

Council Chambers: 5:00pm

Attendees: **Donnajean Ahigian** Dance Hall/Property Owner, **Tom Roberts** Beach Pea Baking Co, **Tom Emerson** Economic Development Committee, **Marissa Day** Planning Board, **David Rich** DPW, **Jamel Torres** KACTS, **Tom Errico** TYLin, **Mitchell Rasor** MRLD, **Chris DiMatteo** Town Planner, **Michelle McDonald** Town Hall, **Elisa Winter-Holben** Winter Holben Architecture & Design/Resident

Working Group Members Absent: Ken Gilbride, Terry Lochhead, Kendra Amaral

Welcome: **Chris DiMatteo** explains the meeting is the third working group meeting, kick-off meeting in February and Public Forum in June. He explains there is information about the study available on the Town website. There is also a Facebook page.

Consultants Tom Errico and Mitchell Rasor introduce draft recommendations. **Agenda:** 30 mins through transportation materials (part 1), 30 mins land use and urban design (part 2), 30 mins transportation information (part 3) followed by next steps/project delivery.

Mr. Rasor gives a summary of June 15th, 2017 Public Forum at Traip Academy:**Key Points:**

- 4 Breakout groups
- Generally, some repeated concerns were parking, future land uses and walkability
- Great community fabric
- "Don't want to become Portsmouth"
- 2 or 3 groups mentioned structured parking
- People curious about clear regulations and enforcement

Other comments:

- Want more access to pocket parks and pocket parks that have active family areas and potential access to the water
- Also concerns about marijuana dispensaries in the area

Mr. DiMatteo: explains that marijuana dispensaries are not yet allowed. However, the marijuana working group and Town Council will provide direction at upcoming discussion. Town/Working Group have looked at possible zones for marijuana and Foreside is not considered.

Mr. Rasor: He explains that Foreside has a strong economic base. Predicts entertainment, restaurant uses will continue to be in Foreside.

Overall the forum provided great input. Mr. Rasor had sent a questionnaire to the working group which provided helpful information. Working Group had more pinpointed information, complementary to that of the forum which had more generalized information.

Tom Errico: Reviews transportation, mobility items (**Part 1, Preliminary Draft Transportation Recommendations Summary** handout) and bold and underlined text in packets provided. Also mentions a status of the Walker/Wentworth Street DOT project. Reviews items where group feedback is wanted:

• **Item #5: Proposed Sidewalk on East side of Wentworth St at Walker/Wentworth intersection.**

The challenge is the cork tree and providing the PNSY appropriate truck turning radius. These two items prevent a sidewalk from being on both sides of the intersection. As a result, plans shared with the group do not show the sidewalk. **Mr. Errico** mentions that consultants will continue with this plan but want group feedback. Group refers to sheet 3A of DOT handout. There would not be a crosswalk on the east side of Wentworth St. The crosswalk at the Library would remain and a sidewalk would be added on the east side of Wentworth St and go to Whipple Rd.

Comments Wentworth Sidewalk, cork tree and turning radius for vehicles.

- **Tom Roberts** asks for clarification: the sidewalk can't be continuous because nothing can be closer to the tree? The tree would effectively push out the sidewalk, per design standards.
- **Mr. Errico** says there is possibility for a sidewalk to be built at Traip Ave but shares concern that people will be walking in spot where there would not be continuous accessibility.
- **Mr. Roberts** comments, if the area is built out in the future, there may be a more defined parking lot and infrastructure.
- **Elisa Winter Holben** shares experience crossing the street in that location being very dangerous. Mentions crossing in front of the library is also dangerous. **Mr. Errico** mentions that sight distance is better by the library because it is the crest of the road.
- **Mr. Roberts** asks if it would be better to follow where people will walk as opposed to sight distance. **Mr. Errico**: The sidewalks and crosswalks have to conform to standards.
- The group discusses raised crosswalks vs. flush sidewalks and turning radius for trucks. The curb at Wentworth/Walker is the challenge, not necessarily the tree. **Mr. DiMatteo** asks if the curb could it be at grade and then be raised. **Mr. Errico** shares his concern to provide a fully protective sidewalk but concedes the idea is worth considering.
- **Mr. DiMatteo** asks if the considerations are for large trucks and if there could be a compromise.
- **Mr. Errico** mentions the project needs to engage the PNSY more. **Mr. Rasor** explains the PNSY wants maximum flexibility.

Item #6 Foreside Study expects to determine if whether or not to include curb extensions (bump outs) in recommendations.

Curb extensions and bump outs: **Mr. Errico** explains that overall curb extensions are feasible by design but knows they can be challenging to the Public Works Department. **Dave Rich**, DPW commissioner, wonders if the issues have already been addressed in sheet 2A: where sight distance has been addressed. **Mr. Errico** explains that the plans do not address sight distances specifically, they share status plans. Curb extensions are still an item that the design team is discussing.

