

PORTSMOUTH
TRAFFIC & SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING
8:00 a.m. – Thursday, June 14, 2007
City Hall – Eileen Dondero Foley Council Chambers

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Councilor Ken Smith, Chairman called the meeting to order at approximately 8:05 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL: Members Present:

Councilor Ken Smith, Chairman	Jonathan Bailey, Member
Steve Parkinson, P.E. Public Works Director	John Connors, Member
Deputy Police Chief Len DiSesa	John Howe, Member
Assist. Fire Chief Steve Achilles	Christina Westfall, Member
Deborah Finnigan, P.E., Traffic Engineer	Eric Spear, Member
	Ted Gray

III. ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES:

IT WAS VOTED on a Motion made by John Connors to accept the minutes of the May 24, 2007 meeting. Seconded by Steve Parkinson. Motion passed.

III. NEW BUSINESS:

(A) **Woodbury Avenue between Cottage and Bartlett Sts.** – Speed Concerns and use as a shortcut (letter dated May 25, 2007 attached) – Debbie Finnigan reported she received a call concerning the Rte.1 By-pass project asking if we could look at reversing the direction of Woodbury from Bartlett St. to Cottage St. Several concerns of what that would look like and what it would mean in terms of overall traffic flow in the area. Recommend that it be left as it is at the moment.
MOTION to place letter on file. Seconded by John Howe. Motion passed.

(B) **Pamela Drive/Ocean Road** – Safety concerns – **MOTION** made by Steve Parkinson to schedule a stealth stat there and have the Police Department take records and report back. Seconded by Eric Spear. Motion passed.

(C) **Wilson Rd./Lafayette Rd./Wilson Rd. ext Intersection** - Traffic Signals (letter dated May 4, 2007 attached) – Debbie Finnigan reported there were concerns coming southbound on Rte.1 turning right into Market Basket at Wilson Rd. the cars are not using the lane but driving over the shoulder and there is some curbing on the corner. Another concern is that the pedestrian signals aren't working as they ought to. This being a state signal, recommend that this be forwarded to the State for review and comment.

MOTION made by Steve Parkinson to refer this letter to the state for investigation and report back. Seconded by Jonathan Bailey. Motion passed.

(D) **Ocean Rd/Maple Haven** – Crosswalk – Christina Westfall stated that Ocean Rd is a state road, however, the housing development is divided by that road and the park is on one side with residents on the other side that want to go to the park cannot cross Ocean Rd. there are no crosswalks there. Suzanne and Winchester are the only streets you can enter the other side of Maple Haven.

The Chair asked if crosswalks can be put on state roads or do we have to go to the State?

Steve Parkinson responded that it would have to be referred to the State.

MOTION made by Steve Parkinson to refer this request to the State DOT for evaluation of installing crosswalk on Ocean Road. Seconded by John Connors. Motion passed.

- (E) **Parade Mall** – TAC referral – Gregg Milcolaities of Appledore Engineering representing Parade Mall, Robin Bousa, Traffic Engineer with VHB and Jeff Johnston of Cathartes. Mr. Milcolaities referred to the site walk and will address the site plans. Asked Robin Bousa to go over the traffic study for the record and will then go through some of the problems and how they will be addressed. Robin Bousa Director of Transportation Systems with VHB gave a brief overview of the traffic study for the record. It is similar to the one you just reviewed for the Westin Hotel project, ours is slightly larger. We evaluated Deer St. from Maplewood all the way down to Market and Russell to Deer all the way down to Market, but because of the block this project encompasses we also looked again at Deer St. to Maplewood Ave. down to Market. We collected all new traffic data for the study this past spring so everything is up to date. The design is 2020, forecasted everything 13 years into the future. We feel our access plan compliments the traffics flow. Ms. Bousa referred to drawings showing the flow of traffic. The latest revision to the Westin plan, Deer St is now one-way from Russell down to Market, that being the case you will no longer be able to take a left turn from Market St. onto Deer St. There should probably be a separate left turn lane to accommodate that movement. When the City was reviewing the original Westin plan there was a reduction of parking on Deer St. The original Westin Deer St. plan what we propose to do is actually take the sidewalk from within the public right-of-way, grant an easement to the City and put it on our property. By doing this we can actually put 9 parking spaces back on Deer St. from the private way extending up Russell St.

