



Long Range Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC)

Thursday, June 27, 2019
Meeting Minutes

Attendance

Name	Present	Name	Present	Name	Present
Breana Gersen <i>Chair</i>	✓	Rich Jordan <i>Planning Board</i>	✓	Karen Farber	✓
Becca Casey <i>Vice Chair</i>	✓	Sandra Lipsey <i>LPAC+</i>	✓	Ethan Croce <i>Staff</i>	✓
Dimitri Balatsos	✓	Sam Rudman <i>LPAC+</i>	✓	Ted Asherman <i>Council Liaison</i>	✓
Paul Bergkamp	✓	John Winslow	✓		

Others attending: Keith Noyes; Peter Kennedy, Jack Uminski

Becca started the meeting at 6:00 pm.

1. Establish Quorum

It was observed that a quorum was established with only John not present. John indicated that he would be arriving around 7:00 pm.

2. Review of Draft Minutes of May 23, 2019

Motion by Sam to approve the draft minutes, seconded by Karen. Breana asked that the minutes be amended to reflect the spelling of her name with only one "n". Motion by Sam to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Karen and approved unanimously.

3. Review of Meeting Materials

Ethan explained the meeting materials which included: two attachments previously distributed related to a comparison of zoning standards between districts and a list of building permits issued between 7/11/2016 and 12/31/2018 that were "enabled" by the 7/11/2016 zoning amendments; the current zoning map; two GIS maps of the RB and RD zones showing certain layers requested by the committee; and a Resolution approved by the Council on 5/29/2019.

4. Public Comment

Peter Kennedy mentioned his ownership of 50 acres of land on upper Route One, the recent approvals for development he obtained on adjacent land in Cumberland, and his desire to obtain a zoning amendment in Falmouth to allow certain medical-related land uses. He distributed a package of material to committee members.

Keith Noyes wondered if the Town could supply data based on the most up-to-date permitting activity.

5. Discuss LPAC Leadership (Chair, Vice-Chair)

Breana mentioned that she would like to step down as Chair. The committee discussed the need to then appoint a new chair. Karen suggested delaying this conversation until after John arrives later in the evening.

6. Review RB and RD Zoning Standards and Building Permit Data for Two Family and Multi Family Uses

Sam asked if the Council Resolution approved on May 29 was still valid with three new councilors having been elected since then. Ethan mentioned that this very issue was discussed at the last council meeting to allow the three new councilors the opportunity to comment on and re-affirm the Resolution. Based on the council discussion that evening the Resolution should still be considered valid.

Councilor Asherman said that the Council's desire for LPAC to review RB/RD zoning came somewhat from the notion that the recent rollback of changes to zoning in the RA District would result in new, development demand in the RB and RD Districts. Rich said that that notion/suggestion is pure speculation and that there is no evidence yet to suggest things will play out in that manner. Rich raised the question of whether the results of the recent town council elections provide any insight into how the community feels about growth. Karen thinks that there have been numerous comments over the past year from concerned people in the RB/RD Districts. She thinks having an invitational conversation with those people might be helpful. Becca thought LPAC might be able to take a different approach with RB/RD but there needs to be more clarity on the scope of the effort.

In light of the recent election results, Rich wondered if the town over-reacted to concerns about development. Rich thinks it is critical for LPAC and/or the Town to be able to articulate exactly what the issue is that they are working to solve. Rich's impressions are that people are more focused on growth than density. Character is a very hard thing to define but was still raised a lot by a lot of people. Rich feels that if LPAC does public outreach with the RB/RD task it starts to duplicate the bullets regarding outreach in the Council's Resolution.

Sandra thinks LPAC needs at least one more meeting at a minimum prior to bringing the public in. She wondered about analyzing the RB District and RD District separately. Karen pointed out that RB and RD were previously all one district. She said the public might push to be placed back in Farm and Forest but the issue of redrawing zoning boundaries would be beyond the scope of LPAC's charge.

Dimitri wondered about sending out a survey and/or a flyer to residents. Sam said he doesn't know the best way to collect feedback. Until bulldozers show up next door people often won't be focused/interested. He thinks it would be good to identify what is the most horrific unintended consequence that could come out of the July 2016 amendments in RB/RD. Sam recalled John being vocal about making certain uses conditional uses again instead of permitted by right as one idea.

Karen mentioned reaching out and targeting people who attended the March 28 forum. Becca said a mailer would allow you to zero in on a certain geography of town. Sam wondered about the danger of not inviting people from other zoning districts. Paul thought it would good to do a town-wide mailer to avoid the critique of being under-inclusive. Karen also thought a town wide mailing would be best. It could say that the topic is "this geography" with a map. It could ask "What do you like and dislike?". Karen also thinks to send the mailing first class and not via postcard. The use of postcards was a

complaint heard over the past six months and she thinks if it is sent in an envelope you have a better chance of people reading it.

