**VILLAGE PARCEL MASTER PLAN**

**Meeting Minutes – April 24, 2019**

Attendees: Laurie Smith, Town Manager and Werner Gilliam, Town Planner

Steering: Allen Daggett, Chair, John Harcourt, Jamie Houtz, Tim Committee: Patterson, Michael Weston, Rebecca Young, Russ Grady

 (via Skype)

Absent: Connie Dystra, Sheila Matthews-Bull

Consultants: Bob Metcalf, Mitchell & Associates, Dan Bacon, Gorrill Palmer, Chris DiMatteo, Gorrill Palmer, Tom Dwortsky, Camoin Associates, Kara Wilbur, Principle

* Introduction to Steering Committee Members, Town Staff and Consultant Team.
* Bob Metcalf and consulting team provided overview of process for developing Master Plan. Data collection, interviews, public process, preliminary Master Plan, public information and comment opportunities, final documentation for Master Plan.
* Bob Metcalf provided the committee with an overview of the property, discussed wetland conditions, including vernal pools, wetland impact and permitting; current limits of clearing.
* Discussion – goals and objectives and questions.
* Jamie Houtz: Character of the parcel “Island in the Stream” - how will this site complement the town village, not located in existing village but close.
* Mike Weston: The plan needs to compliment town (village).
* Russ Grady: Property located in Village Residential and Free Enterprise, emphasized being good stewards of the land as important. Can lots be sold for uses like elderly affordable housing? Property/plan needs to be part of town village – connectivity and a discussion regarding the expectation of having development recoup a portion of the town’s purchase of the property.  Another member emphasized the same point about private development offsetting the tax burden.
* Tim Patterson: Public and benefit, how to underwrite cost of public uses, pedestrian connectivity bicycle transportation are important.
* John Harcourt: Need to encourage uses; develop affordable housing; create interactivity community spaces.
* Mike Weston: Identify opportunities for recovery of tax dollars from development.
* Allen Daggett: Agree on identifying opportunity for return on town investment dollars.
* Laurie Smith responded to the tax payer burden by stating that the first priority is to limit any additional costs to the 10 million spent, and the second priority would be to reduce the bond through potentially refinancing it either through a reduced amount or identifying public uses on the property which would be tax exempt.
* Rebecca Young: She abuts the property; enjoys the wildlife; concern with long term impact to wildlife; suggested that students become involved in this Master Plan process; protection of wildlife habitat is important.

Werner Gilliam: Werner highlighted interests from his perspective; how will it be zoned?, what are the mechanics to that zoning (contract zoning?) Are there partnerships that need to be in place to develop the property, new zoning (or contract) will identify uses and how development can occur and look; public private partnership will be important; identify uses and project investors. Dan followed up with a response with regard to the ‘implementation plan’ component of the project.

General Comments

1. Mention communication with the community and how the town’s newsletter can be utilized, which had a deadline this past Friday.
2. Question with regard to if there was a wildlife assessment done. Bob answered yes since the property’s past development scheme was subject to a SLDA permit with MDEP.
3. Can the wildlife report be made available? Yes, (Bob) but might want to consider how much of the past development scheme should be part of the public discussion if the intent is to have a fresh look at the property. Mention of land being conveyed to land trust as part of the report’s recommendations (?)
4. The term “character” was brought up by the committee as related to the town’s comprehensive plan efforts and that the proposed master plan needs to consistent with the character of the town.  At the same time the notion of the property being an “island” on to itself was raised and discussed as being an issue as well as possibly an asset (Kara or Dan?) depending on the interconnections to the rest of the community.  Some committee members emphasized the need for the property to be “connected”.
5. Committee member thought the road between North and School Streets is a positive attribute in itself.
6. Comment with regard to how can the community be encourage to use the property in their “everyday lives”
7. Discussion on schedule. Done with the visioning by end of May; Mid-September for the full master plan; and October for the complete document after Selectmen review.
8. Public outreach discussion.  Committee felt evenings and weekends needed with emphasis on a variety of opportunities for input.  Examples were given regarding the paper mailing vs. survey monkey, more input received with the former.
9. Following Dan and Kara’s description of the public outreach Town Manager expressed the lack of staff/time to monitor a Facebook page.