The Chair stated this effects Deer St. and as a business owner and if there is no objection he will continue.

Ms. Bousa referred to a question raised at the site walk was the queuing coming into the garage from the Hanover St. entrance and presented the committee with a Memo summarizing their results. Mr. Bousa stated that when meeting with TAC last week there is a list of things we need to do and will work through them, they are as follows, some relating to traffic.

1. Look updating analysis in their original site reflecting the new Westin approved plan, the one-way circulation on Deer St.
2. Look at contingency plan, what do things look like if this project moves forward before the Westin moves forward.
3. Steve Parkinson requested they look at an evaluation of a special event when the private way may be closed and how does that effect the traffic circulation.
4. The Westin has some concern with issues of queuing on Deer St. resulting from the Maplewood signal and want to make sure that the signal on Maplewood does not back traffic on Deer St. up past the garage driveway.

One of the findings of their traffic study was that as the Westin site is developed and the Parade Mall is redeveloped the coordination plan on Maplewood will need to be adjusted to accommodate the additional traffic on the side streets. We can use those adjustments to help control queuing both for the Westin garage and the Hanover St. garage. There will be additional analysis and will submit to their traffic engineer as well as Debbie Finnigan to review.

Gregg Milcolaities recapped the site walk and have prepared four sketches in response to comments. Referred to the plans explaining them.

Steve Parkinson referred to the exit from the parking garage and how are pedestrian handicap ramp going to be accommodated with the angle and point section shown on the drawing?

Mr. Milcolaities responded actually it should be twisted and more in line with the crosswalk and will be aligned with a straight line. The handicap ramp will be flushed, we need to change the angle to be parallel with the property line.

Steve Parkinson would like to see the new detail on this.

Mr. Milcolaities referred to their site plan not showing parking Hanover St. There will be 8 spaces along Hanover St. currently there are 14, 6 will be lost due to the entrance to the parking garage, the exit to the private way and the exit out of the residential component.

Debbie Finnigan referred to the configuration of the crosswalk at the Vaughan Mall and her concern her concern is that there is suppose to be a certain radius landing on the crosswalk once you get off the tip down and not sure what you show meets the criteria.

Mr. Milcolaities responded it will be detailed on the site plan. Surveyors are there now, TAC also wants to see detail across the street.

Deputy DiSesa asked for clarification of the one parking space to be lost to improve the site line.

Mr. Milcolaities responded it has been looked at.

Steve Parkinson referred to the WB40 and WB62 Truck Turning Exhibits and does not see a turning template from High St. as was done on the Fire Truck Turning Exhibit. You showed the template from Hanover St. into High St. High St. into private drive but on the WB40 and 62 you did not.

Mr. Milcolaities responded because it has already been designed and approved.

Debbie Finnigan asked 1. Still do not have a site plan of pavement markings on Deer St. and how that relates to the private way? 2. From the Hill into the Hill's proposed parking lot, how is the ADA access going to work through there?

Mr. Milcolaities responded they are dealing with the ADA access with TAC .

Debbie Finnigan stated you will deal with Traffic & Safety as well.

Mr. Milcolaities responded they are prepared to address the handicap issue.

The new plan shows the pavement markings but did not have that for TAC and now have it for the next TAC.

