

VILLAGE PARCEL MASTER PLAN
Meeting Notes – July 15, 2019

Officials: Laurie Smith, Town Manager
Werner Gilliam, Director of Planning & Code

Parcel Master
Committee Members: Allen Daggett, Chair; Rebecca Young; Jamie Houtz;
Russ Grady; Sheila Mathews-bull, selectwoman; John
Hardcourt; Mike Weston; Connie Dykstra; Tim
Pattison

Consultants: Bob Metcalf, Mitchell Associates (lead
consultant), Russ Preston, Principle Group, Kara
Wilbur, Principle Group, Chris DiMatteo, Gorrill
Palmer

Public viewed visual displays laid out around the room prior to the start of meeting and were discussing / chatting amongst themselves.

Laurie Smith: Welcome & Introduction

Bob Metcalf: Provided brief over-view of previously held Visioning Sessions w/ aide of Power Point Presentation. Sessions were well attended w/ 70+ at Saturday's event. 50+ at Kick Off meeting on May 30th. Stated they had reviewed public meetings, questionnaires, surveys, public comment & input and were utilizing all information to guide the Town through the vision process, which is a long range plan 20, 30, 40 years into the future, based on demand / need. Plan will allow flexibility to change as needed. Review existing development of parcel relative to open spaces, town property, conservation trust property, commercial, residential, etc. Determine zoning for the parcel. Input collected from public via questionnaires, surveys, public meetings, discussions, likes, dislikes, etc. will be used to create plan. Interest expressed in interaction between old & young. Stated Gorrill Palmer is part of their consulting team and their focus is currently on infrastructure costs associated w/ roadway improvements, trails, parks, etc.

Russ Preston: Stated creating a visionary plan was a complex process. Tabulations have been reviewed, revealing patterns & trends developing / emerging. Process will be completed via co-design w/ public participation. What are we getting right / What needs improvement? Parcel to be used to further local community use. Touched on issues currently facing Kennebunkport, such as affordable housing. Explanation of Principles Used: Prioritize small town character, ecology of site, framework, walkable neighborhood, preservation of natural legacy. If downtown was to burn flat, would current zoning allow to re-build as stands today? Presented slides showing there were areas that were far from pristine and in need of improvements. Spoke of the creek which runs thru parcel and desire to engage the water feature. Expressed need for area to be easy 10-minute walk, center of town / Dock Square. Water/Wetlands will be a challenge, but goal is to make this the forefront, not background, utilize the river, creek and ocean and develop walking, biking and nature habitats around these features. Russ continued: Vision is for small town character to stay in place. Currently 3 newly drafted Plans in the works, for meeting sake, labeled as Left Plan / Middle Plan / Right Plan as titles had not yet been assigned. Development will need to begin in North Street area due to civil engineering purposes. They cannot begin in South Street area as certain items need to be addressed prior to being able to implement improvements in South Street area. Considerations are: Preserving natural areas, light development, powerline corridor, wetlands, neighborhoods, family-oriented design, country style roads w/ permeable surface, may not be paved, maintain suburban character, hidden local road networks, non-tourist areas, geared towards residents.

Possible boardwalk / hybrid trails. Connectivity to water via trails / sidewalks / country-style roads.

Review of current architecture = Typical Coastal Maine. Wish to retain this feel.

Missing Middle Housing: Scale between single family housing and mid-rise buildings. Town Center / Hall / Civic Bldg w/ senior housing, cottage courts, smaller homes. No track development / mono-culture bldgs. Engage community / interaction w/ neighbors.

Maintain historic character in new development.

Additional Concerns expressed:

Aging in Place / Incorporating Solar Panels in Design

Target Demographics:

Families / Seniors / Couples

Factors to be considered:

Standards / Regulations

Speed Limits / Traffic Calming:

Bike Lanes / Street Parking / Reduce Speed to 20MPH

Propose to expand town center out $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ mile by restriping, narrowing travel lanes, incorporating street parking to slow traffic. North Street to be gateway for primary flow into downtown w/ network of smaller loads for local traffic.

Plan will take decades to accomplish – long-term plan.

Possibly repurpose former boat-building barn into a town center / civic bldg. w/ neighboring park.

Building for play – important to sprinkle throughout parcel varying areas for play.

Connecting water to town / community

Summer crowds / tourists vs Winter (year-round) residents

Review Public Process thus far:

May 30 – Kick Off Mtg

5 Community Mtgs

Stakeholders Interviews

3-Day Visioning Event

July 23 Steering Committee Mtg

Oct 24 Public Mtg

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Snow Removal?
2. North Street – Concern about routing majority of incoming traffic onto this one road. Feels this is unfair to abutters of North Street. Safety concerns. Impact concerns. Feels burden should be shared w/ alternate routes.
3. Concerns w/ speed / traffic. People traveling 45 mph currently – unsafe. Believe roadside parking will add to problem, not solve problem.
4. Does not believe North Street is wide enough to handle street parking as proposed. Plan is to narrow travel lanes to create space for street parking, which will in-turn slow traffic.

5. Concerned w/ response that solution to everything is “Town Management will handle take care of it”. Not reality. Reiterated affordable housing issue. New residents vs Old residents who grew up in town. Has anyone visited the alley ways / back areas? Don’t cater to minority interests i.e.: pickle ball courts, etc.
6. Concerned that plans depict image of “Somerville”. Too touristy. Catering to tourists and not residents. Response: Losing sight of the fact that what is presented is only IDEAS at this stage. Retain open mind / Open Discussions. Early planning stages – Nothing is finalized.
7. New Resident – 3 yrs. Feels Kennebunkport needs to act NOW; not later. Need to retain their young people.
8. Question about how 10 million was financed to purchase this parcel by the town and how is it to be paid back? RESPONSE: Town authorized Bond / 20-year payback. General Fund Budget is primarily funded via property taxes.
9. Pro affordable housing as this brings in additional tax dollars. Would like to see affordable housing maximized; less land used as common space, parks, trails, etc.
10. Tom Macone’s project – Did Town disapprove of plan? Is this why Town purchased parcel? Discussion of Land Use Codes and what didn’t residents like about proposed development?

RESPONSE: Town didn’t stymie Macone’s project; more so saw opportunity for Town, approached discussion w/ land owner and purchased. Affordable Housing / Increased Year Round Residents / Children – All 3 are related.

Need is NOW; Not later. Ability to build affordable housing to bring in families w/ children to increase enrollment in school w/ only 129 students. Municipal employees unable to afford to live in town; majority live outside of Kennebunkport. Chief of Police lives in Sanford.

11. Land Use Ordinance Discussion. Needs changing to accomplish vision. Wondering how many affordable housing lots / units does Town hope to build? RESPONSE: No set # yet decided. Cost of parcel vs. Sale price of homes will be a deciding factor in how many homes can / will be built. Calculations are still in the works. Stated how years ago, it was common place for Towns to buy up large parcel of lands to develop into housing in order to increase their tax base revenue.
12. Steering Committee will continue to update public meeting by meeting; what has been accomplished, what remains to be done.

CLOSING – Thanked all for attending and for input.