

**Town Council Sub-committee
Future Use of 260 Foreside Road - Meeting Minutes
Town Office – Large Conference Room
September 13, 2016 – 4:00PM**

Members Attendance: Caleb Hemphill and Ned Kitchel

Others in Attendance: Nathan Poore (Town Manager), Theo Holtwijk

The meeting was called to order at 4:05PM

1. Review of Draft Minutes

The draft minutes of the June 28, 2016 meeting were approved as written.

2. Discuss Status of Town Landing Parking Evaluation

The committee discussed the draft parking survey questions that were prepared by the consultant. It agreed to execute the survey on-line through Survey Monkey. The committee agreed that some questions could be clarified and/or expanded upon.

Councilor Kitchel stated he had not received any parking complaints in the area. Nathan reported that one street had restricted parking due to past issues. The committee recognized that boat-related parking by others than the owner, such as crew members, may have an impact as well and will try to get a better sense of that. As Thursdays are typical boat racing days, that day will be added to the survey question 1.

Nathan and Theo will edit the survey and review the draft with the survey consultant before resubmitting it to the committee. The consultant's report will not be finalized until the survey results have been incorporated.

3. Discuss Site Visits to 260 Foreside Road property

The committee discussed their respective site visits with Councilor McBrady to the site. Only two councilors were present at any time. Councilor Hemphill commented that there seemed to be no distinction between the 260 Foreside Road property and Underwood Park. He noted the presence of trails, a dog walker, and spraying at the rear of the park property. Councilor Kitchel noted the presence of an abandoned stove on the 260 Foreside Road property.

Councilor Hemphill stated that he could envision a grass-paver parking area in the front of the property that could accommodate 10-15 cars on a temporary basis. No significant tree cutting would be required to accommodate that. He suggested that the existing parking at Underwood Park could be reworked at that time as the spaces there are quite small. Councilor Kitchel felt that the Underwood Park parking had an inefficient layout. Councilor Hemphill said that landscaping at the park could be cleaned up and the paly structures there improved. He saw less of a benefit to locate housing, such as walkable development, on the property. He hoped that official access along the northern border could be improved as there is a small strip of land that separates that property from the adjacent streets off Johnson Road. Councilor Kitchel concurred. He saw the property more as an expanded pocket park. He felt that a 20 car parking lot could be accommodated and that the Parks and Community Programs department should be asked to prepare an improvement plan for the property as that department would have

the best handle on what the needs were. Nathan inquired what type of recreational improvements the committee was thinking of. Councilor Kitchel responded that he could see larger field area, but not an official athletic field. He thought that perhaps the property could stay largely as is. Nathan suggested that the public could be invited to make improvement suggestions and that a parking area combined with an expanded park could work.

Councilor Kitchel commented that he thought the replacements of the swings and wooden apparatus on Underwood Park were not as successful as what had been there before. He noted that there had not been any negative feedback on the acquisition cost of the property. The committee discussed is a building lot at the front of the property was desirable and noted that some mature trees were located there and that it would conflict with a parking area. It concluded that including a house lot would not be easy, even though the entire property was quite spacious.

Nathan reminded the committee that its charge was to come up with a recommended process for use of the property. Councilor Kitchel felt that the process should not include a blank slate for the public, but that a charrette type event where the public could comment on some options would be desirable. Nathan said that parameters for the site could be set and that the parking report and committee report would be outcomes of the committee's work that would be presented to the Council. Councilor Hemphill stated he envisioned an organic parking lot that could be deactivated during the time when there would not be any demand for it. Perhaps it could be used as a skating area in winter months. Councilor Kitchel commented that people currently already park on the property and that he has seen six cars at a time there. He said he still liked the idea of a cottage development on the property but felt the expanded park had a higher calling.

4. Next Steps

Nathan and Theo will prepare the next draft of the parking survey.

5. Next meeting

The committee did not set a new meeting date.

The meeting adjourned at 4:43 PM

Draft Minutes prepared by Theo Holtwijk, September 16, 2016