Sam said you could add maps with roads identified and could add a hard copy of a survey as well. You could also post on the website and Facebook. Karen said to maybe think about giving people a couple of alternative dates to attend an LPAC meeting. Summer is a challenging time to get good attendance at meetings due to vacations and busy summer schedules. Erin said the mailing could be an invitation and a survey. Rich wondered about just inviting the public to regularly scheduled LPAC meetings but to hold them downstairs. Becca said LPAC could target the two September LPAC meetings with the goal of getting responses back from the survey prior to that. Karen said there could be a web link to the survey online, a map, and an invitation with two dates/times. The survey does not have to be long with only a couple of questions max.

Becca doesn't think August is a good time to hold meetings. There will be a need to decide on questions and refine those. Rich said it is important to set the council's expectations around timeframe for turnaround, similar to RA. Becca said the town could be calling attention to something that might not be an issue for people. She said some people haven't even realized that two-family dwellings are going up and can't distinguish between a two-family and a single family home.

Sam wondered if it makes sense to circulate zoning data with definitions as to what ordinance terms are. Rich thinks not to overcomplicate things and that the big variable is lot size for the most part. That is something that people can wrap their heads around and is something that shows people an order of magnitude as to what they can do. Erin suggested sending out something that is more of a newsletter look. Sam said LPAC also heard there has been a lack of information. The more information you can push out in a simple way the better. Karen wondered about targeting residents that are known to have grievances and trying to pull them in for educational purposes sooner rather than later. That might help to inform the survey questions. Rich said that in his Planning Board role he noticed that opposition to the Tuscan Way project lessened after the Council lowered the density allowance. By the time the project was at the final approval stage the neighbors seemed generally OK. He thinks the process worked. John said that because it went to the Planning Board the Tuscan Way project involved abutter notifications. People only pay attention when its in their backyard or two doors down. He thinks moving uses from permitted to conditional uses created a big part of the communication issue.

Becca said the mailing can mention the change from conditional to permitted uses and ask "is it a problem"? She said LPAC needs to be neutral and ask both sides of the question. Erin suggested wording something like "Should you be required to go to the BZA to build anything other than a single family dwelling?"

Karen pointed out that while attached housing was a conditional use prior to 2016 that form of housing wasn't being built because it was impractical economically. Sandra said LPAC discussed moving some uses to permitted uses in part so town boards didn't have so many applications to look at. Breana said if you ask people what they prefer to see for development on a neighbor's property most people are going to say "nothing". That tunnel vision doesn't allow you to look at the bigger town-wide land use picture. She would be interested in having questions that touch on those bigger issues. Rich said the conditional use process is expensive, time consuming, and resulted in virtually all approvals being issued anyway.

John differentiated between developers and land speculators. It's the latter in his mind that have been buying a piece of property because of the zone change. He thinks the speculators have been the biggest

irritant.

Becca said the committee first and foremost needs to get to the answer of “is there a problem in RB/RD”? Erin suggested asking people what street they live on. Rich pointed out that zoning boundaries do not begin and end with streets.

Becca attempted to provide a recap: Create either a town-wide mailer or district wide mailer; include the topic and background to focus people on RB/RD; talk about the history of conditional vs permitted uses; limit questions to two or three on a short questionnaire; Provide a link to the website with the survey online or respond with paper survey; invitation to visit LPAC on certain meeting dates; set deadline for surveys due; pick dates for people to come in; shoot for mailer out by end of July.

John emphasized the importance of focusing narrowly on the charge given to LPAC: RB/RD zoning. He doesn't think a town-wide mailer is needed. Sam thinks the committee should be as inclusive as it can. Paul thought a town-wide mailing would be good since development creates more traffic and people in adjacent districts might be impacted.

Karen said the committee can circle back to the scope of the mailing at the next meeting. She suggested that committee members come back to the next meeting with three proposed questions.

Becca asked if would be possible for Erin to draft a template mailing for LPAC to review at the next meeting. Becca and Karen offered to meet with Erin to sketch out a template.

Discuss LPAC Leadership (Chair, Vice-Chair)

This item was continued from earlier in the evening now that John is in attendance. Breana mentioned that she would like to step down as Chair. Breana moved to elect Becca as LPAC Chair. The motion was seconded by Sam and approved unanimously. (Becca abstained) Sandra moved to elect Breana as Vice Chair. The motion was seconded by John and approved unanimously. (Breana abstained)

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Set Date and Agenda for Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 11.

9. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 7:50 pm

Draft minutes prepared by Ethan Croce