

VILLAGE PARCEL MASTER PLAN

Meeting Meetings – August 8, 2019

Attendees: Laurie Smith, Town Manager; Werner Gilliam. Director of Planning and Code

Parcel Master
Plan Committee: Sheila Mathews-Bull (Chair), Rebecca Young, Jamie Houtz, Mike Weston, Connie Dykstra, John Hardcourt Absent: Allen Daggett (Chair), Russ Grady

Consultants: Bob Metcalf, Mitchell Associates (Lead Consultant) Chris DiMatteo, Gorrill Palmer

Meeting opened 4:02 pm

Sheila Mathews-Bull call the meeting to order

Review minutes of previous meetings

Approved July 23 minutes; one amendment; strike Mike Weston being present. `

Review of Kennebunkport Village Tomorrow Vision Session Concept Plan

- a. Review of neighborhood pattern and density
- b. Review of Infrastructure Network
- c. Discussion on Density

Bob Metcalf: Introduced himself and gave a brief overview of where the project was and what the next steps will be. He presented the hand drafted Option 1 generated during the visioning session and indicated they were transferring into a CAD format to determine and fine tune road alignment and some of the lot configurations. Bob indicated he would like the committee's feedback in terms of what their thoughts about the overall master plan idea. He stated that they spent some time looking at what the minimum lot size would be considering the village context but was interested in more input on what the committee may understand the minimum lot size might be. In terms of the village context but also in terms of affordable. Bob indicated that that the overall design would need to include a variety of lots sizes to support the affordable housing interest and a mixed neighborhood. He reviewed the various densities and associated lot sizes. Four dwelling units per acre is approximately 10,000 sf lots, an if 25% of the lot area is for a dwelling, there would likely be a 2,700 sf building footprint, six dwelling units per acre would likely mean 7,200 sf with 1,800 sf building footprint, eight dwelling units per acre would result in 5,400 sf lots and 1,350 sf building foot print, and so on.

They are looking at somewhere around 10,000 square foot lots and getting down to 3,000 to 5,000 square foot lots which means you can have a mix of housing types and sizes of houses which you find in the village area. Asks the committee feedback from in terms of what their perceptions of lots size.

Mike Weston: Lived in Metro Detroit Michigan for almost six years on the outskirts and the lots were 60 by 80 feet in size, 4,800 square feet in lot area, with a two-story home that was around 2,700 2,800 square feet. This was among different sized lots. Thinks a home around 900 sf might be too small. Thinks this is what we should be looking for, right on a mix of lots size that would provide a mixture of people and different ages though it may require zoning changes.

Bob Metcalf: Pointed out on the plan where the different sized lots were. Also indicated where on the property were constraints as to where to plan for lots and how the vernal pool and wetland areas are integrated into open space for the various neighborhoods, suggesting there is the surrounding open space connected to the smaller neighborhood scaled open space. Parking could be accommodated in the back with alley way access.

Jamie Houtz: The theory would be that the houses built would have different values, a small community that would be diverse in income maybe.

Bob Metcalf: Yes, diverse in income, diverse in age, diverse in that there would be young families starting out that may not have kids, basically as a starter home or maybe have their first child. With regard to configurations and the housing stock, architecture and character that ultimately become part of the zoning in terms of making architectural design recommendations. The number of lots we are looking at here is just under two hundred with this configuration as it looks at right. Approximately just under 40 acres of the 54 buildable acres is shown in the current concept as developed.

Connie Dykstra: Understanding is that this exercise shows how many houses we can have fully built out if we wanted to do this instead of the other ideas that have been suggested. If the town decided, we needed all this land primarily for houses this is sense of how many could fit and what the lots could look like.

Bob Metcalf: Described and identified various setbacks on the parcel. Along the back area is approximately 15 feet between the property line and back of the lots. Discussed that a walking trail would need to be accommodated in this area. Also identified areas where housing types would vary, such as cottages and other small-scaled housing opportunities. Discussed how the circulation may be designed not being a thruway and provide a framework for clusters of development. Also identified the existing open spaces adjacent to the parcel, existing sewer easement and other opportunities for connectivity. Identified the total length of the roadway for the presented configuration as being 500 feet shorter than what the existing cut road is today, and an additional 7,800 feet for all of the secondary, alley type roadways. Currently refining these numbers so to calculate estimates on potential infrastructure costs. The ultimate ownership of the roadway will be up to the town and is part of the master plan

discussion. Looking at 22-foot wide roads currently. A smaller network of roadway is the objective for the currently concepts, though they may entail more effort in snow removal they provide for less total impervious area, less impact on the environment. Zoning recommendations will be part of the master plan, pros and cons between contract zone and creating a special zone for the parcel.

