

## Oakland Comprehensive Plan

1996 Review Committee

12.28.2017

4pm

Attendees: Robert Nutting, Gary Bowman, Mark Fisher, Dale Sturtevant, and Chuck Sweigart

Facilitator: Garvan Donegan, CMGC

### Agenda

1. Overview
2. General review of 1996 Plan
3. Edits and comments on each section
4. Design and layout of new CompPlan
5. Introduction of maps
6. Next steps

### Overview

#### General Review

- 1996 Plan is dry and boring; the new CompPlan should be written in positive language. Subcommittee should explore ways to add creativity to the CompPlan.
- Pretty much every section needs to be updated, and in several cases a complete rewrite is necessary.
- The 1996 Plan is not user-friendly; the new CompPlan should be useful as a manual that a businessperson, official, etc. could carry around with them and refer to regularly.
- The new CompPlan should be framed as a guide to achieve the community's desired land use.
- 1996 Plan implies a bias to a specific planning philosophy that may not be appropriate for Oakland. There are many ways to steer development in order to respect rural and growth areas: infrastructure, geography, traffic, etc.
- One good point to bring forth from the 1996 Plan is the lack of visibility of downtown when arriving in Oakland.

#### Edits and Comments on Each Section

Table of Contents – at seven pages, this section is too long. It does not need to include every subsection of the CompPlan.

Summary – this section needs a complete rewrite. It should be 1-2 pages and include the essence of the community: where are we; how did we get here; where do we want to be; how do we get there. Should not mention “zoning”.

History – one of the more usable sections of the CompPlan; will be updated to include recent history. A question to explore is how we articulate the balance of being a bedroom community with significant commercial development (e.g. FirstPark, KMD, Valley).

Regional Context – this section requires additions and updates. Subcommittee will need to decide how to characterize Oakland – is it a “gateway”, “heart of”, or something else?

Survey – the Survey & Public Input subcommittee will select 1996 survey questions to include in the new survey, which will make for an interesting historical comparison. The new survey will be shorter, and the Survey subcommittee aims for a response rate higher than the 1996 rate of 11.5%.

Inventory and Analysis – this section will be updated by relevant subject matter experts, and will include updated data provided by the State. In addition, this subcommittee would like to add more analysis, include a nicer introduction, and improve the overall flow.

Subsections:

Downtown – this section may become “Commercial Development”, separated into “downtown” and “KMD business area”, with a feature on FirstPark. The Oakland Business Committee would be an appropriate body to write this section.

Facilities - Town of Oakland has updated street surveys and equipment/facilities inventory.

Social Services – subcommittee shall boost the KVCAP and public transportation section.

Utilities – special attention should be given to water, waste water, and solid waste.

Communications – update to reflect broadband as critical infrastructure.

Open Space – include Messalonskee rail trail and Colby-Sawyer farm. Include a map of open spaces, trails, conserved land, and publicly-owned lands, showing legal access to these spaces and trails.

Natural Resources – simplify the technical language

Policies – this section needs a complete overhaul. Rather than long-winded case statements, the section should be organized into simple policy statements with strategies for implementation listed underneath. At the end of the section should be an implementation matrix.

**Design and Layout**

While subcommittee members had no particular concern with the layout and format, the new CompPlan will be shorter, more organized, and easier to read and use.

Where possible, data will be included in an appendix, with a summary of the data integrated into the text via sidebars or footnotes.

Photos and stories will make the Plan more engaging.

**Maps**

Garvan displayed several maps provided by the State. These maps are powerful visualizations of important topics, including wetlands and infrastructure. All maps are available in the Google shared drive, along with updated data from the State.

### **Next Steps**

- Once the 1996 CompPlan is digitized, Garvan will send relevant sections to subject matter experts (e.g. department heads, town historian) for updates and edits.
- CMGC staff and interested subcommittee members will compile edited sections and begin writing the first draft of the CompPlan. The first section of the CompPlan (history, inventory and analysis) can be written now; policies, strategies, and implementation will be delayed until public input is collected.
  - o This subcommittee advocates for the inclusion of youth as an important stakeholder

Respectfully Submitted,

Elaine Theriault