

# Affordable Housing

Kristi Mathieson <[REDACTED]>

Wed 10/14/2020 4:50 PM

To:town comments <tcomments@kitteryme.org>;

Cc:Matt Brock ; Judy Spiller-Personal ;

Hello Town Council Members,

Thank you for taking a moment to read my note. As the District 1 House of Representatives unopposed candidate, I wanted to express my support for the extensive work put forward in the affordable housing ordinance package. Kittery needs to ensure those who work to make our community a thriving and special town can afford to live within the community they work.

I fully support the Housing Committees work to rezone specific areas for mixed use development, their work to create incentives for developers to ensure some affordable housing and to establish a permanent Housing Council Committee for the future. I look forward to working at the state level to assist Kittery in developing future measures in support of affordable housing.

Kindly submitted,  
Kristi Mathieson

--

Kristi Mathieson MS, RD, LD, CLT, CPT  
New Hampshire Natural Health Clinic  
304 Riverway Place  
Bedford, NH 03110  
[nhnatural.com](http://nhnatural.com)  
fax 815-642-1118

# Fwd: Wed. 8/9 Pubic Hearing Title 6

Shaye Robbins <[REDACTED]>

Thu 10/15/2020 5:30 PM

To:town comments <tcomments@kitteryme.org>;

Hello,

I am reviewing the Town Council Packet of October 14. I was away and was unable to register to participate due to connectivity issues during travel.

I do note however that my comments, included below, which were sent on September 3, 2020 do not seem to be included in the packet in regard to animal control, nor are any notes included in the summary referencing comments that are in favor of passing the previous title as written. In fact no comments regarding the animal control were included at all. As the public hearings were switched and last minute changes occurred through out this process making it difficult as an informed, and interested citizen I was disappointed that my comments were not included, I was not able to participate in public comment due to the changes and last minute switches. I am unclear as to whether further public comment on this code; labeled draft; will occur.

I am unclear whether the document included in the Town Council packet is in fact a draft of Phase One- as it is not labeled a Draft of Phase 1; or if it is considered the final and only draft. Again unclear with the labeling provided.

Although I understand a working group is being recruited and I will be putting my name in for consideration, I am unclear as to where some of the most important items to me in the code have gone. These surround the predictability issues of walking on public lands including leashing while walking on public lands; and 10 ft of space from pets.

If there is a Phase 2 I would like to know what items will be included in Phase 2 as several items of extreme importance to me, as noted in my Sept 3, 2020 notes which do not seem to have been included, seem to have disappeared from this draft entirely. As written, and labeled, and with these exceptions and no clear written focus as to what Phase 2 will and will not include; I am not for passing this ordinance as I believe it is incomplete, and includes language that is unclear.

Please note; Had I known that the section below B 33-34 which are labeled DRAFT OCT 14, 2020 I would specifically have addressed this section in public comments, perhaps I still have the opportunity. Again- unclear.

<START>

**B. 33-34DRAFT:** October 14, 2020 dog for hunting, where hunting is permitted, provided the dog is under the voice control of its owner.

No dog is allowed to approach within ten (10) feet or have contact with of any person other than the owner or responsible party unless such person has communicated to the owner or responsible party, by word or

gesture, their consent to be approached by the dog.

<END>

The item in red is crossed out in the draft of Oct 14, 2020. I would very much like the language to return to approach within ten-or even 8 feet which gives a clear ability for one party to communicate to another. For example: a dog gets too close one party can say to the other "please respect the 10 ft rule" or "No closer than 8 feet please" either one is preferable to the stress of watching a dog bound toward, or move toward a loved one, who is unstable, small or otherwise fearful and have to simply wait until the dog takes down the other person. For myself, who walks in the park and on the beach with small people and during my work hours, being approached by happy, wet, slobbery or jumping unleashed dogs creates a stress that ends with "Leash all dogs at all times" The amount of space rule, is incredibly important to voice control, and shared spacing if leashing at all times is not the option.

As written this section is unclear- What is word or gesture? What is approach? What if a dog starts toward me at 30 feet is that not allowed? What do I say? "Do not approach? Always walk in a direction away from people or you are approaching?" The way this is written, without a numerical, understood amount of space, seems to create more, not less ambiguity. Please note this rule needs to work wether a dog is on a leash (which includes a defined amount of space) or not.