Sharon Somers, Attorney representing the interests of the Hill Condominium Assoc. They are here as they are actively working with the applicant to try and

resolve some of the on-site traffic concerns. It is critical to make sure our concerns are part of the record and to fully preserve our rights. Encourages the Traffic & Safety Committee to taken as much time as needed to thoroughly analyze this project, it is a huge, massive, complicated project and understands and appreciates the developers concerns about wanting to meet a time table but also important for this Committee to protect the abutters and public's interest by taking the time needed to properly analyze the project. They have two concerns with this project. 1. Is a policy and planning issue that the City has indicated a desire to encourage pedestrian traffic and they feel this is an appropriate project to try to implement that concern. They would like to see this Committee and this project focus in on pedestrian traffic as a component of the review to facilitate the use of this project and theirs. Encouraged to hear the point raised on ADA compliance and how access is going to be for the Hill. In your review of the plan want you to note that currently there is a sidewalk essentially is on the Hill side which basically goes around the perimeter of the Hill property and eventually will lead to the downtown area. They strongly encourage this Committee as well as the applicant to give serious consideration to having a sidewalk factoring into the existing trees which will function as a gateway for both properties and encourage the pedestrian flow such that the applicant will construct a sidewalk on both sides of the property. Raise this as a policy concern and wants this Committee and the applicant to be mindful of this as we go forward.

The second concern they have is on-site traffic. Attorney Somers gave a history of the Hill in chronological order. The Hill in conjunction with the Blue Mermaid restaurant has been in this area for a long long time and referred to their own delivery patterns in particular the Blue Mermaid. The Hilton Garden project proved a year or two ago and still going through the massive file. One of the things she found is the approval itself has no conditions or doesn't address in any way traffic issues dealing with on-site traffic issues, truck delivery issues etc. Nothing in the final work product to indicate what steps were taken to try to prevent an interference with the existing use on the abutting property, namely the Hill and Blue Mermaid. She understands that when the Hilton Garden project was before the Planning Board process there was discussions at that time about the fact that Deer St. was going to function as one of the primary access to the site, which is no longer the case as Deer St. will be blocked off. Secondly, at the time Hilton Garden was proposed, discussion was that there will not be a restaurant, only a coffee shop and that box cars would be the chosen method of delivery and courtyard be used to house some of those delivery vehicles. In moving forward with the historical background, the proposal before you, Deer St. is no longer in the play, Garden Way is going to be a two-way street, the proposed private way into Hanover one-way, the two private ways have to serve as access to the property, the Hilton Garden, the existing Hill Condos and to the proposed residential condos as well. The traffic study and comments Atty. Somers has been listening to don't address the on-site internal traffic flow that is going to be generated and used by these various activities she just addressed. Feels this is something this Committee needs to work on and be concerned about. There needs to be a lot more information presented to this Committee on these types of issues before any kind of informed decisions and recommendations can be made. Encourages this Committee to pin down and have the Applicant pin down is what the delivery protocols are going to be. Attorney Somers brought to the Committee's attention to the observations of the on ground conditions they have noticed and presented the members of the Committee with photographs that were taken by Scott Logan during the past month of what is going on there right

now explaining each of the photos showing delivery trucks servicing Hilton Garden. There are some issues that need to be explored, what hasn't been factored into this is what the delivery protocol is going to be for the new hotel going in and/or any restaurants that may be part of the new project that need to be serviced by these large trucks. They are and continue to be open to any creative solutions to work with the applicant on and are in the process of discussing that. What needs to be borne in mind by the applicant and this Committee is that it is the applicant's burden to demonstrate their going to be able to meet site review criteria and none of those have to do with on-site traffic issues. As part of this Committee's job in terms of making a recommendation to the Planning Board to make sure that those things are addressed.

