

VILLAGE PARCEL MASTER PLAN

Meeting Minutes – June 11, 2019

Attendees: Laurie Smith, Town Manager and Werner Gilliam, Director of Planning and Development

Steering

Committee: Allen Daggett (Chair), Sheila Mathews-Bull (Selectmen), Rebecca Young, Mike Weston, Connie Dykstra, , John Harcourt, Jamie Houtz, Russ Grady

Absent: Tim Pattison

Consultants: Bob Metcalf, Mitchell & Associates, Chris DiMatteo, Gorrill Palmer

Meeting opened 4:02 pm

Previous Meeting Minutes

Approved May 9 and May 21 minutes

Group Interview of Stakeholders

1) Introductions (attendees)

Parcel Master Plan Committee:

Allen Daggett (Chair), Rebecca Young, Jamie Houtz, Russ Grady, Sheila Mathews-Bull (Selectmen), John Harcourt, Mike Weston, Connie Dykstra.

Laurie Smith, Town Manager; Werner Gilliam. Director of Planning and Code
Bob Metcalf, Mitchell Associates (Lead Consultant) Chris DiMatteo, Gorrill Palmer

Committee Representatives:

Beverley Soule (Ad Hoc Senior Advisory Committee); Jim Stockman (Lighting Committee); Stedman Seavey (Budget Board); Ruth Fernandez (Cemetery Committee); Carol Laboissonniere (Conservation Commission); Steve Powel and Jonathan Ripton Shade Tree Committee)

2) Site Existing conditions overview:

Bob Metcalf provides a brief presentation that includes: the existing conditions and neighboring context of the site, the master planning process for the project; and format of the meeting.

- Existing conditions and neighboring context of the site
 - Parcel has frontage on North Street and School Street
 - An 86-acre site that has gone through permitting for a residential subdivision a number of years ago.
 - Two streams that originate from wetland on the site that merge and outlet to the Kennebunk River in the vicinity of Bass Cove.
 - Roughed in road extends over a mile in length between School Street and North Street.
 - Stream 75-foot regulatory setbacks
 - Wetlands on the site total 16 acres and subject to shoreland regulatory setbacks
 - 3 significant vernal pools have been identified (100-foot setbacks), two located southwest of the CMP line, the other is located northeast corner of the parcel.
 - 135-foot wide CMP easement bisects the site, land use zoning on the westerly side is the Village residential zone , and to the easterly side is the Free Enterprise Zone
 - Upland areas 52+/- acres
 - Wetlands on site total approximately 16 acres that are subject to shoreland and MDEP regulatory setbacks
 - Abutting properties include: Cape Arundel Golf course; Weintraub property; Bishop Woods; Daggett properties; Foxberry Woods; Shawmut Woods; McCabe property; and Wallace Woods
 - North Street access to the parcel is approximately a 1/2 mile to Dock Square,
 - School Street access to consolidate school is approximately a 1/2 mile and a mile to square in Cape Porpoise.
 - Discusses the alignment of the roughed in road
 - There have been cleared areas (for building windows) as part of the original development, the remaining area is wooded.
 - Approximately 6,100 linear feet of roughed-in roadway, the shoreland zoning and Maine DEP permitting process essentially dictated where the road was laid out during the subdivision process.
 - public sewer and water utilities stubbed out at north street frontage, along with future power to extend from this direction

Question: Is there any stormwater management for the roadway? **BM** Site was designed with stormwater management features approved as part of the previous development review; these may need to change depending on the development that is realized on the site.

Question: Areas that were cleared are they now just opened or stumped? **BM** Yes, the areas were stumped and grassed over and now there is successional vegetative growth in these areas.

Begin stakeholder meeting :

- Format of this meeting will be obtaining feedback on the needs of the community from a subset of the stakeholders that are associated with land use issues through a series of questions. Discussion of the master plan process, emphasizing that it is not the actual design of the property but is a guide for future development.

Question 1) What are the important issues that should be considered? Specifically, land use needs, and other important objectives that should be considered in the development of a master plan.?