The following item; Also does not clarify the responsible party or provide a manner in which to communicate or educate the public. Are these leashed dogs? Off Leash dogs? Without knowing this, I am unable to provide meaningful comment because the language is ambiguous. I do not agree that 1 person is able to be the responsible party to 3 off leash dogs. Being responsible includes waste, approaching, and voice control. It is difficult to imagine a majority of people being able to profile this level of responsibility equally to each pet. This was a major switch from 1 dog off leash.

38 D. No person may be a responsible party for more than 3 dogs at any time while in a Town park.

Thank you for hearing my comments, I am not for this Title Draft of Oct 14, 2020 being adopted as written.

Best,

Shaye Robbins  
Kittery Point

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Shaye Robbins <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Wed. 8/9 Pubic Hearing Title 6  
**Date:** September 3, 2020 at 3:49:07 PM EDT  
**To:** [TownComments@kitteryme.org](mailto:TownComments@kitteryme.org)

I am writing in support of the proposed ordinance changes Title 6 Animal Control as outlined in the Town Council Packet released Sept 3

I support these changes to current code for the following reasons:

- 1. The clarifications to the code are necessary for the Animal Control Officer to provide effective enforcement.** It is a constant refrain “enforce the existing rules” But the way the existing rules are written we have determined the code has to be clearer for enforcement to be possible. The ACO, Town of Kittery Chief of Police and Town Manger have all reviewed the ordinances, given professional opinion on the needs to make the work of the ACO more effective, and those updates have been included within the ordinance. **Not passing the Title as presented means the loopholes and lack of enforcement continue.**
- 2. The clarifications on leaving of bagged waste and the clarifications on leashes on public land are supportive to our Town of Kittery staff-specifically the DPW staff.** Our community staff are not the responsible for the picking up of dog waste, bagged or otherwise. When dog waste is left behind by intentional or unintentional actions, the final responsibility for clean up lies with staff. This is true **regardless of the sustained efforts of numerous volunteers** who speak of daily clean ups by their own efforts. When a dog is on a leash it is difficult to walk away from waste, and when one has to keep waste while walking it removes the ability to forget, and creates a more beautiful, trash free experience for those entering our parks next, and is consistent with the carry in carry out policy applied to all visitors alike.
- 3. The inclusion of leashes creates a more predictable environment for visitors.** For those who are unstable; small; fearful; or in need of or desire personal space and this includes both humans and animals; the update in the code for use of leashes, defining voice control, and the 10 ft area of space around an individual (again animal or human) creates a more respectful and predictable environment for the many user types in the park. I point out to the Council that the surveying done by the Parks Commission returned results that were consistent with Dog Owners asking for more stringent leashing and approach laws for the protection of their family members- their dogs. Like people, not all dogs like to be approached by other dogs. This code up date makes that clear and consistent.
- 4. The step of clarifying the code on voice control, hours open to dog visitation, number of dogs allowed off leash under voice control, allows the Park Manager and Parks Commission to move forward with appropriate and accurate signage that reflects the actual code thereby strengthening the communication to and education of the general public.** This education step will likely be very welcome by those who are frequent, respectful users of the park, and public lands. Those who cannot abide will either not come, learn, or be fined; thereby improving the experience for those dog owners who currently struggle with the mixed messaging and interpretations of etiquette our code currently allows. Our residents who are respectful users of the park should be supported. Let me say to those who own dogs and use the parks: If you already have a good voice control relationship with your dog you will notice no difference; if you already pick up your waste you will notice no difference; and if you already are able to walk with your dog on or off leash without approaching others you will notice no difference. If what I am hearing is true, and the majority of people with dogs never see any problem and do not see these changes as necessary- then the majority of people with dogs will notice no difference. Those few people, those few bad apples however will notice a difference because enforcement will be real and valid.

5. **The clarifications in the code on treatment of animals in general was way out of date and incredibly necessary.** Anyone who likes animals should be in support of this. If we do not pass this title there are no protections in place for the treatment in animals.