Don Peterson Westin, referred to conversations with Jeff Johnston and his group regarding traffic and circulation as it relates to our development as well as theirs. They do have concerns, are in support of this project, but it is incumbent upon them to bring to your attention. Regarding the right turn concept coming into and around the site, we want to insure that circulation works for everyone. It is important to state that while we are here as Harborcorp, ultimately the parking garage will belong to the City and their concerns relate primarily to the traffic on Deer St. which is the primary access to the parking garage. Wondered why the one-way came from Deer St. toward Hanover St. Mr. Johnston responded that was the preferred methodology and Mr. Peterson stated they can better explain that then he can. One question he has of the concept of the right hand turn is how do we insure that the majority of the circulation goes from Market St. to Hanover and circulates into the garage in that right hand turn scenario? Mr. Bousa represented we had a concern about the Maplewood Ave. queuing at the left hand turn lane coming off Deer onto Maplewood. We do have a concern about that and by moving the turning lane toward Maplewood she feels the situation would be improved in and around that queue as well as access to the parking garage. The question we have is what happens to the left hand turn for people trying to get onto the private way? There is no turn lane, there is approximately two car lengths before backing up onto the entry to the parking garage, that's entry and exit for the primary access to the parking garage. One car can stack everything up going back down Deer St. towards Maplewood Ave. as they wait to turn left into private way. The Committee might want to consider the implications of that, what it does to the circulation 1. around the site and 2. what it does to access and egress to the parking garage. To resolve this problem, an opposite one-way of the private way, you have no left turn there, if this is not possible, another option to consider a no left turn and people would have to go around the block and come down the right way off Maplewood Ave. Don't know how practical this is for anybody, but concerned about one car being able to stack up and basically shut down access and egress to the parking garage. These are our concerns and very interested in pursuing this project in concert with Parade Mall, we will be long term neighbors but the City is involved as ultimate ownership of the parking garage and hope they take a good hard look at this question.

Al McEachern, Attorney for the applicant and since the issue of the use of Garden Way has come up submitted to the Committee a log of deliveries that were made utilizing Garden Way for a three week period beginning May 16 - June 5 for the record. It shows during the period May 16 to June 5 there were approximately 30 truck deliveries to the Blue Mermaid and 21 to the Hilton

Garden Inn. Emphasized they are actively discussing options with the Hill on how to effectively utilizing Garden Way so that deliveries can be made.

Robin Bousa responded to the question regarding the Hill and internal traffic. Typically traffic studies don't look at an internal parking lot. What you see here as far as two-way roadway leading into parking lot is a typical standard on-site design. From a capacity perspective, in an overall scheme of things it is a small scale parking lot, there is plenty of capacity to handle normal activity. These are two separate issues and need to be looked at that way, the truck issue and circulation issue. In our opinion from a capacity perspective there is plenty of capacity on these two roadways to service the parking lot, the truck issue you need to look at separately. Regarding to comments with the Westin and queuing, for the record, we knew our access onto Deer St. was going to be an issue from the beginning and met several times with Debbie Finnigan and Steve Parkinson discussing it looking at all the options. The memorandum provides some of the history. The suggestion of moving the driveway closer to the signal on Maplewood was a good thing, actually it really is for the garage. Shifting our driveway down, takes away a number of conflicts and opens up more available gaps in the through traffic on Deer St. There simply is not room for a left turn lane. Of all the places between the existing location and Maplewood Ave. our driveway is in the optimal location, provides maximum storage you can provide for the Maplewood signal. Gregg Milcolaities referred to the pedestrian access that there is an existing sidewalk from Deer St. up to the Hill that we are not changing, as I mentioned we will be creating connections to bring the Hill into the Parade Mall project, discussions are on-going between the two parties. It is up to the City's standards, lanterns, sidewalks, planters and the intent is to be pedestrian friendly, the reason for the expense of putting over 300 cars below ground to create pedestrian environment.

The Chair asked Mr. Milcolaities to touch more on the sidewalk coming down between the Hill and the proposed Building No.2, why it is not coming all the way down?

Mr. Milcolaities responded there is a sidewalk there now and we are not changing it.

The Chair stated it doesn't show on the drawing as coming all the way down. There is one on the Hill side but your side shows it coming down and stopping. Is it supposed to come all the way down?

Mr. Milcolaities responded "no" it stopped to put some green in there. It is not stopping pedestrian access, if anything we feel it's improving pedestrian access.

