

**PORTSMOUTH  
TRAFFIC & SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING  
8:00 a.m. – Thursday, December 13, 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	Ted Gray, Member
Steve Parkinson, P.E. Public Works Director	John Connors, Member
Deputy Police Chief Len DiSesa	John Howe, Member
Fire Chief Chris LeClaire	Christina Westfall, Member
Deborah Finnigan, P.E., Traffic Engineer	Eric Spear, Member
	Jonathan Bailey, Member

**III. ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES:**

**IT WAS VOTED** on a Motion made by John Connors to accept the minutes of the November 8, 2007 meeting. Seconded by Steve Parkinson. Motion passed.

**IV. NEW BUSINESS:**

- (A) **Elwyn Ave. off South St.** – Request for Speed Limit Signs (letter dated 12/4/07 attached) – John Howe referred to the onsite and a resident’s concern of speeding. They observed the area, cars parked on both sides, there was no obvious real serious traffic situation. In speaking with some residents there is occasional speed in the past, have noticed nothing of late. Recommended that the letter be filed with the understanding that as the Police Department patrols and they notice unusual traffic situations, that they advise the Committee so it can be addressed.

**MOTION** made by John Howe to place letter on file and as the Police Department continues to patrol and if they notice unusual traffic situation, they advise the Committee so it can be addressed, and to place a stealth stat there. Seconded by Ted Gray. Motion passed.

The Chair suggested a stealth stat there and Deputy Chief DiSesa stated they can be done but has not been anywhere close to a speed issue that they are aware of.

- (B) **Richards Ave. at Rockland St.** – Request for added stop lines at intersection (letter dated 7/11/07 attached) – Fire Chief LeClaire stated there are stop lines at stop signs on Rockland, but there are no stop lines on Richards Ave. It is a matter of painting in the stop lines on Richards Ave.

**MOTION** made by Fire Chief LeClaire to paint stop lines on Richards Ave. Seconded by Christina Westfall. Motion passed.

The Chair stated we are also looking at putting in crosswalks there as well.

- (C) **Essex Avenue** (upper end) – Request for “No Parking” sign – Steve Parkinson stated since the water tank was taken down at the corner of Essex and Islington and a small park created there with the addition of sidewalks around the corner on Islington and Essex, there has been an issue of cars parking adjacent to the sidewalk. Feels it would be appropriate to post “no parking” signs the length of that sidewalk.

**MOTION** made by Steve Parkinson to post “no parking” signs the length of the sidewalk around the corner of Islington and Essex. Seconded by John Howe. Motion passed.

- (D) **Islington/Cornwall** – Request for appropriate sidewalk and line of sight – Christina Westfall referred to the onsite that there is a bus on the corner and a crosswalk is there as well, ADA curb cuts there, the line of sight is very difficult and parking is up to the bus stop, so it is difficult to see and recommended the crosswalk be moved further down in front of the park with appropriate curb cuts in line with curb cuts already in place on Islington. Seconded by Steve Parkinson. Motion passed.

Ramona Catalpa 249 Islington St., there is a very serious problem with the crosswalk location. Not only from Cornwall St. cross over to Goodwin Park but also from Goodwin Park coming back across Islington St. People aren't paying attention. Cars don't stop and has nearly been run over more than once. In addition to being here and keeping track of the speeding vehicles, feels the only thing she can do is publicize these plate numbers and shame some people into slowing down. She's afraid she'll be the 4<sup>th</sup> fatality on Islington St.

Deputy Chief DiSesa has been working with Ms. Catalpa as well. The Police Department has been doing direct patrols since speaking with Ramona several weeks ago and continuing to do that. Deputy DiSesa suggested putting a “crosswalk ahead” sign. Feels it is a question of signage and enforcement to get people to realize there is a crosswalk there and will continue to do that.

The Chair stated we are looking to do the weebles and different things at the SRTS level and while doing design work for Islington St., will see if these will work in that area as well.

Also Deputy Chief also referred to a similar issue at the mall and Public Works Dept. placed a yellow crosswalk signs posted on the pole there which made a tremendous difference and almost alleviated the problem. Feels that the combination of that plus Police presence will go a long way to solve this problem.

Ms. Catalpa also referred to the issue of one-way street at Cornwall turning from Islington onto Cornwall there is a problem of everyone going the wrong way out of Cornwall, some of the people don't realize it's a one-way street, but most of her neighbors who live there don't want to go around the block.