6. **The most important part of these code clarifications to me is that dog owners and their dogs are not banned from either Sea Point Beach or Fort Foster.** This has been the stance of the Parks Commission and is written in the Parks 5 year plan approved by this Town Council.

Again I believe the clarifications in the document are **good for** the ACO to provide **effective enforcement;** the **support of DPW staff;** **reduce** both the incidences of and visual noise of **dog waste;** **dogs who are not cared for** and **does not ban dogs from the parks.** All together these changes support a larger cross section of the community in using the parks, as well as both the individuals and dog owners who need more predictable environments. **I encourage you to pass the ordinance.**

Thank you

Shaye Robbins  
Kittery Point, ME

# Title 16 - affordable housing

Kristi Mathieson <[REDACTED]>

Sat 10/24/2020 3:48 PM

To:town comments <tcomments@kitteryme.org>;

Thank you for your continued leadership and important vote on Monday, October 26th. My name is Kristi Mathieson. I am the District 1 House of Representatives candidate and am writing in support of Title 16.

With median house values in Kittery at \$472,000, 1 bedroom monthly rentals at \$1250 and 2 bedroom rentals @ \$2450 (a 26% increase in the last year) we are pricing many of our essential workers out of living in the community they support.

A Kittery school teachers typical salary is between \$41,000-44,000/year, well below the amount needed to purchase a \$472,000 home. To rent a two bedroom apartment a Kittery a teacher would have to spend 71% of their salary (just for rent, assuming they can find an available rental). My husband is a math teacher, in order for us to afford to live in Kittery he commutes 30 minutes to teach in a different district.

How can we imagine a more diverse and attractive community when young professionals and families cannot afford to live in our community? We are in a place now where affordable housing is a major issue, people who work for the town -- city employees, law enforcement first responders and school teachers cannot afford to live in our community. Please be a leader in our town and vote yes for Title 16. I will look forward to working at the state level to support you on this important issue.

Thank you,  
Kristi

--

Kristi Mathieson MS, RD, LD, CLT, CPT  
New Hampshire Natural Health Clinic  
304 Riverway Place  
Bedford, NH 03110  
[nhnatural.com](http://nhnatural.com)  
fax 815-642-1118

# Comment for Discussion - town council mtg 10.26

Fair Tide Executive Director <[REDACTED]>

Mon 10/26/2020 11:02 AM

To:town comments <tcomments@kitteryme.org>;

Good evening,

I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for Councilor Brock's years of service on the Kittery town council. His fervent efforts to advance affordable housing initiatives are indicative of his commitment to the betterment of this community, and a shining example of a town leader listening to and responding to the needs of its citizens. I hope his send off this evening includes the passage of the final measure in the Affordable Housing Package that he has worked so hard to push forward. Thank you, Councilor Brock for not only being a strong advocate, but for serving as an agent of real change.

With gratitude,

Emily Flinkstrom

**Emily Flinkstrom, MSW**

Executive Director

Fair Tide

*A Long Term Solution to Homelessness*

15 State Road

Kittery, ME 03904

Tel: 207-439-6376 ext.1

Fax: 207-438-0294

[www.fairtide.org](http://www.fairtide.org)

# Dog owner deliberately ruined Seapoint Beach...

SPJ 

Sun 10/25/2020 2:02 PM

To:town comments &lt;tcomments@kitteryme.org&gt;;

Hello. Please include my observations about dogs defecating & jumping on locals at Seapoint Beach & Fort Foster.

All summer, after work, I tried to get some fresh air & sunshine and a swim at Kittery Point public areas.

Along the roads were threatening disturbing signs of accusations about our town and dogs .

I could not enjoy a walk or swim as dogs seem to target me to jump upon, to the delight of their owners.

So I waited until the autumn, and today I went to enjoy the blessing of accessing the sea and local woods.

**Sea Point Beach was loaded with dogs unrestrained.** Out of state automobiles overwhelmed the parking spaces.

It is not fair to ask of me to pay taxes when you permit the overtaking of public spaces, beaches woods, forests by harassing people who use and allow their dogs and themselves to show Kittery that they can deny peaceful enjoyment of nature to us.

Please take my sad complaint into consideration when making strict rules concerning pets at Ft Foster and Seapoint Beach and our walking forest areas. thank you suzy johnson