

Comprehensive Plan Committee
Minutes from Meeting of June 9, 2021

Present were: Jonathan Hall, Co-Chair; John Gray, Co-Chair; Allen Kratz; Nancy Sanford; Bud Fisher; Jackie Pike; John Kimball; and Sarah Cox.

Jarod Farn-Guillette, Planner with the Hancock County Planning Commission

Debbie Grimmig, Secretary

1. Discuss status of following Plan sections in progress – Jonathan Hall and Jarod Farn-Guillette met to review all of the posted sections, to make edits and to determine what, if any, work needed to be completed.
 - Broadband – They integrated all of the comments provided by Abbie McMillen into the draft which Jonathan Hall recently distributed, with the exception of one. This final language change was reviewed by the Committee via screen sharing and was subsequently included. The Broadband section is ready to post on the website for public comment. Jonathan Hall requested that Jarod Farn-Guillette forward him the draft section with all of the final edits included.
 - Population – Abbie McMillen noted information in one of the data sets did not make sense. Jarod Farn-Guillette will review Abbie McMillen’s e-mail and make the necessary changes.
 - Housing –At John Gray’s suggestion, language relative to mobile homes was changed to make it less offensive to mobile home owners. Chris Raphael suggested another goal be added -- “Facilitate higher density housing options to provide increased affordability and accessibility.”
 - Public Facilities & Capital Investment – Jarod Farn-Guillette will work with John Gray to finalize the Capital Investment information by the meeting of 6/23.
 - Marine Resources – One of the maps was re-introduced after it was inadvertently dropped between various drafts. Jarod Farn-Guillette received the 2014 – 2019 data from the Bureau of Marine Resources which he will update before the meeting for June 23rd. There was discussion on some of the elements effecting the future viability of the lobster industry, including the cost of fuel, effect of climate change on the movement of lobsters, and wind farms. The reference to wind farms was eliminated. The Committee recognizes that there is anxiety about the impact wind farms may have, but since none have been stalled, the potential impact is speculative. Sarah Cox noted that the past 10 to 20 years have been perceived as superb, while the next 10 to 20 years are expected to be not good. Sarah Cox will fine tune this section. The Marine Resources, Recreation and Water Resources sections should all be reviewed to ensure there are no inconsistencies. The Marine Resources Section will be posted with the understanding that missing data will be added and more revisions may be made.
 - Current Land Use – This section will need goals and objectives, which will include considering what the community has and how to maintain it. This section will be discussed at the meeting on 6/23.
 - All remaining data needed for all sections will be included by 6/23 meeting.
2. Jarod Farn-Guillette will present a summary of what remains to be done and a schedule for completion, and we will discuss it – Jarod Farn-Guillette shared a timeline with the Committee which detailed elements of the Comprehensive Plan remaining and the expected time for the

completion of each element. Jarod Farn-Guillette will forward the timeline to Jonathan Hall for distribution to the Committee.

- The Executive Summary and the Appendices should be completed by the 7/7/2021. Jarod Farn-Guillette advised that the Executive Summary be written by the Committee as it reflects the particular interests of the community.
 - Preparation of Final Document – completed by 7/31/2021.
 - State Review – The Plan will be sent to the State for review of findings for consistency. State review usually takes 6 to 8 weeks.
 - Town Referendum – Town vote occurs after completion of the review by the State.
 - Vision Statement – Generally the Vision Statement is done at the front end of the Comprehensive Planning process as a way to launch the project. The Vision Statement sets the tone for the whole plan. There was discussion of the history of public engagement early in the process. In the spring of 2018, community groups were held and the community survey was developed with the assistance of the Hancock County Planning Commission. The survey was distributed to all residents of Brooksville. The results were compiled and the initial overall goals were developed from the survey results. One community group was held to discuss results of the survey. Jarod Farn-Guillette requested documentation (dates, rough notes of meetings, etc.) of any community engagement meetings. The State wants to see that some in-person public meetings occurred. As long as the community demonstrates best efforts for community engagement during the pandemic, the State will probably be satisfied.
3. Jarod Farn-Guillette will suggest how we should prepare to think through and write the Future Land Use section – the last one! – Jarod Farn-Guillette provided guidance on what is needed to complete the Future Land Use section. The Committee will draft a proposed future land use map. Proposed future land use is not zoning and new ordinances are not part of the future land use section. He will distribute a digital land use map (or Committee members may use their paper maps) and asked the Committee to mark the maps with proposed changes. Future land use changes might include habitats which need more protection than is currently provided by the shoreland zoning ordinances; area of scenic views that need protection; where industry should occur; what areas should be developed or remain undeveloped; areas for residential development; areas for public access to water or recreation; and environmental hazards that could contaminate water or soil. Jarod Farn-Guillette will send samples of what other communities have done with respect to future land use.

Nancy Sanford expressed the hope that the Committee can have a conversation about land use issues, otherwise why go through the exercise of looking at future land use. People are impacted by what others are doing on their property. Other Committee members feel that we are on precipice of losing the rural character of Brooksville. There is tension created those who have an attitude that they have a right to do whatever they want on their property without any recognition of the impact some of these activities have on their neighbors. The Committee will consider what land use issues were raised in the community survey. There is merit to having policies that preserve the way of life in Brooksville, but at the same time the Committee recognizes that the Plan has to be approved by the voters. There needs to be a balance of interests. The goal is to highlight problems and suggest solutions without scaring people. Jonathan Hall noted that in the past there has been efforts to mitigate dilapidated buildings and use the land for the benefit of the community. The town philosophy has been to have as little

zoning as possible while at the same time providing assistance with what the homeowner wants to do.

The question was raised as to who can vote on the Comprehensive Plan – any resident or those who are registered to vote in Brooksville? John Gray said the vote would be by paper ballot and registered voters will have the opportunity to vote. The Town Clerk may register people to vote at the time of the vote. The Community Survey was distributed to every resident or property owner in town. Jarod Farn-Guillette believes that any resident of the town has a right to vote on the Plan.

4. Discuss methods of soliciting public opinion – To date, Jonathan Hall has received very little comments from the public on the posted drafts, other than from the Committee members or the friends of the CPC. Community members may not be interested in reviewing pages and pages of text and data, but might be interested in reviewing a summary. He suggested writing a summary of key findings and implementation strategies. The summary could be made available at the Town House and e-mailed using the distribution list maintained by Gayle Clifford. Nancy Sanford asked how the Committee will handle feedback that is different from the direction the Committee is taking. Jonathan Hall responded that in fact the Committee has accommodated concerns raised by community members, for example regarding mobile homes. Sarah Cox said that people will want to know two things – What are you taking away and what will it cost? There are costs associated with some of the implementation strategies such as additional hours for the Code Enforcement Officer. There was consensus that distribution of a summary is a good way to get the information out there and to involve more people.
5. Public Comment – No members of the public were in attendance.
6. Schedule Next Meeting – Next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday June 23, 2021 at 6:30 pm. The focus of the meeting will be future land use.