

Council Chambers: 5:00pm

Attendees: Elisa Winter- Holben, Winter Holben Architecture & Design/Resident; Ken Gilbride, Property Owner; Terry Lochhead, Resident; Thomas Roberts, Beach Pea Baking Co, Chris DiMatteo, Town Planner; David Rich, DPW Commissioner; Michelle McDonald, Town Hall; Tom Errico, TYLin International; Mitchell Rasor, MRLD; Jamel Torres, SMPDC/KACTS; Kendra Amaral, Town Manager

Working Group Member Absent: Donnajean Ahigian, Tom Emerson, Marissa Day

Agenda Item #1: Introductions.

Agenda Item #2: Planning Board Zoning Update from Chris DiMatteo: Mr. DiMatteo gave a brief overview about the Foreside proposed ordinance change to add inns with between 12 and 30 guest rooms. Mr. DiMatteo said the Planning Board would like to have the draft recommendations from the Traffic Study by 11/9/17, prior to making an amendment recommendation to Town Council about the proposed ordinance change. Inns are a permitted use in the Kittery Foreside Zone (MU-KF), the amendment would allow inns to have up to 12 rooms. Amendment includes a special exception to allow hotels to have 12 to 30 rooms with a parking management plan requirement. There will also be a provision to prohibit parking as a principle use after a demolition of a structure along Government, Walker and Wentworth streets.

The consultants were asked to attend 11/9 Planning Board workshop.

Agenda Item #3: Draft Land Use and Urban Design Recommendations:

Figure 11 on page 10 (Land Use and Urban Design Recommendations Summary) illustrated a greenway/ pedestrian bridge- the proposed pedestrian/bicycle way was located beside the railroad right-of-way (ROW). The greenway could connect to Traip Academy for parking and access to the public boat launch.

Mr. DiMatteo mentioned the greenway could be an Eastern Trail opportunity. Mr. Rasor mentioned it could be possible to negotiate with the B&M Railroad to have a multi-use path in the 70-ft ROW.

Page 12 showed connectivity and proximity. Figure 14 illustrated “pedestrian sheds” or series of 5-minute walks.

Elisa Winter-Holben asked if current zoning in Foreside allows for teardown of buildings for surface parking lots or for buildings. She asked if an approval process for tearing-down/rebuilding and rebuilding in the foreside will be recommended through the study. Mr. Errico asked Mr. Rasor if he has any design regulations that could be developed in situations where the developer could demolish and rebuild structure or parking lots that community might not want, “good & bad” rebuild scenarios.

Kendra Amaral was concerned about a future demolition ordinance that could have a detailed process but little action, which could lead to buildings deteriorating due to neglect over time. Mr. DiMatteo asked if there were incentives for adaptive reuse, or ways to provide a code that would encourage adaptive reuse. Working group members expressed interest in adaptive reuse and preserving the existing building stock.

Mr. Rasor confirmed that the buildout scenario and building footprints were a starting point for analysis. Ms. Winter-Holben asked how the recommendations will inform zoning changes. Mr. Rasor explained the process of getting public feedback on scenarios. After scenarios have public support, the consultants

can review ordinances and identify where the scenarios do/don't support the vision. The consultants will articulate that "vision."

Mr. Rasor suggested new standards for rebuilding, or for allowing, buildings to move closer to the street could be introduced. He also suggested introducing new standards for surface parking.

Ms. Winter-Holben mentioned that the roof pitch requirement in the ordinance does not work well with zone height limit in the MU-KF. Mr. Rasor agreed that this is an important point because most iconic, historic buildings do not have pitched roofs.

Ms. Winter-Holben asked if the consultants can provide any comparable zoning from other towns. The working group discussed different styles of zoning.

Mr. DiMatteo asked if the consultants could include incentives as part of their recommendations.

Ms. Amaral asked if the Foreside infrastructure can handle more development and still retain or enhance desired community character.

Mr. Rasor said there are targeted opportunity areas. In general, the area is built out. There are a couple lots of interest. He referenced page 17 which illustrated a contemporary hotel on a Government Street parcel. Mr. Rasor explained that the illustration was meant to show that style of building would be out of scale from the rest of the neighborhood, although the footprint is comparable to that of York Hospital (16,000 sq ft shown in Figure 19), which is in a different zone but within the study area. The second illustration on Government Street could have five residential Townhouses, comparable to the the new residential units on State Road (4600 sq ft shown in Figure 18). Both examples were meant to demonstrate the scale of the neighborhood.

Ms. Winter-Holben asked if the code could be based on size of lot instead of building square footage.