Mr. Emerson shares importance of protecting pedestrians and the dangers of speeding traffic. He mentions other communities that use bump outs and other traffic calming techniques.

Mr. Rich explains that maintenance issues are challenging but are not the only problem of curb bump outs/extensions: there are specific standards that need to be followed, including sight distance from the side streets. The accommodations that would need to happen to the street to allow for proper sight distance are the concern.

77 **Mr. Emerson** argues that bump outs to allow for sight distances.

78 **Mr. Errico**, explains if the plan recommendations would include bump outs, the bump outs would be
79 designed to DOT standards. **Mr. DiMatteo** says the bump outs should also be designed to be maintained
80 in the best way. **Mr. Errico** concludes that the consultants will provide designs that illustrate benefits
81 and the least amount of maintenance.

82 **Mr. Emerson** asks about striping crosswalks/sidewalks on private property at the Walker Street fire
83 station (EMT site) driveway. **Mr. Errico** answers that Towns do this differently, but a rule of thumb is to
84 not strip along every driveway. **Mr. Emerson** brings forward the concern of ROW, pedestrian or vehicle
85 in commercial parking lots.

86 **Item #9** talk about later.

87 **Item #10** talk about later: sidewalks and locations.

88 **Mr. Errico** explains that this meeting isn't the last time to provide feedback and comments. Relay
89 questions to Chris DiMatteo or contact the consultants.

90 **Transportation changes**, particularly on Route 1, State Road, Walker and Government Street, should be
91 considered before investment. Future traffic volumes need to be considered. Traffic forecasts are
92 created, based on background growth and DOT data. The forecast estimates traffic growth by 20% (1%
93 per year for 20 years).

94 **Build out assumption:** adding 100 homes (units) to the area, roughly 15,000 square feet of general
95 office space, 10,000 square feet retail.

96 The estimated number of vehicles generated from the build-out assumption land uses is considered in
97 the traffic forecast. The number is used to evaluate if changes to the road would work (ex. Road diet).

98 Different hours and two sets of traffic volumes (i.e. AM vs PM peak hour). Two scenarios are considered,
99 Shipyard peaks and Kittery Foreside Peaks. Table presented identifies how intersections will work and
100 the traffic simulation model assigns a letter grade.

101 **Page 4** review Walker/Wentworth Street intersection. The table shows letter grade when a variety
102 factors are considered (turning counts, signal times, etc). "A" is good, "F" is bad. DOT uses this
103 information to evaluate changes needed or not needed.

104 The chart on page 4 shows two intersection scenarios: 1) existing intersection delays and grading, 2)
105 estimated intersection delays and grading with lane reduction.

106 **Concept graphic:** Preliminary State Road Concept Plan illustrates land reduction. State Road remove one
107 lane in the northbound/southbound directions on State Road. As a result, one lane north, one lane
108 south, one turning lane. The model demonstrates that this scenario can work in 2036 and the extra
109 lanes are not needed.

110 Also, the model demonstrates that two lanes, exit lanes, are not necessary for departing Walker Street
111 westbound to State Road (US Route 1). This appears on the concept plan.

112 Consultants still need to evaluate bike accommodations. Mr. DiMatteo points out that this scenario has
113 implications for more parking.

Government/Newmarch/Water Street/Route 1(State Road). The simulation presented illustrates the opportunity to widen John Paul Jones Park, make a standard intersection at Newmarch/Government and Route 1 (State Road) and make Hunter Ave similar to a driveway, which would provide access to local traffic. This works from a traffic perspective, however, the park status (State owned) is the challenge. **Mr. Errico** had a conversation with DOT about the transfer of the property between State agencies. At present, the land is held in political process between the legislature and the Governor. However, despite the challenges, DOT is not opposed to transportation improvements although DOT would need to be part of the review process.

Mr. Rasor mentions the property is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and there is “wiggle room.”

Donnajeane Ahigan asks if transportation improvements would take land out of the park. **Mr. Rasor** mentions “it would be a wash” although it would add more park space to the north and south east. **Mr. Errico** mentions more space would also be added on Government Street because of pavement would be reduced.

There is a discussion about the simulation. Conclusion, the model is a rough representation and the consultants would prepare a more detailed plan if Town is interested in the concepts presented.

Marissa Day asks for clarification. She asks if Hunter Ave is one-way as depicted on the preliminary concept plan. Consultants explain it is two-way with a shared use bike lane and parking could be added.

The Working group agrees this idea would fix the intersection and park access at the same time. It would also be a benefit to those on Hunter Ave. Bike accommodations would allow for a southbound bike lane on Newmarch (only) and a shared use bike entrance on Hunter Ave for northbound bicyclists. Turnaround area for vehicles and snow plows on Hunter Ave should also be considered.