Attorney Somers commented that the point I tried to make earlier what seemed to make sense to us is that if the City is concerned about providing pedestrian access in an ecological way and if the proposal is to have a sidewalk on the Parade property then why not take into account for the trees and since there is going to have to be ADA work done, why not simply put the sidewalk over on the Hill property as well, have the applicant do that taking into account the trees so this becomes sort of a gateway area which would essentially help to service both the Hill property as well as this property. Secondly, regarding the traffic study, there probably isn't any question about the ability to handle the actual vehicles that will be generated that will be utilized in this traffic area. The problem comes based upon the photos we just saw that if those vehicles are

blocking that Garden Way, regardless of how much capacity you have, they can't get to those parking spaces so that's the issue. Not to mention the fact that those kinds of blocking issues are also going to interfere with emergency access to the Hill and other portion of the site and will interfere with pedestrian use from here and also pedestrian access to portions of the Hill including the Blue Mermaid.

Don Peterson, Westin had 2 quick points. 1. Would like to have some better idea if the Committee deems it necessary to understand how signage or any other directions might be included in the plan to maximize the direct access to the project site via Hanover versus Russell and Deer that was indicated as a priority as I understood earlier and would like to know how that might be integrated into the plan, and 2. Where does the restudy that is going on by the team for modifications for the signalization at Maplewood Ave. as well as the restudy of the impact of the one-way that was recently passed on our project for the Deer St. between Russell and Market. Asked that the developer include any impact or some sort of a study as to what these two things might do to a left hand turn queue not only onto Maplewood from Deer but on the private way from Deer? Interested in what happens when these two things are reconsidered.

Jeff Johnston, Cathartes stated this is out of his purview and address at TAC. Recognizes these are big projects, we are in some time constraints, we feel obligation to the existing tenants that are in the Parade Office Mall to give them time to locate. Actively working with the Hill and will continue to do that and feel we have implemented 90% of the on-site suggestions they have made and now ready to discuss off-site hoping to work through those and expect we will be able to do that. We are hoping to get a recommendation from you today.

Steve Parkinson asked Mr. Johnston or Ms. Bousa in conjunction with each other, part of the approval for the Hilton was that there traffic was coming from Deer St. through the Parade Mall property to the hotel. With the placement of this building, it eliminated that particular route, how is that traffic to the Hilton now being addressed and was that study part of the traffic for this project because I would think now that the traffic originally designated to go through the parking lot of Parade Mall is now going down the private way.

Mr. Johnston stated his understanding was that John Burke wanted to make sure that if traffic came up Russell St. it could go through the Parade Office Mall site to get to the Hilton Garden Inn, so it wasn't as much going through the parking lot as it was coming down Market taking a right onto Hanover. The traffic studies have taken into consideration that the traffic going up Deer St and down the private way left on Hanover, left into the Hilton Garden.

The Chair came up with a list of about 13 items.

1. Handicap ramp coming out in the exit onto Maplewood Ave. to get that detailing.
2. The detailing of the realignment of the handicap ramp at Vaughan Mall
3. When the motion is made we will have to add on to it that it will be a referral to the Parking Committee for loss of parking spaces.
4. Would like to see details that will come back for the truck radius coming on and off High St.
5. Details coming back for ADA requirements at the Hill lot as discussed
6. Making sure new plans have pavement markings on Deer St.

7. When this site is put together, take into account bicycle racks, as the City wants bicycle safety as well as pedestrian safety.
8. The trucks on Garden Way, granted we are an advisory committee, but when it come to the Planning Board's site review that you have worked out a plan to handle that adequately between yourselves and the Hill which seems conversations are ongoing.
- 9.. Another item is coming from the site walk was assistance with the cost of software to be able to do the timing of the lights. (Debbie brought this up at the on-site. Debbie Finnigan stated we wanted an independent traffic engineer go through and do that. A stipulation that they continue to work on that.
10. The walkway on both sides, conversations you are having with the Hill to make sure the walkway coming down.
11. Request that the developer will continue to work with the City for the Market St. at Russell lights so that there will be a double left hand turn onto Market coming down Russell.
12. Deputy Chief DiSesa brought up at the site walk to allow the police to be able to come onto property to handle traffic issues. The Chair wasn't sure whether it had to be a formalized agreement or signage.

