



WASHINGTON COUNTY  
COMMUNITY GUIDED PLANNING and  
ZONING PROCESS

Planning Committee Meeting Minutes and  
Follow Up "to dos"  
5-7 PM December 6, 2016



**GIS Laboratory Room 223 University of Maine at Machias - Machias, Maine**

**Attendees:**

Judy East, Washington County Council of Governments  
John & Marie Dudley, Town of Alexander  
Betsy Fitzgerald, County Manager  
Stacie Beyer, Land Use Planning Commission  
Crystal Hitchings, WCCOG, DART  
David Bell, Cherryfield Foods, ME Wild Blueberries  
Robert Murphy, American Forest Management  
Michael Smith, Trescott resident  
Tora Johnson, University of Maine GIS Service Center and Laboratory  
Susan Hatton, Sunrise County Economic Council  
Al May, Maine CDC/Trescott resident

**Regrets:**

John Bryant, American Forest Management  
John Hough, Edmunds resident  
Travis Howard, land manager – Wagner Forestry

**Meeting Goals:** a) review zoning changes generated from public meetings to date using 3-D imagery, Good Neighbor Standards and online maps, and b) prepare for final public meeting

Introductions, agenda review – no change to agenda

Presentation of 3-D imagery of 3 Categories of scale in Development Rural Business floating zone – Judy presented slides to the Planning Committee as a test run for how the materials will be presented at the final public meeting(s). We assumed in the meeting that the Planning Committee was "up to speed" on the Development-Rural Business (D-RB) floating zone as it is now adopted in Aroostook County and under consideration for Washington County. Note that in any public meetings we would review the floating zone concept for review and for those who have never seen the concept described. Slides in the Powerpoint depict 3-D imagery of sites in both Aroostook County and Washington County across the 3 Categories of use and scale in the D-RB (a table describing those uses/scales follows for reference/reminder).

Rural Business Development (D-RB) zone, created during the Community Guided Planning and Zoning process in Aroostook County, an allowable “floating” zone in approximately 11 of the many UTs in Aroostook County; and newly adopted by the LUPC			
Factors	Category 1: Natural Resource support businesses	Category 2: Retail, Office etc.	Category 3: Commercial, manufacturing, processing etc.
Size	Up to 4,000 sq ft gross floor area; 3 acres site area	Up to 2,500 sq ft gross floor area for commercial activities	Up to 20,000 sq ft gross floor area
Distance from a public road	1 mile	¼ mile	½ mile

**Overall Comments on 3-D imagery presentation and how to revise it for public meetings:**

- Delete all Aroostook County examples and add more from Washington County
- Include more Washington County eggs; depict what is allowed rather than what is too large
- Add a measurement of the setback of the building from the road
- Check – does the 2500 square foot limitation on gross floor area inhibit any later structures eg. accessory buildings (Stacie advises: yes it does)

**Specific suggested buildings/businesses to add to the 3-D imagery presentation**

**2 IMPORTANT NOTES:**

1) we are not likely to use all the suggested eggs. below; rather we will select several that are recognizable and best depict the scale and use categories in the D-RB, **and**

2) some of the suggested eggs. below may exceed the allowable scale in the D-RB as many of those already chosen in the original presentation did:

- For Category 1 examples:
  - Pottle sawmill on Route 214 in Pembroke
  - Seafood buyer on Route 189
  - Lords Well Drilling
  - Wilderness Lodge on Route 9
  - Tritown Marine on Route 9 in Alexander
- For Category 2 examples:
  - Nook and Cranny restaurant in Alexander on Route 9
  - Monica’s chocolates on Route 189 in Lubec
  - Border Patrol building in Baileyville/Baring industrial park
  - Whiting Corner Store on Route 1 in Whiting
  - Coastal Plumbing on Route 1 in Pembroke(?)
  - County Road Cuts (not sure where this is)
  - Randy’s Variety on Route 9 in Alexander
  - Fox Hill Store in Wesley on Route 9
  - Hill Top Diner and Deli in Twp 26 on Route 9

- Duty Free store at junction of Route 1 and Route 9 in Baileyville
- Former General Store on Route 191 in Cathance
- General Store in Waite on Route 1
- P & J Grocery on Route 9 in Wesley
- For Category 3 examples:
  - Murray LaPlante operation on Route 1 in Princeton
  - Lyle Hamilton wood processing on Route 1 in Topsfield
  - WS Trucking on Route 189 in Trescott
  - Cherryfield Foods in Cherryfield on Route 193
  - Wymans in Wesley on Route 9

Additional examples for the Development – Recreational Services Business floating zone:

- Toilet and Picnic area in Twp 26 on Route 9
- Ranger Station at Cobscook Bay State Park
- Rosie’s Hot Dog stand on the breakwater in Eastport
- Others? Please send along suggestions if you think of some.

Review and refine Good Neighbor Standards for use in Floating Zones

The Planning Committee then reviewed the Good Neighbor Standards with Current Provisions in the LUPC land Use Districts and Standards (Chapter 10 Rules).