Another option to explore would be connecting Hunter Ave to Water Street only, creating a neighborhood loop. Finally, although the Preliminary concept plan doesn’t show it, there would be crosswalks throughout the area.

Page 7 lists suggestions, provided from an accessibility & crosswalk perspective, if circulation on Newmarch/Hunter/Water/Route 1 couldn't change (maintain existing). Some bullets could be considered short-term solutions.

Water Street existing conditions. DOT held a pedestrian safety audit during the summer. Consultants expect recommendations on pedestrian accommodations between Water Street and Badger’s Island from DOT in the next few weeks.

Page 11 Walker Street/Wentworth Street. **Mr. Errico** asks if two lanes are needed on Walker Street, eastbound, approaching the signal (ie. Left turn lane and straight through lane to PNSY). The extra space could be used for parking or on a corner curb extension for crossing. The model predicts the change would delay the intersection by 5 seconds. With or without changes it is unlikely the “F” grade will change unless the PNSY focuses on strategies to reduce congestion.

Review of Draft Mobility & Parking Recommendations (Part 2, Preliminary Draft Lane Use & Urban Design Recommendations handout): Review of Urban Design, Land Use, and Zoning Issues on Route 1 (State Road) North. Consultants present an image with yellow boxes.

153 Access management would help with pedestrian infrastructure and reduce overall confusion.

154 Suggestions include:

- 155 • Formalize a pedestrian foot path between the Golden Harvest and the Beach Pea.
- 156 • Reconfigure the green medians be to street parking spaces.

157 **Love Lane:** Speeds are very high.

158 **Suggestions:** Narrow entrance from Route 1 which is too wide. Also put in an island on Route 1
159 southbound to cut down traffic, but it would block access to TD bank which may not work. Group
160 discusses non-physical option, “local traffic only” sign, but conclude signs may not work. Design
161 considerations like a “chicane” may be more affective.

162 A chicane would be more attractive and would create a difficult road for people to speed. Sidewalks
163 won’t work because of features of the road. A portion of the Road could being a one-way toward Route
164 1 or restrict movements to reduce the traffic volume.

165 **Jones Ave Suggestions:** Add sidewalk on the west side, fit a few on-street parking spots toward
166 Government St. Shifting the road travel lanes east (toward the now “pay-for-parking” lot) could get a
167 better sight distance. A bump out would also help with the sight distance. Everything would fit in the
168 Town right-of-way.

169 Streets are narrow but parking is permitted for one hour by regulation of Dame St, Main St, Otis Ave and
170 other streets. Suggestion is to formalize parking on one side of the street and formalize guidance to help
171 people know they can park legally. This will help get better utilization of available parking and could help
172 with the parking supply problem. The Town could hire a contractor to stripe the spaces.

173 **Off street parking:** There could be shared parking in “off time” periods, lots could include York hospital.
174 Consultants will look into different strategies. Adding parking may not be warranted because of high
175 supply. Parking management makes sense.

176 **Q:** There is plenty of parking but how do you prevent PNSY workers from using it? **A:** PSNY provide more
177 supply. Management is needed.

178 **On street parking** is limited to time frames.

179 **Route 1** portion consisting of the John Paul Jones Park, State Road and Gourmet Alley: The general goal
180 is to create a more uniform area which has connectivity and more continuity. Currently there are three
181 distinct pieces of this road.

182 **Page 5** shows existing and proposed sections of John Paul Jones Park. The street curb lines would be a
183 proposed change on Newmarch St and Hunter Ave would change to two 9-ft lanes, which would allow
184 for parking.

185 **Page 6 State Road at York Hospital:** Downsize the intersection, add turning lane and sidewalk on west
186 side. There is potential for infill development and parking on the west side. The curb on the York
187 Hospital side (the east side) will remain. The diagram provided to the working group needs to be revised
188 to include this information correctly. Development on the lot opposite of the Hospital is yet to be

determined, but it has been discussed as a potential 4 -story building, with two floors of commercial on ground and 2-story residential accessed from above. Proposed plan presented is not finalized.

Mr. Rich asks about Walker Street sharrows approaching the Route 1 intersection. **Q:** How do bike lanes and sharrows mix? Consultants agree they need to focus on the transition from the busy intersection, from sharing the road way to having a bike lane. However, except for the Sharrow on Hunter Ave, Route 1 has established bike lanes.

Gourmet Alley: Some of the data presented about the right of way may be a little incorrect. **Mr. DiMatteo** said he can send the Route 1 right-of-way plans to the consultants. **Figure 5** (page 7) shows existing parallel parking at Golden Harvest beside the green median. **Figure 6 (Page 7)** shows one idea to flip the median and create on-street parking, creating traffic calming and the feel of a more urban, downtown street. This could allow for trees, which could lead to a streetscape. Parking could also act as a buffer for pedestrians.

