

**Town of Cape Elizabeth  
Minutes of the Comprehensive Plan Committee**

April 27, 2006

7:00 p.m. Jordan Conference Room

Barbara Schenkel, Chair  
Julia Beckett, Vice Chair  
Anne Swift-Kayatta  
Bob Dodd  
Skip Murray  
Dave Griffin

Frank Strout  
Mary Beth Richardson  
Mary Ann Lynch  
John Herrick  
Jay Chatmas  
Elaine Moloney

Also present was Maureen O’Meara, Town Planner

The minutes were reviewed, amended and adopted by unanimous vote.

Correspondence

The committee reviewed the correspondence. Ms. Lynch said we should encourage people to come to meetings and public forums.

Mrs. Schenkel referred to a suggestion in the correspondence that the town bond to purchase open space and take this idea up when we work on the finance comp plan chapter. Mrs. Swift-Kayatta thought this had been discussed at the last meeting and that the purchase of open space was the goal rather than by what mechanism. Ms. Lynch noted that bonding is always a mechanism available and it is more important to focus on purchase. Mr. Strout noted that bonding had been used to purchase Robinson Woods.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta suggested committee members set aside correspondence until we get to that subject in the comp plan. No further action than to acknowledge receipt is necessary now. Ms. Lynch said an email acknowledgement is sufficient.

Recreation

The committee reviewed the revised draft. Committee members passed minor changes to staff.

Mr. Herrick suggested that, under Goal 2, that master plans be periodically updated.

Ms. Lynch suggested that the Conservation Commission be charged with monitoring implementation of master plans. It was noted that the Fort Williams Master Plan is supervised by the Fort Williams Advisory Committee rather than the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Strout said that the Cape Land Trust annually inspects and monitors its holdings. Does the Conservation Commission do that? Mr. Herrick said the Commission does try to monitor.

Mr. McGovern said that the town does have many master plans and that it would be good to review them periodically, such as every 7 years. He also suggested this as a general recommendation in the comp plan and not limited to just this chapter. Ms. O’Meara suggested this could be handled in the public facilities section as a general good government type of recommendation.

The committee agreed on a new implementation step 4 to Goal 2 that the Conservation Commission and Fort Williams Advisory Committee should review their master plans a minimum of every 7 years to insure the plans are current and are being implemented appropriately, by a vote of 12-0.

Mr. Dodd asked if the Sprague Master Plan was included and the answer was no because it is their plan.

Mr. Strout noted that the open space inventory should be revised to show that Hobstone is owned by the Land Trust, not an easement. Mr. Chatmas asked if the inventory could include street address numbers, but it was agreed to leave the list as is.

Mr. Dodd suggested that Goal 3, Implementation 1 be revised to note more than 1 field.

Mrs. Moloney suggested charging private clubs fees for using fields as a way to raise revenue. The committee agreed to hold that idea for the fiscal chapter. Mrs. Beckett asked if we should discuss charging fees for Fort Williams. It could be discussed as part of the fiscal chapter.

Mr. McGovern reminded the committee that an additional field has been designed but not built at Lions Field and that it could replace an existing field that is poorly located. The committee agreed to add the “designed but not constructed” fields at Lions Field and Gull Crest and the school campus basketball court to the field inventory.

After a discussion of current cooperative management facilities with private athletic organizations, the committee agreed to revise Goal 3 to include private organizations.

### Transportation

Ms. O’Meara gave an overview of the data and analysis and noted new or controversial sections.

The committee decided to review the chapter page by page, with a focus on concepts.

Mrs. Beckett asked about the policy on new road construction. Mr. McGovern explained that the Pedals and Pedestrians Committee initiated a recommendation, amended by the

Town Council, that certain roads be reconstructed with 2' wide paved shoulders to improve their utility for bicyclists. This recommendation is considered on a case by case basis when roads are proposed for reconstruction, not just repaving.

Mrs. Moloney recommended that a reference be added to the data on page 4.

Mr. Griffin began to discuss the draft recommendation to study a possible pedestrian facility on Shore Rd. He said this is critical to the Cape bike coalition. He doesn't want an accident to occur to make it happen. The recommendation should be kept in the plan.

Mr. Herrick agreed. He is familiar with an off-road path adjacent to a collector road in another town, paved, winding around trees. It was great. We need something like that on Shore Rd, especially with the magnet of Fort Williams Park. It would be good to also have a trail from the Town Center through the woods, but need the off-road path as well. It needs to be near Shore Rd.

Mr. Griffin noted that the prior proposal had a 4' wide paved shoulder, required if you accepted state funding. He suggested that the demographics of the town are different now and that a facility could be designed that would be supported.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta asked what the width of Shore Rd is and was told 22' to 24'. She asked if a facility could fit into the existing right-of-way. Ms. O'Meara suggested leaving that open in order to allow some design flexibility to avoid some elements currently in the right-of-way.

Mrs. Richardson noted that Yarmouth built a pathway named the Beth Condon pathway after someone was killed.

Ms. Lynch said that she walks on Shore Rd every day. The recommendation should not be limited to the path, but also leave open the option of increasing the shoulder. The Town should consider reclaiming the right-of-way, such as clearing some brush.

Mr. Murray said he drives Shore Rd and when he encounters cyclists in packs, he cannot pass them. Shore Rd is dangerous now. Any improvement is better than it is. The Town owns 50' of right-of-way and people don't realize that part of their lawn is in the right-of-way. In Scarborough, they clear back each intersection the width of the right-of-way. Mr. McGovern noted that Cape Elizabeth has more "aesthetic appreciation," and does not clear the entire right-of-way, but rather selective brush clearing.