Additional comments were provided by e-mail from 3 people who could not attend the meeting including:

From Dale Wheaton: *Just a mention regarding "Good Neighbor " standards. When commercial wood cutting operations are occurring near residential areas, it would be great if they did not commence until 7 am!*

From John Hough: *Quick follow-up having just skimmed the good neighbor standards. We heard repeatedly at the public meetings (though we should recall that they were non-representative) that people largely liked things the way they are because they are quiet. Implicit in the neighbors document is the implication that neighbors are people. I feel that neighbors should include other entities such as recreation areas, conservation areas, scenic vistas, dark skies areas etc. as they are something that seem to be valued, and further, given we are talking about recreational support facilities, it will be important that the facility does not negatively impact the resource it is trying to exploit.*

From Diane Griffith: *paraphrasing....Trescott is scenic and has 15% of the Bold Coast Scenic Byway; municipal governments offer more opportunity for discussion of community development and code enforcement and business should be encouraged in existing town centers; home business should be the only type of development allowed in Trescott and floating zones should be considered when this planning effort is revisited in 5 years.*

Michael Smith observed that there is significant distrust of this process because the expedited wind development process has ‘poisoned the well’. Others in the Trescott community (in an e-mail to

Dianne Griffith) perceive the CGP&Z process as being initiated and put “into high gear after the UTs have exempt (sic) from expedited status”.

Judy observed, as Tora had done at the October Planning Committee meeting that the end result of these kind of public planning processes can be, often is, and may be in this case, that very little change takes place ‘on the ground’ but that the benefit will be that those who participated feel heard and that they had an impact on the outcome.

Conclusions from Planning Committee discussion of Good Neighbor standards:

- Add a height limitation; Stacie looked up the maximum height allowed in the current rules and it is 100 feet for commercial structures; all agreed this height limitation should be reduced to 35 feet in the D-RB
- Everyone also agreed that it takes time to review the summary table relative to the rules (excerpts of which were reproduced in a 22 page handout that is also on the web site)
- Include a handout in the public meetings on the currently allowed home occupations standards

View online maps of existing and proposed zoning changes; including discussion/preliminary consensus on Development – Recreational Business Services floating zone

We first looked at the mapped and specific prospective zoning changes proposed for Baring and Grand Lake Stream. These have not changed substantially since the description of them in the Sept 27 Public meeting notes from Baring and the Nov 2 Public Meeting notes from Grand Lake Stream. Grand Lake Stream is meeting again this month to finalize their proposals and we need some follow up meetings with landowners in Baring to finalize the changes near the airport strip in Baring and on the other side of Route 1 as proposed by a landowner.

Tora prepared/projected mapped depictions of the extent of the areas so far discussed as areas where the Development-Rural Business (D-RB) floating zone would be allowed to “land” if and when a permit were requested in one of the 3 Categories.

Some initial reactions to how the mapped extent of these areas look (note we looked extensively at the Trescott map but also at each of the others under consideration for allowance of the floating zone including Baring, Marion, Cathance, Edmunds, and Brookton; Grand Lake Stream does not want to allow either floating zone):

- Washington County, particularly in the southern UTs where the D-RB might “land”, is far less open and vast than Aroostook County; therefore the distances from public roads that are now allowed in Aroostook County are too large for Washington County.
- The map of the areas where the D-RB floating zone could “land” in Aroostook county is very small and does not portray very well how large the areas are where the D-RB could “land”
- Tora’s UT-specific maps give a far more detailed depiction of where the D-RB could land and it seemed clear to all present that the allowable areas in the existing rules from Aroostook County are far too extensive for Washington County; for example the areas would include land locked parcels and extend all the way to the coast in some places

- The distance from a public road where each Category could “land” are different (see the table on page 2 above) and the mapped depiction needs to make that distinction clear
- The areas where each Category could “land” need to exclude parcels with frontage on the secondary roads as preliminary consensus to date is to allow the D-RB to “land” on primary public roads eg Routes 1, 191, 189, 86 etc.

**Conclusions from review of maps:**

- Reduce the areas where each Category of D-RB can “land” to half of what is allowed in Aroostook County. Thus the Table on Page 2 would be modified as follows:

Rural Business Development (D-RB) zone, <b>DRAFT</b> allowable “floating” zone factors in Washington County ( <b>Bold text indicates where proposal departs from Aroostook County</b> )			
Factors	Category 1: Natural Resource support businesses	Category 2: Retail, Office etc.	Category 3: Commercial, manufacturing, processing etc.
Size	Up to 4,000 sq ft gross floor area; 3 acres site area	Up to 2,500 sq ft gross floor area for commercial activities	Up to 20,000 sq ft gross floor area
Distance from a public road <b>and only on parcels with road frontage and major public roads to be determined for each UT</b>	<b>1/2</b> mile	<b>1/8</b> mile	¼ mile

Tora will revise the mapped depictions of the D-RB floating zones to address these conclusions; the Planning Committee will review these maps at a meeting (*to be scheduled*) in January for final presentation/review at public meeting(s) in January-February...maybe March if this snow keeps up.

Preliminary agenda items for January:

1. Final Prospective Zoning proposals for Grand lake Stream and Baring
2. Review mapped depiction of D-RB floating zone in Trescott, Edmunds, Cathance, Marion, Brookton and Baring (with revisions discussed above)
3. Discuss where the Development – Recreation Support Business floating zone could/should/ would “land” and the scale of uses within it.
4. Review 3-D imagery of D-RB Categories of scale and use (with revisions discussed above).

**Next meeting: TBD from meeting doodle**

Likely in Room **228** Torrey Hall University of Maine at Machias (to be confirmed)

Respectfully Submitted  
Judy East