



Long Range Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC)

Thursday, August 11, 2016
Minutes

Attendance:

| Name | Present | Name | Present | Name | Present |
|---------------|---------|---------------------------------|---------|-------------------------|---------|
| Paul Bergkamp | √ | Kurt Klebe | - | Breana Gersen | - |
| Sam Rudman | √ | Sandra Lipsey | √ | | |
| Tom McKeon | √ | Ned Kitchel, Council Liaison | √ | Theo Holtwijk, Staff | √ |

Sam started the meeting at 6:00 PM.

1. Review of Draft Minutes

The draft minutes of the July 14 meeting were approved as written. The notes from the Forum do not require LPAC approval.

2. Review of Street Standards

Theo gave brief recap of where the project stood, what changes he made to the list of issues, and what he hoped the committee would accomplish at this meeting.

Paul felt it was important that the committee's recommendations connect back to the Comprehensive Plan. He thought that that may limit the scope of the street standard review.

Sandra concurred and said that the Plan's goal was to encourage growth in the growth area.

Paul felt that bicycle-pedestrian connections were an important element to enabling more growth in growth area and establishing a sense of neighborhood.

The group proceeded by going through the issues, providing feedback, and deciding if it wanted to weigh in on specific issues or leave them for staff to address.

The general sense of the committee was to give more discretion to developers, but not compromise public safety. The committee felt it could envision narrower roads in rural areas and was wondering if the Planning Board already could waive width requirements.

Tom said that issues that come up during Planning Board review seem to involve road width, riprap and grading.

Sandra mentioned the phased development issue that came up at the forum and the maximum 1500 feet dead end rule. Tom mentioned that the 1500 feet requirement was

routinely waived as the Planning Board tries to accommodate better layouts that involve moving subdivision lots around.

The sense of the Board was to leave the 1500 feet requirement as is. Tom mentioned that without a dead end maximum, developers would have no incentive to connect their roads to other roads. Sam was wondering what other Towns require for dead end length.

Sandra felt that the dead end requirement may help to retain a rural sense, but she wondered about the reason for 1500 feet. Theo mentioned that the Town also has a requirement for no more than 15 lots on a dead end road.

The committee was inclined to modify the private way in major subdivision requirement by distinguishing between rural and growth area.

The Planning Board is often asked for waiver on the connectivity requirement. Even with trails, enforcement is often difficult, Tom stated. He added: especially if they are not used and become overgrown. People tend to forget what the Town required at the time of approval, he noted.

The committee felt it was important for the Town to take ownership of paper streets at the time of their creation.

The committee wondered how the Town keeps track of the requirements of approved projects.

The public access aspect to trails was also discussed. Tom stated that the Planning Board tries to accomplish that, but that developers typically only do it if they can transfer the responsibility for those trails as well.

The committee wondered how many paper streets that have been created have ultimately resulted in built roads. The sense was probably not many, if any.

Theo will find out what aspects of road design the Planning Board can and cannot waive.

By the next meeting Theo will clean up the issue list and separate them into committee issues, staff issues, and non-issues. He will also begin to craft a narrative that explains the committee's thinking on roads. The committee felt that two themes were important for that: the growth-rural area distinction and the notion of connectivity.

Theo will also get the resource conservation zoning materials back out, so the committee can finish its review of that topic.

3. Next Meeting

The next committee meeting is scheduled for August 11, 2016.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:42 PM.

Draft minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, August 18, 2016