

**TOWN OF LINCOLN  
MINUTES OF COMPREHENSIVE LONG RANGE PLAN  
STEERING COMMITTEE  
Held on September 4, 2008  
At 7:30 PM in the Donaldson Room, Lincoln Town Offices**

**PRESENT:**

Ken Hurd	Planning Board; HOBE sub-committee (Chairman)
Peter Sugar	CHUG sub-committee
Ken Bassett	LUED sub-committee
Sara Guerrero	LUED sub-committee
Jim Meadors	OSNR sub-committee
Angela Seaborg	Conservation Planner
Noah Eckhouse	FACTS sub-committee
Mark Whitehead	Town Planner
Anita Scheipers	Assistant Town Administrator
Judi Barrett	Community Opportunities Group
Patti Kelleher	Community Opportunities Group
Catherine Perry	Planning admin.

**Also in attendance:** Buzz Constable  
Neil Feinberg

**COORDINATION AND OVERLAP DISCUSSION**

Judi Barrett had circulated a paper entitled “Issues/ Questions” setting out a number of points, mostly about where to locate certain subject matter in the plan, which need to be settled at this stage. The Steering Committee addressed these points as follows:

**A. Master Plan Documents and Document Organization**

Ms. Barrett’s recommendations for the organization of sections within each topic element were accepted. The goals and key recommendations will come first followed by the key supporting material, with fuller background, analysis and more detailed recommendations after. The early parts of each element can then be incorporated in the executive summary. Implementation will be a separate chapter.

The document produced for the State of the Town Meeting will be a working version of the executive summary.

**B. Community Services and Facilities; Governance**

Ms. Barrett’s suggested division of content between the two elements was accepted. The Steering Committee decided to place the Governance element first.

**C. Teardown and Mansionization**

The Steering Committee thought this issue should be based in either housing or built environment; on balance it preferred built environment.

**D. Historic Preservation Bylaws, Regulations and Policies**

Ms. Barrett’s recommendation for the detail to be in the Cultural and Historic Resources element and a summary in the Built Environment element was accepted.

**E. Non-Profit Organizations**

This subject was placed within Economic Development.

## **F. Demographic Profile**

It was agreed to have a separate chapter on Population.

## **G. Community Facilities, Open Space, and Parks and Recreation**

It was agreed that active recreation facilities such as playgrounds and playing fields that need maintenance should be covered in the Community Facilities and Services element.

## **H. Trails and Roadside Paths**

After discussion, it was resolved to place roadside paths in Transportation, and trails in Open Space and Recreation. Peter Sugar recalled that the roadside paths were created mainly for safe transportation. However, it was noted that the connectivity between the two types of routes is important and that some trails also have a transportation role. They could be shown together on any maps that are included.

## **I. Land Use, Density and Lincoln's Physical Evolution**

Ms. Barrett pointed out that most master plans focus on land use and take this topic as far as designating land for particular uses or for proposed developments, shown on a map. From discussions, she was hearing reluctance to go this far in Lincoln, with an apparent preference for a policy approach that would keep the current framework that applies across most of town, of two acre residential zoning plus overlay districts, but add statements about criteria and process that would govern higher density developments. Previous Lincoln plans have pointed to broad areas and types of development, without going as far as detailed rezoning. The advantages and disadvantages of a spatial plan versus a policy plan were discussed. The former can give greater clarity, encourage desired developments and facilitate coordination of related elements such as infrastructure, whereas the latter can leave a longer timescale for public discussions and hold back more discretion for negotiations.

The Steering Committee considered that South Lincoln was likely to be the only place where it would be acceptable to alter zoning in the plan. It was agreed that elsewhere, criteria/ performance standards would be set out to govern the use of overlay zones, and some wording on process may be included. The LUED sub-committee said that it would discuss what to propose on process. It was agreed that all parties will need to continue to liaise on the approach going forward.

