.

**2. Questions/Clarifications/Identification of any issues of concern/red flags in draft plan**

Councilor Pierce asked if there were any questions or issues regarding the proposed draft plan.

Councilor Farber stated that proposing to cap development in the rural area was assertively laid out in the plan, as opposed to incenting it. She was not sure how she felt about that. She recognized that it was key to the plan and represented a significant step for the Council to consider taking.

Councilor Pierce asked for an explanation of the Potentially Developable Land map on page 28.

Councilor Orestis wondered how much development the Town could absorb.

Sam Rudman referred Councilors to the future land use map on page 23.

Councilor Anderson commented on the recommendation to allocate a minimum of 75% of capital investments in the growth area. He felt that measuring a development cap or capital investment on an annual basis would go too far and was too specific. He wondered where the 75% came from.

Mr. Holtwijk explained that the 75% was recommended as a minimum by the State of Maine.

Councilor Anderson wondered what kind of building LPAC envisioned in the growth area.

Councilor Farber said that she thought the effort of trying to steer more development to the growth area would come hand in hand with the rezoning of certain areas that either the growth or rural area. She referred to the Areas for Potential Zoning Review map on page 40.

Councilor Pierce cited an example of compatible infill development on the Foreside.

Mr. Rudman stated that densities would not be dramatically different from existing densities such as The Flats neighborhood.

Councilor Goldberg felt that any action should be measurable.

The Councilors recognized that developments often takes several years to come to fruition and that linking it to an annual cap could be an issue. Councilors also felt that development limits in the rural area

should not be tied to the amount of development in the growth area. The suggestion was made that the rural limit could be an absolute number.

Nathan Poore polled the Council to see if there was agreement on the concept of steering growth more to the growth area and away from the rural area.

Councilor Farber cited the statement at the top of page 25: “The plan recommends increasing the share of growth in the designated growth area from less than 50% to two thirds of all new residential growth.

All councilors were in agreement with this concept.

Councilor Pierce suggested moving this statement up front and making it more prominent.

Councilor Goldberg wondered what the percentage was and how the status of this would be measured.

Councilor Farber suggested that the rural cap is only one tool and that there are other tools as well. The Councilors also wondered how much could be relied upon historical data.

There appeared to be consensus to focus on incenting growth in the growth area. A recommendation could be to amend the land use ordinance to move closer to the two thirds growth in the growth area ratio.

Councilors recognized that there were many details to consider and that they should debate ordinance language.

Mr. Poore concluded that the Councilors did feel it was important to take pro-active action. He suggested a rural growth cap range of 15-20. Councilors were not sure about that.

The Council took a short break.

Mr. Poore responded to Councilor Orestis’ question regarding capacity for growth. He said there was no easy answer to that and much of it depended on one’s tolerance. The capital assets that are often subject to capacity questions are schools and wastewater systems.

Mr. Poore further clarified how the 75% capital investment recommendation should be interpreted. This amount is in line with what the Town has been spending in the growth area. Councilor Pierce felt it made sense to add to the text that the 75% was a continuance of a historical spending pattern.

Mr. Poore suggested rephrasing the capital investment recommendation to state a commitment to support the growth area from that perspective rather than stating a specific percentage.

Councilor Anderson felt that a percentage was too specific.

Councilor Farber requested a clarification of what was meant by growth-related capital investments. As the plan does not tackle school issues, she felt it was not appropriate to include school investment in this as the Council had no control over that.

Councilor Pierce felt a disconnect between this issue and the text of the Capital Investment Strategy chapter.

Councilors concurred that growth-related capital investments included sewers, sidewalks, and road widening projects.

Councilor Pierce felt it was important that the Council make a policy regarding such investments, so that issues such as ‘whether the Town builds or does not build a sidewalk on such and such a street’ do not get debated each time.

Mr. Holtwijk explained that the school campus property was included in the growth area, in response to a comment from the State that this would make sense as a lot of capital investment is made in schools.

Councilor Pierce suggested adding the word infrastructure to the capital investment recommendation, to make it more clear what types of investments were targeted.

Councilor Farber asked if the plan endorses building sidewalks everywhere in town.

Mr. Rudman stated no. Julie Motherwell clarified that the plan did not do so, but left it to the Council how a network could be realized.

Councilor Pierce pointed to the vision statement on page 7 which spoke to trails as a major component of such a network.

Councilor Goldberg felt the plan should not be seen as a fixed “plan,” but more as a “road map.”

### **3. Do “top 15” exercise of recommended actions**

Councilor Pierce asked if the group wanted to do a dot exercise to indicate individual top 15 recommended actions to see where there may be concurrence.

Councilors wondered if it made sense to do this before adoption of the plan.

The suggestion was that the exercise may help to shrink the list of 70 actions to a smaller more manageable number. For example, a number of recommendations are to “continue” certain activities. Those may not need special Council action.

### **4. Suggestions for plan implementation (upon adoption)**

The Councilors discussed implementation of the plan and felt that day to day oversight should not be handed to LPAC, but should stay with the Council. LPAC should instead be asked to assist with implementation based on specific assignments by the Council.

The Councilors agreed that implementation of any action should, where applicable, dovetail with its own annual work plan.

It was suggested that when the time came to set priorities for the plan it would be important to have some criteria by which to answer that question.

Mr. Poore suggested that criteria might include level of risk and importance of the recommendations.

### **5. Make draft plan revisions, as necessary**

Mr. Holtwijk will make some revisions to the plan text and asked who the reviewer of these changes would be.

The Councilors agreed to ask the Community Development Committee to review any changes on September 23.

**6. Set public hearing date**

Once the draft changes are made, a public hearing could be scheduled by the Council for Wednesday October 16.

The meeting was adjourned by 7:50 PM.

Minutes by Theo Holtwijk, September 20, 2103

DRAFT