



Long Range Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC)

Thursday, April 25, 2019
Meeting Minutes

Attendance

Name	Present	Name	Present	Name	Present
Breana Gersen <i>Chair</i>	✓	Rich Jordan <i>Planning Board</i>	✓	Claudia King <i>Council Liaison</i>	-
Becca Casey <i>Vice Chair</i>	✓	Sandra Lipsey <i>LPAC+</i>	-	Theo Holtwijk <i>Staff</i>	✓
Dimitri Balatsos	✓	Sam Rudman <i>LPAC+</i>	-		
Paul Bergkamp	-	John Winslow	✓		

Others attending: Councilor Asherman (for Councilor King), Valentine Sheldon, Asher Gersen

The meeting was audio-recorded.

Breana started the meeting at 6:00 pm. Councilor Asherman stated that he was sitting in for Councilor King.

1. Review of Draft Minutes of March 28, April 2 and 11, 2019 Meetings

John suggested adding a note to each set of minutes whether that it was audio or video recorded. Dimitri stated that the word “not” should be included in the April 11 minutes on page 2: “Dimitri said that he agreed with that but felt that participation should not be open-ended.” The committee was OK with both revisions. Upon a motion by Dimitri and second by Rich, the minutes of the March 28, April 2 and 11, 2019 meetings were unanimously approved as amended by those present at each meeting.

2. Review of Meeting Materials

Theo reviewed the meeting packet. It contained a draft LPAC info statement, draft memo on Town communication, an e-mail from Sandra Lipsey with comments on the Town communication memo, excerpt from Council meeting notes concerning review of RB and RD districts, a zoning standard comparison between RB, RD, and RA, and a list of projects that were approved from July 2016 through December 2018 in RB and RD that were enabled by the 2016 zoning amendments.

Ted noted that the Council did not set any time constraints to LPAC regarding the review of RB and RD districts.

3. Public Comment

Valentine Sheldon asked who prepared the statement on the Town website regarding a review of growth data. It was clarified that this was not an LPAC document. The statement was prepared by Town manager with staff assistance. Valentine stated that the statement validated the Save Falmouth data. He said that the draft memo on Town communication used the word “misinformation.” He requested that

that word be removed as he felt it was confusing and not accurate. He said that he would write a message to the Town manager regarding the data memo.

The committee discussed the validity of the data used. Becca said that there had been some mixing of growth cap numbers with exempt numbers.

John stated that the new construction in the OceanView TIF district could not be used for police and fire services, despite what he felt was a dramatic increase in calls for service due to those units. He said that the money in that TIF goes to pet projects. A TIF discussion followed pertaining to value sheltering and school subsidy reduction avoidance. Councilor Asherman stated that the TIF projects are costs that the Town would have incurred any way and that the TIF serves to free up funds in general budget for fire and EMS services. Rich wondered if the exempt units should be revisited. John felt it was important to look at the impact of the exempt units. Theo said that a TIF 101 may be useful for the committee at some point, but that the main point is that the Town uses TIF as a complementary financing tool that should not be seen separate from the rest of the budget. The Town looks at overall expenses and overall income and tries to maximize the value for residents. The four TIFs provide a tremendous value to the Town. Valentine commented that the Comprehensive Plan does not differentiate between housing types. Dimitri pointed out the difference between capital and operating expenses. Theo stated that the TIFs use a combination of capital and operating expenses. Becca noted that the Comprehensive Plan is a high-level plan and encouraged a variety of housing, and intentionally did not parse housing types.

4. Review of Draft LPAC Info Statement

Theo explained the sources that he used for this first draft: the Code of Ordinances, the Council Work Plan, and comments from the committee. Rich asked what the purpose of the memo was. John stated that the committee lacked structure and the memo could help increase understanding by the public. The committee reviewed some of the specifics of the memo, such as that the CDC chair is not always LPAC liaison. John said that it was important to have a single line of communication, from the Council chair to the committee chair or via the Council liaison. Becca stated that historically communication have come from the Council liaison, and that as acting chair she has served as the LPAC liaison. John said that if it came from the Council chair it would be directive. Ted stated that if he came to a committee meeting, he was not speaking for the entire Council. Dimitri explained how the liaison set-up worked at FEIC.

Ted agreed that it was important for the Council to give clear and succinct instructions, and that it can be confusing if multiple councilors attend committee meetings. He stated that the Council Chair cannot be at every committee meeting, and that therefore the Council liaison fulfills that role. The committee discussed the role of the Council liaison. Ted said that he saw it as two-way communication, where feedback from the committee could be brought back to the Council via the liaison.