Beverley Soule (Ad Hoc Senior Advisory Committee): Would like to see mixed generational housing be considered, a combination of seniors that would like to downsize to affordable housing with young families that would like to settle in Kennebunkport. Consider the New England model of big house, little house, back house, barn. Many of these types of architectural designs are presented in a book by Thomas Hubka. Thought this would be a great way to create a more New England scene with opportunities for seniors and young families.

Jim Stockman (Street lighting Committee): The Committee recognizes the current ordinance needs to be updated to meet today's technology. Very familiar with the Village parcel and the challenge is to retain the character and atmosphere of Kennebunkport and not allow this area to be the brightest thing in town.

Stedman Seavey (Budget Board): Has not taken a formal position on it but sees a lot of potential and feels perhaps we should not rush into anything and "sit on it" for a while, five, ten fifteen years. It's a great piece of land and happy to have a large parcel with good access. Personally, speaking public facilities and recreation facilities come to mind with regard future uses, but should wait to see what develops over time before doing anything with it. (Note: Budget Board did not meet to discuss)

Ruth Fernandez (Cemetery Committee): There is a cemetery across the street with no new burials. The Arundel Cemetery does have new plots available, though not sure how many are available for the future. Maybe something to consider

Laurie Smith: Has the Cemetery Committee considered the needs for a new/active cemetery (in addition to the Arundel Cemetery) in the future?

Ruth Fernandez: Depends on the Arundel Cemetery's capacity. How many plots have been created and what is the future capacity? Selectman/Recreation Committee in the past purchased many years ago a park (now Beechwood) and it evolved. There was the forethought to purchase the land.

Carol Laboissonniere (Conservation Commission): The committee did discuss the questions and does recognize the functionality of the parcel and the Town's functional needs which may include housing, ore public uses. And also taking in the consideration the preservation of the natural characteristics of the site. The considerable number of wetlands and vernal pools on the site could be an educational resource. The central location works well for such a use.

Feels that the educational use should not play a secondary roll to the Town's functional uses and the Committee is not interested in private development on the Parcel, due to potential disturbance of the existing wetlands. The site is currently surrounded by development and there is already potential issues with stormwater from these developments affecting the site's natural resources.

Question: what was the original development plan include for housing and where was it to be located?

Bob Metcalf: Discussed the original development plan and where located on the site, what type of residential units were proposed in the past.

Carol Laboissonniere: The Committee had a concern with the original development with regard to the amount of stormwater run-off and impervious area.

Bob Metcalf: The original site design used Low Impact Design (LID) stormwater features. Look to maintain and expand such stormwater features for future development.

John Tipton (Shade Tree Committee): We agree with what Conservation Committee has conveyed. With the degree of wetlands and vernal pools on the site it is a great opportunity for us to look at having an educational wooded walkway.

The ecological and geological importance of the natural features of the site and sees this can be an important part of the current idea of the Town as an arboretum.

One of the great attractions to the Town from the Committee's perspective are the woodlands here. There is an extensive tree cover in the Town. This town is a town of trees as much as it is a town of seas.

The following are important features we see part of the parcel:

- 1) The walkway. We would love to oversee the implementation of an educational walk/path through this parcel.
- 2) Would like to propose trees along the street be a diverse population not only to enhance the ecology but the resistance of pests and threats the arboreal environment here.
- 3) A small educational center might be considered for small school children and general public to introduce them to the objectives of the Shade Tree Committee that have been highlighted here, things that are a benefit to the town and can highlight the town's history, its legacy as well as its ecology.

Question 2) What concerns does your group have regarding growing demands and needs for the town. i.e. public services, housing needs, commercial use, open space etc. How should the property be used?

Beverley Soule (Ad Hoc Senior Advisory Committee): Saw this similar to the first question. Town seniors should be involved when and if senior housing is considered and that it is also a Pet friendly environment.

Jim Stockman (Street lighting Committee): Lighting effects everyone especially at night. We ask to be involved throughout the process to ensure the dark sky is protected and conforms to the ordinance. And to change the ordinance to reflect better ways to address these issues. We are working on amending the ordinance to reduce impacts. We have had one of the earliest ordinances (top three in the US) that deals with dark skies. Started in 1978.