- (E) **Meadowbrook Inn – Proposed Redevelopment Project** – Traffic Impact and Access Study and Response to TAC Comments attached – Mike Leo Engineer from VHB on behalf of Key Auto gave a brief overview of the site before turning over to the Traffic Engineer. Mr. Leo had an existing condition site plan showing the property at Route 1 By-pass, Coakley Road, and Hodgson Brook. There are currently three existing buildings that are a hotel use, a lounge

associated with it. Redevelopment of the site proposing 120 room hotel, five stories high, sit down family style restaurant, restaurant B is directly associated with a fast food type restaurant, retail space and another small restaurant. Mr. Leo introduced Nick Sanders, Traffic Engineer with VHB and stated it is a redevelopment of the existing 123 room hotel into a new 120 room hotel/restaurant with an approximate additional 25-26,000 sq.ft. of mixed retail. The access and egress will be provided via two site driveways, one is the full access drive off Coakley Rd. which is going to be relocated from its current location back to a point 250ft. back from the intersection to create some additional separation to improve traffic flow in this area of Coakley. The second access point is the right in/right out on the By-pass and that's approximately 250 ft. north of Coakley and Cottage Sts. The study area was delineated at a scoping session with both the NHDOT and the City, Essentially the scoping session is along US Rte.2 Bypass from the traffic circle through the site driveway to the intersection of Coakley Rd and Cottage and then back along Coakley to the other site driveway continuing down US Rte.1 By-pass to intersection of Borthwick to U-Haul and far south down to intersection of Greenleaf Ave. Continuing away from the site on Cottage to the Intersection of Woodbury Ave. and then from the interchange of US Rte.1 By-pass at Woodbury Ave. both north and southbound ramps through the Holiday Inn drive with the intersection of Dennett down through Woodbury to the intersection of Bartlett and then Bartlett all the way down to the intersection of Islington as well as the intersection of Dennett and Bartlett. Traffic data was collected during the week day evenings and Sat. mid-day conditions that would be typical of this type of retail development, adjusted to the peak month and then grown based on the study area to 2009 and ten year forecast to 2019. Mr. Sanders gave a brief run down of the trip generation estimate as follows: During the week day evening it was anticipated there would be approx. 320 total trips that this site would generate. Important to note that a relatively high percentage of those trips will be passby trips, which is traffic that is already traveling on the by-pass and drawn into the site on their way to or from another destination. Of those 320 trips approximately 120 that are passby trips which is to say that only 200 of those 320 trips are new trips to the area. Saturday midday will generate 515 total trips, again a significant amount of passby traffic and 190 trips bringing your actual new trips generated to 325. That is worse case condition showing no credit for the existing motel. If the existing hotel were to be redeveloped it could generate as much as 70 trips during the week and 85 trips Saturday which is to say taking that into consideration the actual amount of increase of new traffic during week day evening would be 130 trips and about 240 during Saturday. What that says is there is relatively low increase in traffic for instance at the traffic circle in 2009 during the week day evening there is approximately. 4,790 vehicles circulating through the traffic circle in the peak hour. Under the condition it would increase to 4,905 about 2% increase in traffic. Saturday condition it is closer to 5% increase. Other segments of road along US Rte.1 Bypass south of Greenleaf talking about increases of about 15-25 peak hour trips, 15 in the week day evening and 25 during Saturday midday an increase of approx. 1%. Coakley talking about 20 trip increase during week day evening peak hour and 30 during Saturday peak. Woodbury Ave. south of the Bypass increases of 1%. Bartlett St. north of Islington increases of 1-2%. Intersection of Coakley and Cottage St. expect to operate at level service C (overall). The site driveways, right out will operate at level service B and the other site driveway at Coakley will also operate at level service B. Sight distance the figure shows sight lines for the existing right

in/right out on bypass is fair line of sight all the way to the traffic circle which is about 550 ft. which exceeds the after criteria for both intersection sight distances. The intersection of Coakley Rd. and site driveway also has adequate sight distance looking to the west towards the Coakley Rd residences the sight line is over 1,000 ft. and the east is a clear line of sight back to the intersection of Rt.1 Bypass.

In conclusion the traffic demands for the proposed development are not substantially great. Nonetheless we are proposing some of the following improvements: First, the intersection of US Rte.1 By-pass and right of way out of driveway we're proposing to add a south bound right turn lane into the site, referring to the plan. The second would be to relocate the sight driveway from its current location about 50 ft. from the signal back to a point 250 ft. Third, Hearing from TAC and the public that there are concerns with the signal timings and issues with queues blocking US Rte.1 By-pass, we are committed to evaluating the retiming plan of this signal and signal to the south and coordinating them to allow these side streets better access onto the Bypass. Fourth, Client commitment to make a financial contribution to a CIP project.