There are approximately 220 units represented in the current layout with around forty plus acres. Need to keep in mind the process, where we start and identifying ideas, getting them out on the table, then make your way through the comments and finally resulting in your final product is what becomes part of your master plan itself. Need to think outside the box and try to figure what can happen on the parcel and then work your way into what is a sound reasonable plan with the time to utilize in the future.

Jamie Houtz: There are two hundred and some odd units on this illustration where does this density or population match in town? Does it look like Foxberry or similar to Bishop Woods in its configuration?

Bob Metcalf: Probably a Bishops Woods and Foxberry put together you know in terms of this look at that type of density itself because Foxberry put together in terms of density but not in character so much.

Jamie Houtz: Feels it would be helpful to visualize what the character that is being proposed by identifying other places in town that may be somewhat similar and we're not far from the character in other places.

The committee looks at various locations in town using the on-line town GIS website and discuss the variety of lot sizes and density.

Bob Metcalf: Other ways at looking at some of the other ways of increased density factors in terms of multifamily housing, which was supported in the visual preference images exercise is to have a New England style looking home but design it to have four apartments. This may be an option to get the density in a way that large home on a large lot.

Is assisted living an option that the committee is interested in? Depending on public-private partnership options as to whether or not it's a feasible option.

Laurie Smith: Heard both from the Housing Trust as well through this process and people, concerns about several things: 1) the ability to downsize, like to stay in Kennebunkport would, like something smaller maybe more of a neighborhood feel; 2) people want multi-generational neighborhoods, a neighborhood where families starting and the older generation can live together, may be different size lots and different size houses; 3) people who are seniors who maybe need something more affordable, not just downsizing in size but a little concerned about affordability; and 4) seniors who maybe want more of a connection with their own living space. Maybe that is the captain home that may have four units perhaps with a communal lobby; a place to hang out and talk to

people/neighbors but then go back to their own space and it would be separate. We would likely need to do a market analysis with regard to an assisted living facility and determine where along the spectrum people are thinking of when they refer to assisted living

Committee discusses options on the different options through public-private opportunities for senior and assisted living housing, Avesta and rehabilitating existing buildings. Need to look at surrounding towns and neighborhoods that currently have these services and determine if there is still a need.

Rebecca Young: Interested in knowing what data is being used to inform the current concepts in terms of the number of housing units proposed, and the housing types proposed, single family vs multi-family.

Bob Metcalf: Camoine Associates has prepared a housing study in 2018 for the town and they are currently working on a market demand/economic analysis on some of these plans with data from other towns that they've worked on in southern Maine.

1. Next steps Update

Bob Metcalf: Will plan to refine the concept a little bit further looking at the road networking and infrastructure. Camoine Associates will be working on the marketing aspect needing about four weeks. Suggest changing the date for the next meeting to September 17th, with final master plan presentation sliding further slightly. Need a larger block of time to make more progress on the plan. Will have cost projections on potential utilities and infrastructure phasing.

Committee discusses phasing and the aspects of access, North Street vs, School Street or both. Also, the logistics of open space and trails prior to building housing. Need to get the trails in early and should follow the natural terrain. This should be the first thing that gets done on the property. Eco-educational opportunities are present on site.

Will plan to prepare an overlay of the trail network for the site with the existing clearing locations as part of next steps, so to get an understanding of what areas need to be restored as part of the open space plan.

2. Public Comments

(opened at 5:08 pm)

Paul Hogan (Goose Rocks): Does not consider the plan presented to be representative of what the public had indicated after the weekend visioning session. Feels 200 plus units being discussed is too dense, especially considering that all he voted for was open space and trails.

Sheila Mathews-Bull Explains nothing is written in stone. Suggests the plan needs to be more general and show where on the 87 acres will be the best place for a town office, housing, the turn-off on North Street, etc....

Paul Hogan (Goose Rocks) Concerned the master plan will be adopted with what is shown and would not be changed

Laurie Smith: Have been involved with a number of master plans over her career, some master plans are shelved, and others are implemented. Never seen a master plan implemented to 100%. Market demands and life change, we can only see as far as we can see sitting here today. With regard to density, need to better understand the potential impacts and need to get a look and feel of it. In terms of the plan, is can be phased where blocks don't get filled out with houses but could be combined and kept green or could hold for the community in the future. An important aspect the committee will need to address is infrastructure costs. And if community expects to get any of the 10 million dollars back you are then you're looking at a lot more private development and partnerships to get some of that money back. Need to be very careful and methodical about future partners but will need some density in order to pay for infrastructure cost and to not burden future generations with the maintenance of these costs. Need to proceed in a methodical way so opportunities and resources are no wasted in the future and that's hard to see 30, 40 or 50 years into the future. The Trail system may be a good use of the property but what kind of cost and maintenance does it incur.

