



# Route 100 Committee

## Wednesday, February 11, 2015

### Minutes

#### Committee/Staff Attendance:

Name	Present	Name	Present	Name	Present
Sarah Boudreau	√	Eydie Pryzant	-	Joe McDonnell	√
Joe Cooper	√	Rebecca Grover	√	Steve Melchiskey	√
Andrea Ferrante	-	Lori Legere	-	Jim Thibodeau, LPAC Liaison	√
Charlie McBrady, Council Liaison	-	Anne Theriault, FEIC Liaison	-		
Theo Holtwijk, Staff	√	Nathan Poore, staff	√	Tom Farmer, Wright-Pierce	-

**Others present:** Tom Errico, John Edgerton

Joe called the meeting to order around 6:00 PM.

#### 1. Review of Draft Minutes of January 14, 2015 meeting

The draft minutes of the January 14, 2015 meeting were approved as written.

#### 3. Discuss Potential Improvement Options

Theo explained the chart that staff and the consultant team had prepared containing various improvement options. He mentioned the comments he had received from Eydie regarding building height and maximum setback of buildings from the road. He also mentioned that comments had been received from Ethan and that those were included in the materials. He suggested to parking the zoning aspects for now and look at the infrastructure components.

Steve asked what a “sharrow” was. Tom explained it and said he would not recommend it for Route 100.

The committee proceeded by reviewing each of the options and deciding to keep them, modify them, or setting them aside. There was discussion on the desire to have 5 feet shoulders on both sides for the entire corridor. Steve was initially worried about the community’s reaction to that. Tom felt that consistency of this improvement was important.

Some intersection capacity improvements will be driven by future development projects.

Theo shared some road cross sections and a plan view that Tom F. had prepared. The committee liked those, but agreed that a single sidewalk between Leighton and Mountain Roads would suffice. There was recognition that sidewalks in the West Falmouth Crossing could be better connected and that that should be added. There was a suggestion to add a missing sidewalk connection on Mountain Road as well. It was recognized that more sidewalks in the area also will come with more winter maintenance responsibilities for the Town. Joe felt that developers should not be asked to install sidewalk segments that do not connect, but that an option should

be created to make a financial contribution to the Town or Land Trust for, for example, open space or trail improvements. The committee agreed not to pursue a shared use pathway.

Access management was discussed by the committee. Tom reported that the MDOT plan proposed to narrow some driveways as part of its road plan. Theo mentioned that, for example, changes had been proposed at Harmon's Lunch and that may affect the availability of parking spaces negatively. Tom said that on-street parking may be a possibility in such cases, and that in others the closure of a driveway may allow an owner to have more on-site parking. Every property will at least have one driveway. The second part of access management is to review how future developments should be handled. Jim felt that the Town should have flexible guidelines for that as each situation is different. This issue also affects if and how adjacent properties will be interconnected, such as is the case along Route 1 with various properties. This will allow fewer cars to enter and exit Route 100 to visit multiple businesses. Theo said that making upfront improvements that manages access is a lot easier and less expensive than fixing it later when traffic problems arise. If more development is anticipated along Route 100, he said, it will come with more traffic and the Town should try to manage that as best it can.

Steve felt that the committee was not expert enough to evaluate the various wastewater options. He said that this aspect was the tail wagging the dog, that the committee should determine the land use vision and that the wastewater options should match that, whatever they needed to be. Of all the options, the committee was ambivalent about sewer in Marston Street as some residents may want, but others not. As this is a built-out street, adding sewer there would not stimulate more development. Nathan suggested that the committee may not want to recommend Marston Street sewer, but the Town may still want it as there have been various septic system failures in the area.

The committee agreed not to recommend any underground power and communication lines in the area due to the significant cost.

Nathan explained that the stormwater quality could consist of public-private partnerships where actual improvements are made on private property. Jim concurred that it makes sense to share such facilities rather than each property owner having to install systems on their own.

Joe asked the committee if it agreed to recommend more apartments and commercial development in the Route 100 section between Leighton Road and Mountain Road. The committee agreed with that.

The committee also agreed to recommend a single vision, rather than various options, as it believed it would send the wrong message to the public that scaling back the vision was supported by the committee. The committee agreed that a rough cost estimate should be developed by the consultants.

The committee will review a revised chart and cost estimate at its next meeting and will discuss what input it wants from the public at Forum #2. Theo will discuss with Nathan what the financing possibilities are for the plan.

#### **4. Other Business**

There was no other business.

**5. Next Steps**

The options chart will be updated, and a cost estimate will be prepared.

**6. Next Meeting**

Next meeting is February 25, 2015 at 6:00 PM.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 PM.

Draft minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, February 20, 2015