Ms. Lynch noted that we also lose views.

Mr. McGovern said we try to be sensitive to abutting property owners, and work with them to strike a balance of competing goals.

Ms. Lynch suggested that the comp plan include a statement that the Town should reclaim right-of-way where safety is enhanced and consider any other reasonable means

of improving pedestrian and bicycle safety. This will be added to the beginning of the sidewalk section.

Mr. Murray said the comp plan should also consider Shore Rd specifically. The proposed recommendation opens up the new idea from what was rejected before. Mrs. Swift-Kayatta suggested adding working with property owners.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta asked about the cost of such a facility. Mrs. Richardson said we don't want someone to die.

Mrs. Schenkel asked if there was any other focus for bikeways and Mr. Griffin said bikers have other issues than just Shore Rd.

Ms. Lynch suggested adding 2' wide paved shoulders as recommended by the Town Council. When the Town Council funds road work, the 2' strip can be included. Mrs. Swift-Kayatta expressed concern with this absent a cost estimate. The committee agreed to add the list of roads recommended to have 2' wide paved shoulders. Ms. Lynch asked if Public Works does this with new projects. Mr. McGovern said that the town looks at it each time with reconstruction projects, not paving projects. He noted that the Spurwink Ave project is proposed to have 2' wide paved shoulders.

Mr. Murray asked about possible congestion on Route 77 and confirmed that, under state standards, it is not considered congested.

The committee began to discuss a connectivity policy. Ms. Lynch suggested that this issue is moot before the referendum is voted on and suggested the committee return to the issue after the June election.

Mr. Murray suggested that short-cuts and connectivity are two different things. Connectivity is good. As an excavator and a member of the rescue, connectivity would reduce the time it takes to get places.

Ms. Lynch agreed that the current short-cut proposal doesn't apply in all instances, but waiting until after the vote will get a sense of public feeling. She agrees connectivity makes sense.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta said the issues are closely related but different. Short cuts do not apply to all connectivity. She agrees that connectivity is good in that it spreads the traffic around, lowers traffic and that not all conclusions will come from the referendum.

Mr. Griffin stated that our roads are narrow and there are positives to having dead end roads.

Mr. Herrick said he favors connectivity, done carefully, with related traffic calming if there are high traffic volumes.

Mrs. Richardson said connectivity is a good thing and should be encouraged. Broad Cove is annoying, and wastes gas. You can have speeding with or without connectivity. Traffic calming and enforcement is integral.

Mr. Strout said he agreed with Mrs. Richardson but is concerned with the referendum, which is targeted towards the project.

Mr. Dodd said the issues are connected. Short-cuts are a form of connectivity. The referendum will have an impact but there is also a broader issue. A connectivity policy will impact roads not regulated by the referendum. Connectivity promotes public safety and is a good planning concept. As a result of the vote, it will impact a subset so he would like to wait.

Mrs. Schenkel suggested adding the language that the Town continue to explore connecting neighborhoods in a sensitive manner, then withdrew the suggestion when “sensitive” would need to be defined.

Mr. Dodd suggested that the Town not disturb the quality of existing neighborhoods but make public safety a priority.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta said she is more pro-connectivity unless there is a reason not to.

Mrs. Schenkel suggested the town should sensitively promote connectivity for safety purposes.

Mr. Herrick asked if there is evidence that traffic calming improves safety and the answer is yes.

Mr. Griffin said Broad Cove is a bad example. He has seen nice communities in the south with 2,000 units on a dead-end road.

Mr. Murray said that Shore Acres is on a dead end, but is better than Broad Cove because the roads in the neighborhood connect to each other once you get in there.

Ms. Lynch suggested that the town promote connectivity for public safety, but also for environmental reasons, efficiency, and conserving energy.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta suggested the Town should promote connectivity when it benefits public safety, traffic circulation and development of neighborhoods. The committee continued to discuss this recommendation and make revisions. Staff will revise for committee review.

The committee moved on to a discussion of traffic calming.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta suggested a revision to clarify the language that traffic calming is applied to new and existing roads.

Ms. Lynch that the Route 77 intersection improvement in the chart be revised to show that a signal has been approved. The committee voted 10-2 to delete the six-year transportation plan information.

In the discussion of Goal 1, the committee confirmed that the high school traffic light has been approved by the Planning Board.

Under Goal 2, Ms. Lynch suggested that the Community Services senior bus to Mill Creek, the Mall and Downtown Portland be referenced. Mr. McGovern stated that RTP may merge and it would be better to make the recommendation more generic to whoever is offering the service. He noted the school department allows the use of the school buses to make it possible for community services to provide the transportation.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta noted that the community services buses are for all citizens. The committee agreed to add a second implementation step that the Community Services Program and the School Department shall continue in offering transportation and shall increase services as needed.

Under Goal 3, Implementation step 1, Mrs. Beckett asked about sidewalks in other areas. Mr. McGovern suggested that the town prepare a master sidewalk plan. He noted that the Pedals and Pedestrian report should be updated. The committee rewrote implementation step 1 and included within it implementation step 2 to read "Prepare a town-wide pedestrian sidewalk and cycling master plan. Include an evaluation of the town's capacity for year round maintenance.

The committee agreed to vote on the Transportation chapter goals and implementation steps after reviewing the revisions at the next meeting.

#### Next meeting

The committee agreed that they could wait until Monday to receive the package for the May 4th meeting. Ms. O'Meara agreed to provide draft chapters on Marine Resources and Water Resources for the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen O'Meara  
Town Planner