Dimitri felt the memo should address who LPAC is, how it works, and what is expected of LPAC. Becca felt that it should be a concise statement. John felt that the assignments should be clear and could be prefaced by “advisory for the following.” It was recognized that what the committee currently is working on will change. Theo noted that he already added a summary description of LPAC to the bottom of the LPAC agenda. Dimitri felt that the public’s confusion was regarding LPAC’s role and that it was strictly advisory and that the committee serves at the pleasure of the Council. Ted stated that the committee does more than work on land use policy. John felt that a footnote should be added with Code of ordinance references. The committee discussed the job of working on the Comprehensive Plan, but also

had related projects. John saw those as separate from zoning. Becca agreed to rework the memo which will be reviewed at the next meeting.

5. Review of draft memo regarding Suggestions for Communication, Education, and Outreach

Becca explained the purpose of the draft memo, which was prepared by Paul. Dimitri suggested making individual comments and sending them in. Rich asked who the audience of this memo is intended to be. It is meant for the Council. John recommended that the Town create a monthly newsletter as a lot is going on that is not on the public's radar.

Ted offered a clarification. He said that the Council is currently addressing all kinds of communications and has hired a part-time staff person to help with that. He said that it would be helpful to have LPAC's thoughts on that, but that no specific recommendations were needed. He noted that LPAC has been on the front line of this and would have valuable input. John stated that it was not just about zoning. Becca suggested that the memo not focus on the background, but keeps its focus on helping the Council. Ted stated that LPAC does not need to come up with a communications strategy. Rich agreed that the framework section in the memo may not be needed. Dimitri noted that with public comment at Council meetings, the Council does not seem to have a way to get back to residents as there often is no response.

John felt that a newsletter would be pro-actionary and not reactionary. He envisioned a piece in bullet form. Then, he said, people can come with solutions and input. Ted remarked that people seem to love the road construction flyer that the Town put out a while ago. Valentine stated that Cumberland puts out the Town Cryer. Rich felt that it may be helpful to have the e-alerts synthesized in one place. Dimitri said that Cape Elizabeth has a newspaper that is very effective. Ted said that Falmouth relies on the Forecaster. It was noted the people can subscribe to a variety of notices. The committee discussed the need to reach out and for people to feel more involved.

Becca stated that items 1 and 2 in the memo were too high level, and that some examples may be better. Ted suggested that take-aways from the last 4 to 6 months would be helpful. Rich suggested that adding a notification requirement to beyond abutters, to for example within 250 feet from a property. Dimitri said that social media communications are important and that those require succinctness. Valentine said that Facebook was important too. Becca will prepare a second draft.

John suggested to get feedback from the new communications person and the Council. He said that a lot of people do not connect via digital media. Theo said that Sandra had submitted some thoughts on the topic as well. Becca will incorporate Sandra's comments. Rich said that the first draft memo provided a good outreach framework for the 2020 Comprehensive Plan, which he hoped would be started soon. Dimitri said that he felt that the forum idea needed to be more focused and more frequent.

6. Begin Review of RB and RD District

John said that he wanted to digest the two RB and RD handouts first. Becca recapped the Council agenda item. Ted added that this item was not voted on. Rich wondered if the Council's request to review had been formal. Ted agreed that that was not clear.

Valentine stated that the zoning standard handout needed to be corrected for RA as the Council proposed to make two family and multi-family uses conditional. Theo will fix the chart.

John stated that he had a problem that accessory dwelling units were now a permitted use, whereas before they were a conditional use. He did not understand the committee's thinking. He showed an example on Middle Road of an ADU that seemed it was a single-family home. He wondered what the difference was. Ted said that the difference was 850 sf, which is the maximum size of an ADU. John felt that that was large. Rich stated that that was a separate issue. John countered that there were many more ADU's now, and that rental units had increased. That meant, in John's opinion, that near the water every weekend was now like July 4th.

Becca suggested that committee members drive around to the RB and RD projects to see what they were like. Valentine asked if the building permit chart represented all growth in RB and RD. Theo said that the projects listed were only the enabled projects, and that all other projects could have been done regardless of the 2016 zoning amendments. In response to a question why the focus on two family and multi-family units in RB and RD, Valentine said that there was a concern with the shift in growth from RA to RB and RD with the pending RA amendments.

7. Other Business

Ted stated that the committee should bring any observations that the Council should be aware of to the Council through the Council liaison of the committee as that provided more input for the Council. He said that the committee's discussions were important and that the committee has a productive format.

Rich asked John if he felt that LPAC meetings should be televised. John said that he was fine with an audio recording, so the meeting can be listened back to, if needed.

8. Next Meeting

The committee will meet next on May 9 at 5:30 PM. The committee will review the revised LPAC info memo, the revised Communications memo, and begin the RB and RD review.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 PM.

Draft minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, May 17, 2019 rev 1