Mr. Rasor answered yes, and mentioned other towns allow it as long as the project can meet requirements like setbacks, ratios, building height, etc. It was suggested Kittery consider building street orientation.

Mr. Amaral asked about infill development and if community character could benefit and what uses were needed in the zone. Mr. Rasor explained the 5 scenarios are in locations that could be redeveloped or be development sites. The scenarios reinforced intersections and squares. Mr. DiMatteo asked about overarching impacts of residential development and commercial development throughout the study area. Mr. Rasor explained single-family homes are not illustrated in the zone, rather mixed-use development (residential above, commercial below the building). Ms. Amaral asked about uses that could sustain the business economy in the Foreside. Mr. DiMatteo said most of the focus in the Foreside has been on retaining residential character and asked if there could be rezoning to have mixed use and commercial development be low-impact in the residential zone.

Mr. Rasor suggested if the corridor approach to development, where buildings could front the streets.

The group discussed creating connections and consistency between zones, especially Walker Street and Gourmet Alley; development could be guided in to areas where more capacity could be handled. It was suggested that Wallingford could have its own zone to stabilize growth and protect its character.

The corner parking lot near Wallingford Square was discussed. It was determined that a park or other public space, may not be the best use of the parking lot because of the busy intersection. He explained that water access would be exciting and possibly a better gathering space. There was discussion about the public dock near Wallingford Square and the nearby sewer easement and whether or not that area could be used as a public gathering space.

Mr. Rasor explained that the Walker Street and Route 1 intersection could be reconfigured to enhance “sense of place.” Other intersections, “squares” were reviewed: Wentworth and Whipple Street, and Government Street and Route 1 (near John Paul Jones Park). People may feel more comfortable walking if sense of place is enhanced and transitions between areas are more attractive. Integration of the Route 1 corridor with character of Wallingford Square to help to guide growth, build capacity without losing quality, was suggested.

Mr. Rasor explained potential build out scenario at ambulance site, 4500 sq ft building. It could be redesigned to have residential second floor. The building could be moved closer to the street, current zoning setbacks are limiting.

There was discussion about Wallingford Square and the idea of a boutique hotel. Mr. DiMatteo discussed that the Planning Board would like to figure out moving forward what uses make sense and what impacts would be based on accommodations in the Foreside. The working group expressed concerns about a 30 room hotel in Wallingford Square including traffic, parking, and delivery trucks.

Agenda Item #4: Review of Letter for MHPC

Consultants reviewed a letter from Maine Historic Preservation Commission regarding John Paul Jones Park. Consultants only sent conceptual sketches to the commission for review. Although its role is only advisory, the Historic Commission was concerned about recommendations changing the motorist experience and view of the monument.

Mr. Rasor explained his opinion that pedestrian experience is also important. Mr. Rasor said the park is isolated and should be better integrated with the community. Mr. Errico said that the Commission may not understand the scope of the project, as no detailed design plan was submitted.

Ms. Lochhead did not support park concept because trees could be removed to accommodate travel lanes. Ms. Winter-Holben said there the park could be a lot more pleasant with walkways to the park. Mr. Errico explained the consultants created a scenario for pedestrian access if the one-way road remained.

Agenda Item #5: Draft Traffic and Parking Recommendations

a. New Item- Crosswalk at Dame Street and Walker Street (across from Dance Hall)

Mr. Errico explained the DOT project does not include an intersection in this location. Crosswalks will be located at Wentworth/Government Street intersection with signal, and at Jones Avenue where the intersection will be moved closer to the Dance Hall. Adding a crosswalk at Dame Street would create a loss in parking. A new signal at Wentworth/Government Street will help the existing intersection.

Mr. Rich said adding a new crosswalk at Dame Street could create a traffic back up at the signaled intersection.

Agenda Item #6: October 25, 2017 Public Meeting- Agenda and Materials for presentations

Group discussed meeting should include specific areas (“best hits”) and an item for overall vision, with narrative, support and graphics. Topics to be on Route 1, Walker Street, John Paul Jones Park, and other “hot spots.” Love Lane removed from list. PSNY not to be discussed as this is a larger traffic study, PSNY has been involved. Worked group decided public meeting combine open house (5-6pm) with meeting (6-7:30pm).

Agenda Item #7: Draft Final Report of MaineDOT Review

MDOT wants the report to meet their review requirements. Mr. Errico said he would gather presentation materials for the public meeting and share information with MDOT.

Meeting Ends: 7:05pm

Meeting Minutes: Michelle McDonald