

Aroostook CGPZ Planning Committee Meeting Minutes March 18, 2015

Attendance: Mark Draper, Ked Coffin, Sarah Medina, Bill Paterson, Fred Corey, Paul Bernier, Jim Nadeau, and Jim May

Others Present: Ken Murchison, Billie MacLean, Samantha Horn-Olsen, Ben Godsoe, and Jay Kamm

Mark Draper, Chair, opened the meeting at 9:07 with welcomes and introductions.

Minutes of February 18, 2015 meeting

The minutes of the February 18, 2015 meeting were accepted with a minor modification. Bancroft should be added to the list of towns where the Small Business Development Subdistrict is to be considered.

Presentation and Work Session- Refine basis for locational considerations and Refine Uses in the Subdistrict.

These two agenda items melded into one discussion.

Locations

Jay and Ben presented several documents relating to the Narrowing the Geography and Examples of Uses in the Small Business Development Subdistrict (D-SBD). The Steering Committee was asked to help narrow which towns, plantations, and townships the proposed subdistrict should be located in. Committee members stated that the CGPZ project should be more inclusive and proactive with both locations and uses. For example, there is the potential for a major electrical transmission line to be constructed in Hammond yet that town was removed from the list during the February meeting.

There was considerable discussion as to the criteria used to identify eligible towns. The committee indicated that objective factors should be the basis for selecting towns if possible. Staff has conducted further analysis to identify appropriate factors and suggest that among the factors that may make towns suitable for a D-SB subdistrict are:

- Contain a major public road;
- Contain or are close to populated areas;
- Are close to service centers, retail hubs or major employers;
- Contain or are close to areas with substantial levels of structural development or land divisions.

Questions arose as to how this criteria was used. Jay and Ben indicated that staff looked at each equally and that candidate towns have a majority of the criteria to be considered. Committee members felt that having a public road is the “absolute” criteria.

Border towns such as the Big Twenty (Escourt) and T15 R15 (St. Pamphile) were also refined. Committee members felt that only those areas north of Wildcat Stream (Big Twenty) and west of the Shields Branch (T15 R15) be considered for inclusion. All proposed uses may not be appropriate in these townships but the Committee felt that some residential development as well as retail that support the forest industry be included. Staff will continue to review and look into this designation.

The Route 11 Corridor (T9 R5, T8 R5, T9 R5 and T14 R6) was also discussed and should be considered due to potential future economic growth. The Committee felt that any new development should be clustered along this corridor and that the number of new curb cuts be limited. The Committee also felt that natural development constraints in these townships may prohibit development.

The following townships and plantations potentially qualify for the new subdistrict: St. John Plantation, Cross Lake Township, T17 R4/ Sinclair, Cyr Plantation, Hamlin, Connor Township, Winterville Plantation, Nashville Plantation, Garfield Plantation, Oxbow Plantation, E Township, Moro Plantation, Cary Plantation, Benedicta Township, Silver Ridge Township, Reed Plantation, Macwahoc Plantation, Molunkus Plantation, Hammond, T7 R5, T8 R5, T9 R5, T14 R6, and Bancroft (deorganized as of July 1, 2015).

Uses

There was considerable discussion concerning potential uses in the subdistrict. Staff provided an overview of potential uses for committee review. Uses were broken into four (4) subcategories including: Natural Resource based Businesses; Retail, Restaurants, Offices, and Similar Businesses; Manufacturing, Construction, and Similar Businesses; and Public or Private Services and Institutions. Under each of these major categories was a list of potential uses.

The Committee reviewed Category I; Natural Resource based Businesses and felt that these were appropriate uses for the proposed zone. They also determined that most of the uses could be located closer to existing residential development than the other categories. The committee also determined that items 6, 7, and 8 that deal with commercial stables, greenhouses, and indoor recreation facilities should have a size limit associated with them. Staff will work on draft limits for the April meeting.

Category II (Manufacturing, Construction, and Similar Businesses) was further defined to make it clear that these uses included non-natural resource bases businesses. The committee discussed the proposed size limits and questioned if the “<20,000 square foot” requirement was sufficient. Committee members felt that increasing the limit to greater than 20,000 sq. ft. limit would not meet the purpose of the subdistrict and potentially allow for larger development than intended. The committee decided to leave the “<20,000 limit” in place.

Considerable discussion revolved around category IV- Public or Private Services and Institutions as the committee felt that some of the uses were already allowed in existing subdistricts or did not meet the Purpose and Description of the subdistrict. The Committee recommends moving some of the uses to category II (Retail, Restaurants, Offices, and Similar Businesses) and change

the name to Retail, Restaurants, Offices, and Similar **Small** Businesses. Other institutional and public uses were eliminated.

Public Participation

A series of public meetings to gain input are scheduled for April 13 at the Van Buren Community Center, April 14 at the Fort Kent Town Office, April 15 at the Department of Conservation Office in Ashland and April 16 at the Oakfield Community Center. All meetings are from 6-8 PM

Next Meeting/Adjourn

The next meeting will be at NMDC on April 8, 2015 from 9 AM to noon.

Meeting adjourned at 12:17 PM

DRAFT