The working group discusses the commercial parking lot owned by the Second Congregational Church. They conclude that the commercial parking lot may be out of character from the neighborhood.

Government Street toward Wallingford Sq parking is narrow. There is room to formalize and stripe on-street parking and still have two travel lanes and 7 feet for parking. It is a matter of shifting lanes.

Page 10/11 Greenway Concept for the underutilized railway line, the 70-ft ROW is used only once per year. It could be a shared use pedestrian/bike path which could start there and cross Wentworth Street toward the delivery access driveway, which is a public right of way until government property. The Greenway could continue and access Wallingford sq. and the Traip boat launch via a pedestrian bridge. During the summer months the Traip parking lot isn't fully used. Open space and connectivity could provide a lot to the town.

Parking: Walkability and perception of parking, consultants argue that overall there is more of a perception issue than a lack of parking. Connectivity, confidence and consistency (signage, sidewalks) could help quality of walkability. Street space is civic open space.

Page 13 gives examples of building footprints in the study area. There is a range in square footage and distinction between square footage in Wallingford sq. versus residential areas. As a result, commercial development in the Foreside is limited. **Mr. DiMatteo** elaborates that commercial spines in the Foreside could be identified, there are two characters to the community. To keep the residential feel of the Foreside Zone, an overlay zone could be added.

Potential Redevelopment sites Page 14 1) Sustain Southern Maine site, 2) Government Street 3) Existing footprint and change layout EMT Lot, Walker St 4) Town property at Public Dock 5) Garage lot Whipple/Wentworth.

1. Instead of the residential/commercial units as determined by sustain Southern Maine, consultants use modified suggestions with 90 residential units along with various infill sites.
2. **Figure 18** (page 16) shows potential footprint and on-site parking for a potential redevelopment. The footprint would be the same as the new mixed use development building on Route 1, but all Town houses, no commercial units. However, zoning does not allow this footprint, although it fits on site with setbacks.

Mr. Roberts asks how to prevent lot merging for purposes of demolishing old and building new commercial/residential buildings. Consultants suggest zoning as a means of control, which could establish date requirements for lot merging. Housing market is challenging in Kittery, density could help. The group resolves that mixed use, not only residential units, should be considered on this site and along Government Street.

Mr. DiMatteo suggests identifying the districts and corridors where commercial development is wanted.

Mr. Rasor explains that lot consolidation to deal with building footprint could be a bad solution.

The group discusses height limit, 35 feet, and roof pitch in certain areas. Consultants recommend reviewing the design standards, especially as it relates to roof pitch. This could be addressed in an overlay zone.

The build-out scenarios are based on a 20-year period.

2. Continued...**Figure 20** (part 18): move building forward, toward street add parking behind, add street space, and design could meet code. This could be two dwelling units (luxury or other units). A mixed use building is a possibility.

Consultants have heard from the Public the desire to keep the Foreside residential neighborhood intact, with commercial space at the edges, however, mixed use buildings could be anywhere in the zone.

3. **Figure 19** (page 17) shows the possibility of having a standard hotel (ex. Holiday Inn Express). Doesn't meet zone standards now but could happen in the future. The working group discusses "Boutique Hotel" versus an "Inn" and considerations for Foreside zoning. Inns are of a different scale. Questions come up about putting in an overlay zone to deal with locations of hotels or if hotels should even be considered. The question becomes if the "status quo" can be maintained with community growth, and how can residential areas be protected with reasonable amounts of growth. Considerations about how to encourage people to live and work here, without pricing people out or losing community character, should be made.

4. **Page 22** (page 17) Public dock could be potential site of a park, public right of way, could be a boardwalk. Consultants agree to do a quick cross section of site with redevelopment idea. Easement to the waterfront and the public right of way. This site appears to be a sewer easement. Site redevelopment could challenge current snow removal in Foreside as snow is moved to this location. Snow may need to be hauled out of the Foreside, this factor wouldn't necessary prevent a park.

Next Steps:

Report produced at the end of the year, however DOT needs 3 months to review the report. Consultants and Town are contracted for the year.

Next public meeting draft recommendations needs to be focused.

Mr. DiMatteo suggests another working group meeting, land use and meeting or email before the public forum.

267 Mr. Emerson suggests that the John Paul Jones Park and the potential park at the Town Dock in
268 Wallingford sq. (location of sewer easement) should be at the public meeting because it hasn't been
269 part of past Foreside conversations. It needs to be determined if the land is a public or private row or a
270 sewer easement.

271

272 Mr. Errico reminds the group the numerous steps until the end of the project: Public Meeting, Public
273 Hearing, Planning Board, Town Council. Public meeting end of September, early October. Consultants
274 will hone in on a few things to present but all of the recommendations should be available at this
275 meeting.

276 **Meeting ending at 7:13pm**

277

278