John Hardcourt: Feels really not seeing a master plan. Areas on the plan are not clearly designating areas for the future, i.e. what area may serve as housing or may serve as recreation space, etc. instead there are a bunch of little boxes that look like houses. Don't want to be driven toward something that has all these little boxes. Don't understand why the plan doesn't show an area of the property that lends itself to X purely recreation, municipal uses or housing.

Connie Dykstra: Agrees. Feels the plan is mostly about how many houses could potentially be on this property and what can be done with the property that is left over, i.e. walking trails.

Laurie Smith: The Committee needs to speak up and say this stuff because we don't want to end up to the end of this process and have people said well that's not what they wanted. This is the time to say that. Heard through the visioning process and through the public sessions people said no commercial but kept saying yes to residential, village and nature trails and I think that's why we ended up here. We can go over this in more detail or we can do whatever the Committee needs, get more information you might need but I don't want you to feel like we're headed in the wrong direction.

Mike Weston: Looking for a concept with no houses, as with what Connie has said, the areas are already defined, but they don't have to be house lots. Some of them may be but some may be open green space. Need to develop something that mitigates the number of houses that are going to be built, never signed on to 225 houses. Thinks the little boxes should come off.

Sheila Mathews-Bull: Should be a rendition of areas that might be used for more than one thing, i.e. the swimming pool shown doesn't have to be a swimming pool, it could be where a butterfly garden is, etc. The plan should show utilizing as much of the space as possible and not being in a position later to realizing later that a building location was better suited somewhere else.

John Hardcourt: Commenting on Laura's point, this is the master plan that ends up getting approved would never come to light and those little houses.

Mike Weston: Feels this is not a master plan it is a concept and it's up to the Committee to come up a master plan.

Bob Metcalf: The objective of the RFP was to look at how this property could be developed to look at the needs for housing that's affordable for the future needs for the town, but also this was going to be a 50-year plan in order to give an idea of what could be done on the Parcel and what density is necessary to support the schools. The twenty-five homes the Housing Trust is looking at developing are not going to solve the issue with the school population. Didn't want to just show housing bubbles without first being able to quantify the economic and infrastructure aspects. Would be remiss if there was not something concrete to base number of units on and what the cost of the lots might be is going.

John Hardcourt: Disagrees. Thinks you could take a bubble plan and do an economic study for X number of houses with this size, the economic impact would be this or this, but it doesn't have to be laid out like the current plan. Thinks everyone is sort of all saying the same thing we're all on the same page.

Connie Dykstra: It's more about messaging. Need to be clearer on the plan that the areas shown as housing are potential areas for housing. The area for the road is where the wetlands are not. When the plan is this specific it may be challenging. The messaging for the ultimate master plan needs to be changed.

Bob Metcalf: Look to get a bubble diagram prepared that will also have the information that is needed, not necessarily the way that it is typically done. Feel the information that has been generated to date with the concepts will be able to get the committee to the next steps. Appreciates all the comments.

Speaker (#1) from the public: Feels the majority of the people want open space and do not want this density and developing all these houses for the school is not what the community wants.

Speaker (#2) from the public: Question on the permitting process. Does the permitting process have to begin over for location of the road?

Bob Metcalf: Yes, it's a different configuration; however, because of the restrictions for the setbacks from the streams the first section coming in from North Street up till the power line is pretty much fixed, as well as is the section coming in off a School Street due to the wetlands.

Speaker (#2) from the public: Recalls issues for the roadway along the North Street side that had to do with waivers, from the Army Corps and a seasonal stream.

Bob Metcalf: A 75-foot stream setback for the state shoreland zoning but the town has the ability to reduce it down to 50 feet, which it was; not sure of the exact number but couldn't meet the 75 feet. For just a short section. The actual width of the roadway was allowed not to be a full-blown 24 foot wide travel way with a sidewalk to minimize the impact on the site. But we have to go through that again basically since it is a whole new design.

Speaker (#2) from the public: The fire department ended up having to give approval on the width of the road because it was narrower than the usual roads.

Bob Metcalf: The Planning Board took the recommendations from Public Works and from the fire department.

Speaker (#1) from the public: Feels the plan is trying to solve all the problems of the community in one small parcel. Need to decide what you want this to be it, can't be something that's going to help everyone or benefit everyone it's too small an area. First consider what the majority of residents want it to be which they expressed at that first meeting.