Steve Parkinson stated that as much as he would like to see this project moved forward there are too many outstanding issues that need to be addressed by this Committee rather than just sending the results onto TAC. One, if for whatever reason, the improvements that are part of the Westin project do not get built or are delayed as construction of this goes forward, what is going to happen. It is premature at this point and they will have this information soon to just pass this back to TAC without those answers being done here.

MOTION made by Steve Parkinson to table to July meeting. Seconded by Christina Westfall. Motion passed.

Debbie Finnigan stated trash pick up was not mentioned and is important as whenever they decide to pick up trash it not be during peak hours. Suggests that an updated analyses with new circulation needs to be looked at and approved by this Committee as well as the special event analysis with the street being closed. Although she agrees with Robin that the analysis does not particularly look at the on-site circulation and agrees if there were no trucks there it would not be a problem, but there needs to be some way to determine how to get trucks there to deliver as well as cars. Looking at those pictures, when trucks are parked in that lane, those cars are going into the opposite lane of oncoming traffic and need to understand this is a problem and needs to be looked at. Another thing there needs to be a dimension or explanation that there will be enough pedestrian access a minimum of 5ft. clear access near the outdoor seating. Also suggests that this Committee make a favorable recommendation of those items before sending the project back to TAC.

Christina Westfall wants to make sure the analysis includes the possibility of people realizing they can make that a quick short cut to get in the parking garage quicker by going down Russell cutting across Deer to the private way.

Gregg stated they are going to TAC and there are a number of site related traffic issues would like to pursue our TAC approval and knock off site review issues and come back here. TAC had a number of site related issue that they would like to address, come back here and then back to TAC.

Lucy Tillman responded she will relate this to David Holden as she is not sure how to proceed, it will be discussed.

Steve Parkinson stated typically referrals out of advisor, they get their approval contingent upon Traffic & Safety and doesn't see the process stopping.

IV. OLD BUSINESS:

- (A) **Newcastle Ave./Marcy St. to South St.** – Neighborhood concerns (information attached) – Debbie Finnigan stated this project has had several meetings with the neighborhood concerning placement of sidewalks and crosswalks on Newcastle Ave. between Marcy and South Streets. Tom Richter prepared three plans, the first plan is the sidewalk coming from northerly side and crossing over at Ridges Court and continues down the street all the way to South St. with a crossing at Humphreys Court to get access to the pathway to the school. The second plan shows the sidewalk continues on the north side from Marcy St. to Humphreys Court and continues across Humphreys Court as it does today and continues on the southerly side a new sidewalk on the southerly side from Humphreys Court to South St. The third plan shows sidewalk from Marcy St. to the address of 77 Newcastle Ave. which is about three houses to the east of Humphreys Court crosses there, this is the location at the top of the hill where the crosswalk is proposed to be located, and continues on the southerly side all the way to South St. This is what Tom's thought was as compromise solution to where the sidewalks and crosswalks should go. These are the current three plans you have in front of you.

The Chair asked which one was currently what we approved last time through.

Debbie Finnigan responded tabled. It was up to the City to determine that and coming before Traffic& Safety for discussions to see what the outcome should be.

Steve Parkinson commented this project was before this committee last it was dealing with parking issues taking place out there and concern we had at that time was we had this project that was coming forward and have gone through 3 designs, the original one that had gone forth was the sidewalk on the north side, then there was a compromise of part on the north and part on the south and the final one that the neighborhood seemed to agree. The issue of the sidewalk itself has not come before this Committee until today.

Heather Hurtt 69 New Castle Avenue, requested that the plans be numbered A,B & C.

Steve Parkinson responded that the first plan is the sidewalk on the north, the combination of north and south is the second and the third plan is the south side.