Carol Laboissonniere (Conservation Commission): Conservation Comm does not support commercial development on the site. The Town's functional uses or housing and open space, but not commercial use.

The landscape of the site and the natural character of the site should be incorporated in the landscape design. Native rather than a forced landscape representative of a commercial development. Commercial use means to the committee uses such as a coffee shop but not an assisted living facility.

John Tipton (Shade Tree Committee): Consider town facilities that are planned with the natural landscape as a priority, but want to emphasize the environment. Using the property in an educational manner would go a long way in engaging the town and should keep it open to the public and make it meaningfully engaging by preserving the natural qualities of the place, those are the elements that would allow to meaningfully engage with the public.

Question 3) What design characteristics should we consider in our implementation strategy?

Beverley Soule (Ad Hoc Senior Advisory Committee): The same items previously stated along with energy efficiency is important to consider. Question: Do you want to see Assisted Living happen?

Allen Daggett: Yes, maybe in the future, many people want to stay here but can't afford to stay in the home they are in, but don't want to leave.

Beverley Soule: Not sure if the town is large enough to support assisted living.

Jim Stockman (Street lighting Committee): General comment on Assisted living has a variety of connotations that are different. Be careful using certain words because images that pop in the people's minds may not be what you intended to convey.

There is a wide variety in building sizes associated with 'assisted living'.

Beverley Soule: Is Assisted Living something appropriate for the Senior committee to look into?

Laurie Smith: Part of the consultant's role is to look into the economic aspect of the master plan and the down-sizing is the theme we have been hearing and will be considered along with other types of housing as we move through the master planning process, and might possibly need its own plan.

Stedman Seavey (Budget Board): The characteristics of the parcel itself are essentially the design characteristics that should be considered; a large parcel centrally located but only partially developed, with portions of it that are not very developable. And also, we should be deliberate in placing structures, thinking only public structures, like a new town hall building. Be deliberate in the process with a lot of thought. Don't want to rush the process, we know we have needs for housing, but might have a need for public park or building, but it not clear if one outweighs the other, may be five years you might know.

Carol Laboissonniere (Conservation Commission): The way the parcel is shaped and organized by its natural features could be a way to use the parcel; segments can be used for different purposes. The use of natural amenities in this way would help create an integrated feel of the parcel. The Committee is not against the use of the parcel for community needs such as housing, need to be practical but the town also needs to take the time to understand what is the best use for the future. With the integrating the landscape in the design can really be quite nice.

John Tipton (Shade Tree Committee): Agree with what was said by Conservation Committee and Mr. Stedman, that it should evolve over 5-10 years. Whatever roadway is constructed it should make sure all runoff is mitigated. The natural beauty of the place allows for a very fine development to be. The priority should be preserving the natural characteristics of the site.

Question 4) Does the parcel location provide an opportunity for connectivity to the Village area and to Cape Porpoise? If so, what should those connections include?

Beverly Soule (Ad Hoc Senior Advisory Committee): Don't want to see the roadway become a short cut between North Street and School Street. Recommend extending sidewalks all the way to Cape Porpoise like what was done on North Street.

Ruth Fernandez (Cemetery Committee): Stream that goes through the property and under North Street and next to the cemetery, is there issues with erosion with tides and storms?

Bob Metcalf: Explains stormwater post and pre level requirements. It is not allowed to increase the amount of stormwater runoff off a site more than what is currently exists today.

Carol Laboissonniere (Conservation Commission): A comment regarding the sidewalks. There is a trend for grass strips rather than catch basins; a more natural way to deal with stormwater.

John Tipton (Shade Tree Committee): There is a way to connect this parcel to Cape Porpoise and the Village. With a great deal of effort there is a connection all the way to Paddy's Creek from this Parcel, public access through a pathway that leads down to Wildes District Road, and incorporate historic elements (cultural history) of the village and Cape Porpoise

Question 5) What expectations does the group have for the village parcel?

Beverly Soule (Ad Hoc Senior Advisory Committee): Hopefully it will provide for housing the town doesn't have and in an attractive manner

Stedman Seavey (Budget Board): Would hope there is strong and broad support, citizenry on the whole weighs in on the outcome and what is finally decided.

