



## Route One North Committee

Meeting Minutes  
Monday, May 15, 2017

### Attendance

#### MEMBERS

Chris Wasileski, Chair ✓  
Nicole Favreau, Vice Chair ✓  
Arthur Batson ✓  
Paul Burlin  
Dava Davin ✓  
Laurie Leonard ✓  
Jay Trickett ✓  
Steve Woods ✓

#### COUNCIL LIAISON

Charlie McBrady

#### OTHERS

David Woodward, VHB ✓  
Steve Thomas, VHB ✓  
Mabel O'Brien ✓  
Janice Tooker ✓  
Gale Lowe ✓  
Linda Garvin ✓

#### STAFF

Nathan Poore ✓  
Theo Holtwijk ✓  
Andrew Clark ✓

Chair Wasileski called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

### 1. Review of draft minutes from the April 25 meeting

Laurie expressed concern that the minority opinion, excerpted below, was not adequately represented in the draft minutes as he desired to be represented as sharing in Art's opinion:

Chris, Steve, Dave, Nicole, and Paul felt that no residential use should be recommended for site #5. Art disagreed with that recommendation. The committee agreed that this position should be reflected in the draft final report.

The committee agreed to amend the draft minutes to reflect Laurie's position on this matter as that was discussed at the meeting. The minutes of the April 25 meeting were approved as amended.

### 2. Review of draft committee report

Chris introduced a draft of the *Route 1 North Vision Plan* as prepared by VHB. David summarized the report as consisting of an introduction, an analysis of the study area, and a vision for future development. Chris asked whether there had been significant alterations from the presentation at the public forum. Steve Thomas pointed out the footnote on page 31 acknowledging "a few" dissenting viewpoints. The committee agreed it would be best to specify the number of dissenters.

Laurie expressed concern that the minority opinion was not adequately represented in the draft report. Based on informal voting at the public forum, there was considerable public support for residential use on Site 5, of which the draft report made no mention. He was concerned the draft report represented the consultant's views more than the committee's views.

Theo underscored that it should indeed be the committee's report. He noted that the consultant and the staff are involved only to help the committee express its vision. Theo noted that the report should convey that there are differences in opinion among the committee members.

Laurie stated that he believed that a holistic approach to Site 5 would attract housing, people, and new stores to the Route 1 area.

Chris asked to go around the table to hear committee members' thoughts on Site 5:

- Dava agreed with keeping the area zoned as Business Professional. In her experience, noise from nearby I-295 could make residential use there unattractive.
- Laurie's position had been made clear, and he yielded to the next member.
- Art recommended allowing mixed use, as it is adjacent to existing residential use on Quaker Lane to the south and Cumberland Foreside Village to the north.
- Jay wished to honor the work of the committee, but did not want to see residential development prevented. He felt residential development was more likely to occur than development by technology companies.
- Nicole urged the committee to focus on visioning, and that it was not the role of the committee to approve or disapprove of a property owner's intent. She agreed with the consultant's recommendations.
- Chris also agreed with the consultant's recommendations.
- Steve Woods reminded the committee that the decision had been made to hire consultants and to lean on their expertise. He cautioned the committee against holding a referendum on any plans of Mr. Kennedy, the owner of Site 5. He stated that those plans have changed over the years and continue to do so. He further said that business owners in the area - noting himself as one such owner - have relied on the BP zoning designation when they made their investments. Steve said that he believed that given a tight labor market and a housing crisis, Portland is changing, and the market is moving towards Falmouth. He believed that the conditions are perfect for commercial development on Site 5, and agreed with the consultant's recommendations.

Chris wondered whether there was a compromise to be made. Art was in favor of flexibility. He noted that the draft report's recommendations point to mixed use in each of the other vacant sites.

Chris asked for the consultant's opinion. Steve Thomas said that Mr. Kennedy had been heard and taken seriously. However, he stated that VHB believed that the condition of the land on Site 5 is different from the rest of the study area, and that residential use is less appropriate there. He also noted that any development in Cumberland need not set a precedent for what happens in Falmouth. In light of discussion surrounding senior housing, Steve urged that there are better locations in Falmouth - denser, more walkable, mixed use - than having residents isolated on Site 5.

Chris asked for the opinion of Town staff. Nathan reviewed the proposed changes to existing zoning. There were no significant zoning changes proposed for sites 3, 4, and 6. Sites 1 and 2 had been guided towards mixed use in conjunction with discussions surrounding the redesign and redevelopment of the Falmouth Spur. Nathan noted that that topic remained in Executive Session by the Council. He stated that should zoning changes be made at Site 5, Falmouth may find itself running out of commercially developable land. Nathan noted that the

weighing of property owners' rights with the need for comprehensive planning is a fundamental issue that the committee should wrestle with.

Mabel O'Brien of Applegate Lane asked whether the Vision plan accounted for future trail access. The Committee said it did. Mabel stated that was a concern of public encroachment of trails onto private property at Applegate. Nathan assured her that, while the draft plan did not provide specific level of detail concerning trail locations, any expansion of the trail network would be done in cooperation with abutting landowners.

Art moved to approve the draft report's Land Use Recommendations #1 through #5 as written, but striking "with limitations..." from the end of recommendation 3. Steve seconded that motion. The motion passed 7-0.

The committee worked to rephrase the footnote on page 31 as a new Land Use Recommendation #6. Steve proposed the following draft language for recommendation 6: "The majority of the Committee supported the Innovation and Technology Ridge Vision for site 5, continuing its existing BP District uses. The BP district includes business and professional uses and retail service, with no residential uses allowed. There was considerable discussion among the committee, landowner, public, and consultants about the merits and concerns of the potential inclusion of residential uses on site 5. It is important to note that X of Y committee members advocated inclusion of residential uses on site 5, dissenting from the majority committee opinion."

The committee voted 7-0 to adopt this language.

The committee then voted to keep the BP zoning designation on Site 5. That motion passed 4-3 (Art, Jay, and Laurie opposed). This split will be incorporated in the text of recommendation 6.

Jay suggested adding a recommendation 7 that, upon the suggestion by Steve, stated: "On the west side of Route 1, the majority of the committee (4-3) recommended supporting retail and restaurant uses be allowed only in association with the primary BP uses."

The committee approved this language for recommendation 7 with a vote of 7-0.

Theo wanted to find out if the committee was generally happy with the remainder of the report. He noted that Town staff had some content and formatting changes to address with the consultant. He also stated that a section on costs and financing needed to be added before the work is complete and ready for presentation to the Town Council.

Laurie stated he has concerns with page 26. Theo will make sure that the rest of the document reflects the split opinion of the committee.

Chris asked if there was general support of the rest of the draft report and if staff could be directed to work with the consultant in producing a draft final version. Laurie moved to do so, and Nicole seconded that motion. The motion passed with a vote of 7-0.

Staff will bring back the final draft to the committee, so it can review the final version before it is presented to the Town Council. Jay noted that it was important for the committee to meet to do so, as the cost/financing section was an important part of the recommendations. The rest of the committee agreed with that.

### **3. Other business**

There was no other business.

### **4. Next meeting**

The next meeting of the committee was scheduled for Monday, June 12 at 6:30 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 9:07 pm.

*Draft minutes prepared by Andrew Clark, May 17, 2017.*