Speaker (#3) from the public: Urge the Committee to walk the land if you're making recommendations on what it should be. There are no trails it's torn down trees and dirt. Has there been a determination as to how many affordable units are needed and are, we working in conjunction with the Heritage Housing Commission? Are all of the 200 houses proposed to be affordable? If so, are these deemed income-restricted? Income qualifications? And if the house were to be sold the person to buy it must also meet those qualifications? Not becoming vacation real-estate is a real concern.

Sheila Mathews-Bull: The housing committee has looked into this and there are rules and regulations.

Speaker (#3) from the public: Do we know how many units are really needed? Don't buy into the 'if you build it they will come'. Think you should build to what's needed and accommodate those needs.

Speaker (#4) from the public: Is there coordination between what the Heritage Housing Trust is doing and what's happening here?

Heritage Housing Trust Committee Member: We planned the Heritage Housing Trust for over the last two years this was never on the horizon and feel the town is going to decide what they want to do with this parcel and the Trust will react and support whatever the town wants to do so we don't have a need for X in this plan.

Laurie Smith: The Housing Trust could be a partner, up to the Town whether to invite the Housing Trust to be a partner.

Speaker (#5) from the public: Question for Werner on the square footage required in the village zone right now to create a lot.

Werner Gilliam: The front portion of the Parcel in front of the CMP easement is in Village Residential and on the other side of the CMP easement is the Free Enterprise Zone which has a forty thousand minimum lot size requirement or density for single-family homes. Densities change for a duplex or for a multiplex. The density goes from forty thousand to twenty thousand per unit whenever you want to develop a duplex and then (not entirely sure) the multiplex has a minimum of sixty thousand square foot lot size, for four units.

Speaker (#5) from the public: It will be a tremendous change in the square footage for a lot, six thousand eight thousand or three thousand square feet for a lot

Werner Gilliam: Zoning was created in town in the early 70s, important to know what you had here historically before zoning was enacted compared to development after zoning was enacted. It's important to see what the historic build out of the town has been and how that's evolved. 20,000 square feet, is about a half-acre. 40,000 square feet is what people typically call a Builders acre. An actual acre is 43 560 in terms of square footage. Wallace woods have lots that are at the 20,000 square foot size and that's offset in open space so the density of Wallace Woods is an example the density.

Heritage Trust Member: Want to follow up as to why the Trust now versus waiting for this to come to be, never knew that this was a possibility and it still isn't a possibility because it is only an idea it is not an actual plan. The Trust is addressing the need for now.

Speaker (#6) from the public: Need to remember this is a ten-million-dollar purchase and if we don't get our money back this is going stop us from doing other things in the town and we may need that money. Not hearing how we are going to get our money back. Feels a hundred million dollars in property values is lost. Hope people consider that that we just can't spend ten million dollars and put walking trails. The town is loaded with trails, people don't use them. Like to see us get our money out of this and not have a ten-million-dollar bond.

Speaker (#7) from the public: Support what Jamie said about planning the trails and the recreational facilities and things as a first step before you start laying out property lots. If you don't, good chance that it will never get done or what does get done is a compromised. Suggest looking at the property surrounding this particular property because that's the neighborhood that you're building, not the downtown Dock Square area. It would be good to have more kids in Consolidated School but this is part of regional school unit it's not only the town school. What happens in the future depends on what's going on in the total region not just what is happening in downtown.

Beverly Seoul (Speaker #8): Concerned local people who feel that going to Kennebunk for services is not the same as being in Kennebunkport and isn't sure that Huntington common or Atria is even affordable for some people in this town. No discussion about it but there may be a possibility of creating a non-profit for that kind of care for senior housing and assisted living. It would take a lot of fundraising, however, there is a model in Portland 75 State Street which has been there over 100 years that is a nonprofit that does both. Various levels and various sizes of apartments as well as assisted living. Would be a big endeavor and it would take some time to do and some real dedication. We are a town that can do substantial fundraising when it wants to. If we wanted to fundraise for something to really serve our local seniors we could do it.

Rebecca Young: Joined the committee because property borders the Parcel. As an environmentalist and a property owner first impression were to keep this as natural as possible. Has had to modify personal perspective and desires for this property based on what has been heard and more importantly based on what we perceive the needs of the community to be. It is concerning that what has been presented to the community is largely driven by anecdotal commentary at our different meetings. Appreciates the structure around that process and enjoyed how feedback is collected and how it's being used, a fabulous job. However, we really need to see what the data says we need now and into the future in order to present this to the community in a way that will allow seeing beyond what our own wishes for the property may be. Would like to see this be something that is really for the future which is why data really key to making a plan that the community can accept and understand and why we're moving forward with it.

Laurie Smith: We are going to meet again on September 17th at four o'clock here. Thank you everyone for coming.

Adjourned at 5:48 pm.