

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

May 4, 2006

7:00 p.m. Jordan Conference Room

Barbara Schenkel, Chair
Julia Beckett, Vice Chair
Elaine Moloney
Bob Dodd
Skip Murray

Frank Strout
Dave Griffin
Anne Swift-Kayatta
John Herrick

Absent: Mary Ann Lynch, Mary Beth Richardson, Jay Chatmas

Also present was Maureen O'Meara, Town Planner

The minutes of the April 27th meeting were reviewed, amended and adopted by unanimous vote. The committee also reviewed and approved an article for submission to the Cape Courier announcing the June public forum. The committee also revised the schedule to extend the completion date to February, 2007. Committee members are asked to bring their calendars to the next meeting in order to schedule additional meetings for this Fall.

Transportation

The Committee reviewed the revised Transportation Chapter.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta questioned the 4' wide paved shoulders on Spurwink Ave.

Mr. Griffin wanted to change the word describing a pedestrian path on Shore Rd as contentious. The committee agreed to change the word to "challenging."

Mrs. Beckett questioned, on page 7, if the shifting back and forth from the Greater Portland to Cape Elizabeth perspective was confusing. The committee decided it was a useful reference and decided to keep the information.

Mr. Griffin did not want to recommend connectivity. Mrs. Swift-Kayatta said this issue will be revisited after the June vote. Mrs. Schenkel suggested changing "should" to "favor." The committee agreed to note this section with an asterisk that it will be revisited after the vote, in bold letters.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta said that instead of using the term "current policy," the actual year should be inserted.

Mrs. Beckett suggested that additional sidewalks be added to the inventory list. Ms. O'Meara said she had added sidewalks per the Town Public Works Director's review.

Mrs. Schenkel questioned if it is certain that a traffic signal will be installed at the Route 77/Shore Rd/Scott Dyer Rd intersection. It has been voted on by the Town Council but is not certain until it is installed.

The committee reviewed the Transportation Goals. Goal 1 was approved. Under Implementation step 1, Mrs. Swift-Kayatta wanted it revised to simply state “Reconstruct Spurwink Ave.”

Mr. Herrick asked why the Route 77/Shore Rd/Scott Dyer Rd intersection light was included as Implementation Step 2. It was agreed that incorporating actions in the Comp Plan that are underway was appropriate and would help with the implementation rating of the plan. Mr. Griffin suggested step 2 be revised to state “consider implementing.” Mrs. Schenkel said that since the Town Council had already voted on it, we should not weaken the recommendation. It was agreed to leave it as stated in the draft.

Under Goal 1, Implementation Steps 1-5 were unanimously approved with the caveat that #5 would be revisited after the referendum vote.

For consideration of Goal 2, Mrs. Moloney asked if school children should be included. It was agreed to focus on them as part of the school portion of the Public Facilities Chapter.

Mrs. Schenkel suggested an implementation step that an education effort be directed at parents to have kids ride the school bus. There was no support and she withdrew the suggestion.

The committee liked the revision to Implementation Step 1 to more generically refer to a regional transportation provider. The Committee unanimously agreed to Implementation Steps 1 and 2.

In review of Goal 3, Mrs. Swift-Kayatta suggested adding “pedestrian” to include people walking on the side of the road. Mr. Dodd noted that Ms. Lynch raised this issue and it should be included.

Mr. Herrick suggested adding to the Implementation step the construction of 2’ wide shoulders. The committee agreed that this was in the plan and would be considered when the master plan cited in Implementation Step 2 was prepared.

Mr. Griffin suggested a fourth Implementation Step, that all major roads have added 2’ wide shoulders when repaving was planned. The committee noted that Mr. McGovern has stated that shoulders could be added when roads were reconstructed, not just paved. Mr. Murray noted that Fowler Rd was repaved but no shoulders added. He noted that sometimes there is adequate base on an existing road to add a paved shoulder.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta said she remembered a big meeting on the Fowler Rd project. The road needed to be reconstructed and base material added for shoulders. Without the addition of a base, there was no base to pave.

The proposed Implementation step was revised to state: Consider adding a 2' wide paved shoulder when reconstructing or repaving major roads. All four Implementation Steps were unanimously accepted by the committee.

Marine Resources

Ms. O'Meara provided an overview of the chapter.

Mrs. Beckett asked if there was any boat launch access for noncommercial boat owners.