## **J. Commercial Development**

Ms. Barrett said she felt the need for direction from the town on how to approach the desire for broader revenue sources versus opposition to commercial development. She observed that different towns look at this in different ways. Noah Eckhouse suggested that commercial development should not be taken off the table, and commented that he saw a split between people who can afford to ignore increasing taxes and those for whom rising costs are a real problem. Ms. Barrett was concerned that the land use criteria may not address the issue clearly. Buzz Constable suggested that the need for more revenue should be recognized but that there may be creative alternative sources to consider, such as taxing home occupations or creating income-generating services. Jim Meadors was less certain that new revenue sources were needed; he did not want to rule out commercial development but wanted to explore whether it harms home values and evaluate it carefully.

It was agreed to place the topic within Economic Development so that it is not limited to a land use issue.

## **K. Community Survey and Project Timeline**

Mr. Whitehead has asked for a written report from the survey group by September 16<sup>th</sup>. He reported that Chris Hamilton and Phyllis Mutschler have been working on their sections. The report is expected to be concise and to focus on the survey process and data quality. Ms. Barrett was concerned about the tight timeframe to discuss the findings and incorporate them in material for SOTT. Other attendees were anxious not to spend too much time on it at the September 16<sup>th</sup> meeting because time is needed for discussion of sub-committees' proposals. Anita Scheipers suggested postponing fuller analysis of the survey to the Implementation stage, although some members felt there was a demand from the public to hear some results soon. CHUG is the main sub-committee that wants to make use of the survey results in its proposals. It was agreed that the September 16<sup>th</sup> meeting will simply receive the report from the survey group and discussion will be scheduled for October 7<sup>th</sup> [later changed to October 21<sup>st</sup>].

## **UPDATE OF SUB-COMMITTEES' GENERAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

Ms. Barrett had asked the sub-committees to consider whether the sets of goals and objectives that COG has on record need updating at this stage. LUED has sent a revised version and FACTS said that it would do so.

Ms. Barrett also asked each sub-committee to ensure that there is clear separation of their goals between the plan elements.

## **DISCUSSION OF SEPTEMBER 16<sup>th</sup> FULL CLRPC MEETING**

Mr. Whitehead explained that the purpose of the CLRPC meeting is for the sub-committees to outline their key proposals and obtain feedback from the other groups. Items that are potentially controversial should be raised for discussion, and the meeting could be viewed as a dress rehearsal for SOTT. Proposals could be modified as a result of discussion.

CHUG stated that it will be holding focus group discussions on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> and the conclusions may affect the proposals. Mr. Whitehead reminded the sub-committee chairs that information gathering has to be drawn to a close at this time and decisions be made based on what is known.

It was agreed to set a strict time schedule for the meeting to ensure all topics are covered, and to present all of them before beginning discussion. Each sub-committee's key points should be sent to Mr. Whitehead by the 11<sup>th</sup> so that they can be circulated to all CLRPC members in advance. The 24<sup>th</sup> will be considered a potential overflow date.

## **DISCUSSION OF SOTT PREPARATION**

The State of the Town Meeting is on Saturday November 8<sup>th</sup>, 9:00- 12:00 AM. The CLRP Committee report needs drafting and sending to the Selectmen's office by October 13<sup>th</sup>. Tim Higgins has suggested that an interactive format be planned for the meeting and explained in the report. The CLRP has been allocated two hours of the three hour SOTT Meeting.

The difficulty of achieving any depth of discussion in the time available was discussed. Ms. Barrett suggested picking a few cross-cutting issues but it was felt that all key draft proposals need to be made public. Mr. Eckhouse suggested that the SOTT presentation be based on the draft executive summary. Sara Guerrero suggested holding

further forums after SOTT. It was agreed to schedule one night with multiple rooms for group briefing sessions for members of the public who wanted to hear more or make suggestions. This will be on November 13<sup>th</sup> in the Town Offices, 7:30 – 9:30 PM and there will be two 45 minute sessions.

A public presentation will also be made in January, to precede Town Meeting.

#### **STATUS OF RESPONSES TO WORKING PAPERS**

This was not discussed.

#### **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Due to shortage of time, reports were not presented.

#### **FINANCE REVIEW**

Mr. Whitehead reported that an invoice has been received from COG for work on the Natural Resources and Open Space papers and GIS mapping, totaling \$6,425. The committee voted unanimously to approve payment of the invoice.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM.

Submitted by Catherine Perry