

Unity Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting

September 11, 2014, 6:30 pm, Room 201 Koons Hall, Unity College

Present: Emily Newell, Don Newell, Jean Bourg, Bob Downie, Michele Levitt, Sonia Antunes, Sara Trunzo

Meeting devoted to discussion of survey results and changes we should make in the strategies document due to feedback. Emily's notes on our discussion are below, followed by Jean's document to be published on the town website.

We should get rid of 1d4

only one had less than 50% of likes. Which was ic2. Id4 had 57% and is confusing. It's going away
need to get back to minutes now that we aren't revising a document and we will post the revisions of the documents

the likers didn't comment as much as the don't likes. More negative comments even when there were more positive votes

do we go more vague on the groups we mention to sort of take out the fear of agenda or adding a lightning rod. Maybe it would be better to define what "partner" and "work with" mean.

Should also do a Q&A

Need to put out there the answer of "how are you going to pay for this". Almost all of this is volunteer power, and we realize that the funds are not available.

Add a statement above the goals that the underlying goal is to maximize the contribution to our community through volunteerism.

Where it says tif or another committee - take out tif. Tif is too fresh and current for a 15 year plan. This is 1a1.

Should "economic" and agricultural/rural character really be paired?

Wish the selectboard would get on board that they sanctioned this process. Who should talk to them about this? There is confusion about why we are doing what we're doing

Who are we trying to attract? We are uplifting the people already here. Keep people here. We want to attract people who appreciate what is here. We would like an environment

Q&A should address walking downtown – why it's good. That it is here. A lot of walkers here. Make an environment that attracts

Integrate ia2 paddling and birdwatching, other categories.

1a3 cohesiveness ..among town organizations.... So that we're working together, straight line, not overlapping. UBR was once created to do jut that – to watch over the various groups. between groups Maybe instead of “partner”. YES the town needs to partner with FOLW. Otherwise, overused.... Sounds institutional.

Need to pull that UBR and Unity are NOT two different things. Get to the roots ... show the ten commandments. Need to reinforce why UBR is here

1a4 keep in mind “who for” are these strategies are

1b1

1b2 eliminate this strategy or rewrite...take MFT out of the sentence. “task a town group to see how to use the food

1c2 take out the sales.

1c3 find the facts. What's up with depot/state maint. Verify state does summer, town does winter? Take away 220. Trucking off depot, not keep trucking off 220 lg trucks” is unnecessary lightening rod

1c4 a lot of neg. maybe due to misunderstanding. Clarify it. Doesn't need to be there. Is in section 8.

1c5. Eliminate or reword. Original plan speaks to trash ordinance. Maybe in land use ord? find it. May be worded better

1c6 reword

1c7: maintain the residential character of that section. Change language

1d1: reword take out explanatory. Treasure and support existing businesses.

1d2: find other, softer examples. Three examples. Take out examples. Add that new businesses would lift up the current businesses

We need to edit for unstandable-ness

2b2. Just forget it.

3a2 and 3a1 need to be flipped.

We need to really reconsider naming specific entities

What is our response to the response? Maybe: next version should show what is new, what is old, what is gone, basically show the changes track version.

Comprehensive Plan Survey Response

The response to the Comprehensive Plan Committee's Survey regarding goals and strategies was largely positive, but there were several strategies with confusing wording and other strategies that several people found objectionable.

In response to your comments, we have eliminated some strategies and changed the wording on others. You will soon be given another opportunity to comment on the reworked document.

The committee approached the goals and strategies section fully aware that there would be no funds in the town budget for implementing many strategies. Nowhere in the document do you see wording like "add this to the budget" or "the town should pay for." Instead, you see wording like "the town should seek a way to pay for" or "town management should partner with" an organization.

Several people objected to the idea of "partnering" with local organizations to achieve some objectives. We have changed "partner with" to "work with." Several objectives require specialized knowledge and skills that the town officials do not have, grant writing skills in particular. For example, it makes sense for the town to work with Friends of Lake Winnecook on improving the water quality in Unity Pond. Similarly, the selectmen are already working with Unity College's development office to research the need for lodging in town.

In the reworked document, we removed most mentions of non-profit organizations by name. A comprehensive plan is good for 20 years, and organizations may come and go during that time, so it is better to reference them generically as "appropriate local organization."

We would like to clear up some confusion about the role of the comprehensive plan in relation to the land use ordinance. Maine Revised Statutes (<http://www.mainelegislature.org/legis/statutes/30-a/title30-Asec4352.html>) states that "A zoning ordinance must be pursuant to and consistent with a comprehensive plan adopted by the municipal legislative body."

The state's Comprehensive Plan Review Criteria Rule Chapter 208, page 42 (<http://www.maine.gov/sos/cec/rules/07/105/105c208.doc>) advises that

"The plan must include a Future Land Use Plan that is consistent with the community's vision and other policies in the plan. The Future Land Use Plan brings together plan elements that affect land use. It is intended to synthesize these elements into a cohesive guide to realizing the community's vision, including the development of land use regulations/ordinances."

The proposed new Land Use Ordinance has not been made public and hopefully a public call for comments on it similar to our survey will happen soon. Our document also references the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance which is not yet being revised.

Both the Comprehensive Plan and the revised Land Use Ordinance have to be approved by the town at town meeting.