Ruth Fernandez (Cemetery Committee): This has nothing to do with cemeteries

Carol Laboissonniere (Conservation Commission): Official position of the Conservation Commission would be to preserve the open space, however, do realize it may need to be modified to accommodate public usage needs.

John Tipton (Shade Tree Committee): “Ditto”.

Question 6) Should the Town identify a portion of the site to be retained for future yet to be determined needs of the Town?

Beverley Soule (Ad Hoc Senior Advisory Committee): We anticipate that it will be developed in stages over time to accommodate future needs.

Bob Metcalf: Thanks everyone for the very valuable information provided and gives an overview of the visioning session and the final document. Emphasizes the product is a roadmap and not a definitive action on what is going to happen. Will be gathering more information from the community at large and provide a summary of that at the Visioning workshop and then break out into groups and do planning exercises with plans and markers. The Master Plan document will include all the data we have been collecting, marketing assessment on if particular uses are economically viable, potential zoning amendments that may need to be considered make the program work, and identifying public/private investments, i.e. affordable housing along with plans and maps.

4) Next steps

Laurie Smith: want to encourage everyone to come out on Saturday July 13 and let other people know about the public visioning session, being held at the Consolidated School at 9:00 am to Noon.

Reviewing the Town’s website: Here on the front page Navigate to the ‘Village Tomorrow’ tab. Click on that and navigate to the Village Parcel page that has the calendar and documents with regard to where we are in the process.

Also, at the bottom of the front town’s website page there is an opportunity to sign up for ‘e-Alerts’ where you can sign up for agendas and other information such as news on the front page. Good way to stay in touch.

Allen Daggett: Thanks everyone for coming and participating.

5) Review of input from the Kick off Meeting

The Visual Preference Survey has been tabulated but haven’t broken out yet. Two questions were asked for the attendees to answer at the Kick-Off Meeting:

Question 1: What kind of user would you like to see?

Some highlights were:

- Affordable and workforce housing ranked as important
- Along with nature trails...
- Gathering spaces and wellness for the community,
- Starter homes, playground...
- Keep the spirit...

Question 2: What would make this project successful?

- Green spaces everyone can enjoy
- Recoup the investment
- Not being over taxed
- Multifunctional
- No additional traffic
- And not be seen from my house
- Balance of uses...

Laurie Smith: Interested in hearing from the Committee members who attended.

Mike Weston: Thought it was well done and got good input. And the current input today is very consistent to what's been heard to date, which is encouraging. And want to make sure everyone gets heard at the Visioning Session.

Bob Metcalf: There should be an opportunity for that with folks breaking out into groups.

Mike: Hopes citizens realize this is an unusual process for most projects to acquire information and go so well; not adversarial and getting people to speak their mind.

Allen Daggett: Agrees and feels the process as gone great, good opportunity for everyone to speak their mind.

Rebecca Young: Really loved the setup with the visuals and worked effectively with the seeing something quickly and concrete to vote on....it would be nice to have something for the younger attendees, at the July meeting.

Question:

Will there be feedback on the visuals that had the red and green stickers from the Kick-Off Meeting, specially to identify those that were clearly overwhelming in one direction.

Bob Metcalf: Yes, in the process of doing so.

Laurie Smith: York County Star was there and made a story on the event.
Spoke to Parks and Rec maybe having daycare, good idea? (yes)

Sheila Mathews-Bull: We inevitably have people ask why they haven't heard about this...Getting info on social media should be something we should do to alert folks on the meeting date and the process?

6) Next Dates:

June 25, Another Stakeholder Interview meeting (Fire Station)

July 15 Monday night 6:00 pm provide a presentation of the findings from the Visioning Session,

Allen Daggett: Opens up public comment.

Public Comments:

- Concerts with no amplification....
- Get rid of two fire stations...bad idea

Sandwich boards is low tech and an effective way to advertise

Missed the public meeting, unequivocally no retail? Doesn't make sense, why?

Bradbury's...don't really need it on the parcel.

Tumbleweed tiny homes...should be considered (passed out pictures)

7) Moved to adjourn 5:29pm