Ms. Hurtt referred to Newcastle Ave is extremely busy servings 3 purposes. 1. connector from Newcastle Island, a major artery for vehicles coming from downtown Portsmouth to Newcastle. 2. Major recreation loop as part of the Newcastle loop for joggers, bicyclists. 3. South side of street provides access to off street pedestrian walkway to Little Harbor School. Requesting this Committee to recommend is either the third plan showing majority of sidewalk

on the south side or actually a plan not before us today which is actually run the sidewalk all the way on the South side. Urges you to recommend running the sidewalk all the way down on the south side, or the third plan. The only modification she requests is to not have a curb in front of her home, cannot get both doors open on both sides of the car as her driveway is narrow and often parallel parks in front of her house and asks that a curb not be placed there.

78 Newcastle Ave. stated she watches traffic all day and the placement of the sidewalk on the north side would not be used, people would continue to stay on the street.

David Harrington 59 Newcastle Ave. feels the sidewalk should be on the south side as that is where most of the pedestrian traffic is.

Mrs. McCloud Ridges Court, would like to see sidewalks on both sides of the street, the south side although gets most foot traffic does have the most snow, longer for it to melt and if had the option of walking on both sides of street would be better. It is a small stretch of street but a very important stretch, a gateway and would be better to have sidewalk on both sides.

Steve Parkinson stated there were parking issues as the road is very narrow and people cross over centerline to get around cars.

Christina Westfall stated cars were parking on the sidewalk and people had to go into the street because cars were parked on the sidewalk.

MOTION made by Jonathan Bailey to accept Plan C or 3 as designated with sidewalk on the south side of the street. Seconded by Eric Spear. Motion passed.

John Howe asked the reason for the plan not going all the way on the south side? Debbie Finnigan responded there is ledge there and not currently budgeted money to blast the ledge and put up a wall to make that happen even though the seawall project has nothing to do with this section, the thought then was the sidewalk would remain on the north side so when you cross over to the new sidewalk next to the seawall, the crosswalk would be there. To make that change would require additional engineering. The intersection at Marcy St and Newcastle Ave. will change in the future, will not at all look like it does today.

The Chair referred to a comment at the site walk was the visual line of crosswalk at Humphreys Court.

Steve Parkinson responded we are proposing crosswalk in front of 59 Newcastle and now taking it further away from that side and doing a 90 so you have lesser of a crossing from Humphreys over.

Christina Westfall though it was in front of 39 instead of 59 would be the same location on all three proposals.

The Chair referred to curbing on both sides of the street what would happen to the old sidewalk and how would you do curbing.

Steve Parkinson responded typically install curbing along driveway cuts, areas where existing sidewalk is would be removed and grassed and any existing sidewalks from the houses would be extended out to curb line.

- (B) **South Street** - Crosswalk placement (letter dated May 10, 2007 attached) – Debbie Finnigan’s concern was adding a crosswalk at Johnson Court on South St. cross over from Johnson Court onto where the playground is. Concern with danger of existing crosswalk at School St. This Committee recommended putting in a crosswalk on the northerly side of Johnson Court and the removal of the existing crosswalk and appropriate signage to warn motorists of that crosswalk.

MOTION made by Steve Parkinson to reconsideration our actions from previous meeting. Seconded by John Howe. Motion passed.

Hilary Kompasov 97 South Street, stated their original letter was sent in March stating that the existing crosswalk on the corner of South School and South St. would be more effective if it had signage close to it indicating there is a crosswalk and to paint it, it is barely visible. Secondly, we had proposed a crosswalk be placed across from 77 South St., Marcy St. side of Johnson Court. The reason is there are many children crossing there, four children live at 77 South St. and is an access to the park there is already a slanted curb at no.77 and not in front of No.91. Also hoping to get a zone so that it would be the first entrance of the park all the way to the second entrance. There are 23 kids in the direct vicinity going back and forth and our concern is getting better safety for them and importantly have not heard any recommendation from this Committee yet on signs, currently there are no signs as you drive from Marcy St. approaching playground, we need something there. Particularly concerned with signage. We recommend that there are those post signs that say “state law” attached to telephone poles, would like one attached to the pole across from 91 South St. It was mentioned that the telephone pole would impede visibility for traffic coming from City Hall down South St. There’s a good 10 ft from the pole to where we are proposing that 77 South St. crosswalk be placed. Interested in what signage you are proposing.