Committee members said that there is a second boat access for non commercial boats where you launch adjacent to Crescent Beach. The ramp is compact sand and is accessed from the Kettle Cove parking lot. This is available with a beach access permit issued by the Police Department.

Mr. Herrick asked if we need a town dock.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta said she has only received access complaints for Great Pond. The telephone survey was referenced.

Mr. Strout said there used to be a concrete boat ramp at Fort Williams and also one at Two Lights. They eventually fell apart. Some committee members felt it was not safe to launch at Fort Williams due to the action of the waves unless you were an experienced boater.

Mrs. Beckett asked if we should consider a public boat ramp. Mrs. Schenkel and Mr. Herrick said we should study the need for one.

Mr. Griffin said that most people who launch in salt water understand there are risks and are serious about it. If we have a boat ramp, you might encourage people without skills to launch at Fort Williams.

Mrs. Schenkel noted that the Cape coastline is exposed.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta expressed concern that there are so many tourists in Fort Williams towing a boat that a ramp there would be an attractive nuisance.

Mrs. Maloney asked if there is a problem launching in South Portland. Members said no.

Mr. Strout said that there is pressure on Kettle Cove for commercial fishermen. There is a problem for access for commercial fishermen on Summer weekends. He would like to take the pressure off there by offering another place for others to launch.

Mr. Murray noted that in South Portland, you launch in mud flats. In Cape, the compacted sand boat launch get washed out and changes. Committee members noted

that, due to the shallow water, you cannot launch a boat larger than 16' on the compacted sand launch.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta asked if we are talking about finding another launch site for non-commercial boaters.

Mr. Strout said that he thinks Fort Williams is the place for another boat launch. It is safe if you know what you are doing. You can't base the decision just on liability issues.

Mrs. Beckett asked how pressure is on commercial fishermen. Mr. Jodie Jordan, local fisherman, responded that it is not a problem because of commercial fishermen. The congestions is due to noncommercial boaters.

Mr. Herrick said that this is a complicated issue and it should be analyzed, with the goal to protect commercial access.

Mrs. Beckett asked if a second access can be installed at Kettle Cove if it is owned by the state. The consensus is that state permission might be obtained.

Mr. Strout said he is on a state board which has grant funding to expand access for commercial fishermen. It includes access to fishing grounds, shell fishing beds, etc. When you apply for the grant, they review the Comp Plan to see if it supports the grant application.

Mrs. Schenkel noted that there is no parking at the mooring areas. Mrs. Swift-Kayatta noted that there is no public parking except at Kettle Cove and Crescent Beach.

Mr. Strout noted that Pond Cove has public parking.

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta said that if we want to add this use to Fort Williams, we need to study the impact.

Mr. Murray noted that the commercial ramp is also used by the WETTeam, and that should be recognized.

Mr. Jodie Jordan noted that parking at Kettle Cove in the summer is very congested. The WETTeam sometimes cannot launch in the summer at the noncommercial ramp and use the commercial ramp instead.

Mr. Murray noted that it is also a very tight angle to maneuver into the commercial boat ramp, especially with lots of summer parking.

Implementation Step 2 was recommended: Study the need for an additional boat ramp and potential location for all users.

A third implementation step was suggested to provide public access and parking to existing shell fishing beds. Mr. Strout said people have to trespass on the Sprague property to get to the shell fishing beds. The committee drafted the step to read:

Evaluate the need for and feasibility of public access (including parking) for existing shellfishing beds for licensed commercial fishermen.

Mrs. Schenkel stated the implementation step lacked enough direction and we should say “provide public access.”

Mrs. Swift-Kayatta said that this is a complicated issue, with cost and access issues. If Fort Williams is considered, there are also other issues. She thinks a good faith evaluation is needed to determine how much of a problem there is. She is not against the idea.

Under Implementation Step 1, change access to ramp. The committee agreed to add two more implementation steps.

The committee agreed to review the revised Implementation steps and vote on them at the next meeting.

Citizen Comment

Mr. Greene, of the Sprague Corporation, noted that it would be helpful to have access out to the Spurwink River. The Sprague Corporation has no commercial fishing, but need access to Richmond Island in emergency situations. It would be nice to have access to Kettle Cove. There is a ramp to the Spurwink River, but it is private.

The meeting ended at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen O’Meara
Town Planner