

## **Franklin/Somerset Community Planning Process for Townships & Plantations**

### **Full Committee Meeting Tuesday July 28, 2015 Kingfield Town Office (Webster Hall) Meeting Minutes**

#### **Attending:**

Committee members: Kirsten Burbank, James Taylor, Clyde Barker, Julie Richard, Suzanne Hockmeyer; Kay Michka, Tom Rumpf, David Spencer, Kaitlyn Bernard, Tom Coleman. ????

Staff: John Maloney, AVCOG; Chris Huck, KVCOG; Heather Johnson, SEDC; Hugh Coxe, LUPC; Ben Godsoe, LUPC.

Public: Russell Walters, Kingfield; Alan Michka, Lexington; Greg Perkins, Holden; David and Carolyn Small, Norridgewock.

1. Kirsten Burbank welcomed the Somerset Committee members and the public to Franklin County. Those present introduced themselves.
2. Julie Richard provided an overview of Somerset Subcommittee's progress since the last full committee meeting in February. She indicated that they got off to somewhat slow start but are now moving forward. Areas that have been identified and discussed include: zoning change approvals; identify new sub districts but not as detailed as in the Rangeley Plan; predictable rezoning for businesses/need to consider the Aroostook model; need to define type and size of recreation support businesses; need to maintain the "golden egg" (the natural resources that provide for outstanding outdoor recreation); and have used map to look at land ownership patterns and areas possible for zone changes.

Kirsten said the Franklin Subcommittee was also slow to start. The committee has identified seven major categories of issues and their relationship to the area of focus. A straw boss matrix has been developed the presents these. Kirsten spoke about the public information gathering meeting the committee held on June 23 and the input received was helpful to the committee.

3. Tom Rumpf facilitated the discussion of common themes in county subcommittee's planning processes to date. Ben Godsoe provided a 'common challenges' paper that identified three similar areas that the two committees have discussed. They were adjacency principles, predictability of the rezoning process and the desire to increase the flexibility for land owners. The discussion resulted in the following major themes.
  - **Adjacency criteria is an issue**  
Explore Small business zone

Allow recreation based business in M-GN District  
Criteria/process  
Rezoning is roadblock  
Is there a more “refined” approach than 1 mile?

- **Public vs. Private Road dilemma**  
Use for recreation?  
Maintenance agreements?
- **Regulatory Coordination /application efficiency**  
Sketch plan process – reduce costs  
More early intervention  
Zone change process (Delegate to staff?)  
Submission requirements
- **Zoning Approaches**  
Possibility of performance standards for future recreation uses/change demand

4. Chris Huck led a discussion of future public outreach efforts. It was suggested a public forum might be held on the use of private roads but the committee decided that issues was not directly related to common challenges and a too big of an issue for the committee to address at this time. There were questions about the use of the media for committee meeting coverage.
5. John Maloney reviewed the suggested contents of the interim report. There was agreement that the report would include the activities of both subcommittee and a draft be prepared for a joint meeting on September 15, 2015.
6. The committee received the following suggestions from the public.
  - Meeting times should be changed to evening or weekend so interested people could attend. Not everyone that works can come to an afternoon meeting.
  - Any changes proposed should only address needs of recreational businesses, which are very specific and limited.
  - There are free or low cost resources available to applicants for permits/zoning changes.
  - Should consider performance based standards.