The Chair stated that there is a federal list of approved signs, we cannot dictate what the signs are.

Arthur McManus 115 South St. has four copies of pictures of signage. The intention of this discussion is to improve not to just move a crosswalk that obviously helped overall safety of the children crossing the street. The existing crosswalk serves multiple purposes, not just access to the playground but also provides people in the South End access to cross South St. as they go to City Hall, Farmers Market, schools, etc. There are two entrances to the playground, one on the north side across from Johnson Court and the other is at the intersection of So. School and South St. Advocating not to remove that crosswalk but instead repaint it for more visibility. There is a need for two crosswalks, one at Johnson Court. Presented pictures of other sidewalks in Portsmouth having two crosswalks. In summary two crosswalks, signage on both sides to improve visibility.

The Chair responded to the speed issue that we ordered a stealth stat be done by the Police Department and information came from the Deputy Police Chief, you can be provided with a copy of that report. Responded to Austin and Miller crosswalk are close to each other is because there is a school right there.

Steve Parkinson stated crosswalks are painted once a year depending on weather.

Craig Welch 77 South St. father of children ages 7,5,3, and 1 and teach our children to cross streets safely. We just want people to slow down, we want to do whatever we can with signage or more crosswalks to get people to slow down. The best solution for them is a crosswalk in front of the playground, a lot of visuals and ask you not to take out the crosswalk. Kids cross where kids live into the playground and that is not an unsafe crossing if people go 20 MPH.

MOTION made by Steve Parkinson to place a new crosswalk from Johnson Court to the playground side of the park in the area of 77 South St. retain the existing crosswalk, painting it, and Department of Public Works install appropriate advance crosswalk signage as well as sidewalk crossing signage at the crosswalks. Seconded by John Connors. Motion passed. Eric Spear and Cristina Westfall opposed.

Eric Spear referred to site walk and feels the crosswalk on South School St. was unsafe for visibility coming around that curve and support our original recommendation, does not feel people should cross there.

Christina Westfall agrees that this is an issue that there is a poor sight visibility creating false safety. Same thing on the other side and feels better placement would be more in the center of the road which would be in front of No. 91.

John Howe commented feels it is really a signage issue and advance signage would be best to deal with this.

Jonathan Bailey also agrees and everything we deal with is to try and calm traffic, to slow cars down. Putting them in a bad sight line is not a good idea.

Debbie Finnigan referred to comments about traffic coming from Marcy St. onto South St. and speed up is because of the configuration of that intersection. At some point you may need to look about reconfiguring that intersection to force people to slow down around that curb. Agrees with the comments and personally would like to have the original recommendation of the Committee.

Steve Parkinson stated looking at the stealth stats we are not looking at a 50 MPH speed zone, we are talking about a 20 MPH zone that has stealth stats showing the average is 25 MPH, a low speed roadway and with appropriate advance signage to the crosswalk that it will be a safe situation. Does not see an issue with the addition of the other crosswalk on the opposite side of the pole in front of 77 South St.

The Chair personally does not like keeping the existing sidewalk, not a problem with placement of the other one, feels it is a better place in front of either 77 or 91 South St. because of the sight line. Also agrees with Mr. Parkinson that this is

a slowing down, not a high speed area from what the studies have showed. Does not want to keep the existing one and wondered if we are to keep it if it would be better to paint into the road further up as we have done in other areas.

Steve Parkinson asked if he meant symbols?

The Chair responded "yes"

Steve Parkinson responded "yes"

The Chair agrees to keeping the other one and will vote for keeping the other one and also putting the symbol in the road. However if it turns out that over time if the speed situation has not improved and still continues to be somewhat dangerous, would also make recommendation that Department of Public Works not repaint that one, repaint now but in later days to get that one eliminated if the speeding continues. Will continue to do studies there on speeding and if it continues then is in favor of having the crosswalk across from 105 over to South School St. be eliminated and will look at this at a later date.

Agreeable to the maker of the Motion and the second.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted

Elaine E. Boucas, Recording Secretary