Christina Westfall asked if on Coakley Cottage they are proposing a left hand turn lane?

Mr. Sanders responded "no left turn lane". Stated that under the signal timing and coordination project they are recommending that the timing of these lights be changed such that Cottage St. gets an advanced green and feel this will help clean up the side streets as well in addition to the other timing changes.

Ted Gray feels their projection for 1-2% increase in traffic is very very under rated and feels there will be a tremendous amount of traffic. You are going to have a lot more traffic than what you are projecting.

Mr. Sanders responded that the percentages he worked out, some of the 1% specifically to the south on the Bypass are relatively small percentages. Most of the traffic from this project we're anticipating is going to be coming from I-95 and Route 16 via the traffic circle, there is already a high amount of traffic going through that area, and from a percentage standpoint is relatively low. Going east on Cottage St. we're anticipating a relatively low percentage of our traffic going to and from that neighborhood. Regarding acquiring land on Borthwick pointed out that Rte.1 Bypass improvement plan does make a recommendation and shows providing a connection between those two streets.

Fire Chief LeClaire wants to make sure that they include opticom for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Sanders responded they are giving serious consideration for that, but can't commit right now but they are considering it and will get back to you on this.

Chief LeClaire brought this up as it is a significant intersection that needs to be controlled for emergency response.

Eric Spear referred to the response to TAC comments memo. One of them concerned the pedestrian activity between Cottage and Coakley. 1. states there is no predicted pedestrian activity and states if we did put a protected pedestrian

phase that it would cause a loss of service to B and feels both of these can't be true. Also referred to redevelopment with the Army Reserve Center there will be more pedestrian activity on Cottage and would like to have that set up now in redeveloping the section. Feels it would be appropriate for pedestrian phase and for a sidewalk to the intersection all the way to the driveway on Coakley.

The Chair stated the sidewalk extension exhibit has been an issue that has been on going at this level for a while trying to get that crosswalk and there are a lot of interested people here and suggested he go into detail.

Mr. Sanders stated the purpose was to show the sidewalk along Coakley referring to the blue and green markings on the plan. Stated they're client will consider constructing it if you feel it is necessary, would consider installing it, just not recommending it. Also stated they were asked to look at the feasibility of a crosswalk to the south at the intersection of Borthwick and as you continue down the Bypass on either side there is a pinch point over the bridge underneath the Bypass and no room to construct a sidewalk on either.

John Howe asked if the 5-story hotel having restaurant, conference, meeting facilities would cause additional activity

Mr. Sanders responded "no"

Mr. Howe also concurs with Mr. Gray and asked if there could be an emergency crossover between Borthwick and Coakley?

Mr. Sanders responded probably.

Jonathan Bailey referred to the intersection of Cottage and Rte.1 that you are telling us the traffic volumes aren't going to be significantly impacted and doesn't need significant mitigation or improvement but in asking for a crosswalk we find out that just a couple of cycles of pedestrians during the peak hour pushes intersection into failure. Also, not putting left hand lane in on Coakley side because of inability to do any work on Cottage, the vast majority traffic off Cottage will be going back onto Rte.1 and back into circle. Why do you have to have a left turn lane on Cottage in order to get a left turn lane on Coakley?

Mr. Sanders responded to the first part that they don't anticipate the intersection to drop below level service C. The intersection of Coakley and Cottage will be at .97 V/C (Volume to Capacity) ratio, stating there is not a lot of reserve capacity. You do not have to have linkage between Cottage and Coakley but would be ideal to have both as there is a significant demand on Cottage to turn south.

Debbie Finnigan followed up on dual lefts stating typically when putting in left turn in, you want to make sure there is a shadowing left turn or an island on the other side so you don't have someone driving through into the through lane on the other side. It is really an alignment issue and a safety issue, so you need to have either both lefts or an island shadowing the other left turn for safety purposes. After looking at the analysis they have presented is comfortable that they have done a good job in terms of trying to improve the intersection. What they are planning to do and didn't explain, is they will put an artificial delay on the main line so that the circle has time to process the traffic on the Bypass which when the side streets come up and you have the delay on Cottage and Coakley they have somewhere to go because the Circle has had time to process that traffic and feels it would help more than the lefts. The lefts would help ideally but

thinks they need to look and give the analysis on putting in a pedestrian crossing there. Doesn't think a pedestrian phase is going to be coming up each cycle. On the flip side, as much as we want something, it still needs to go through and get approved by the State as they are their signals. We can propose this, ultimately will the State let us put in the pedestrian crossing and we need to make a good case to them for that change.

Mr. Sanders referred to a phasing chart of the existing phasing of the intersections of Coakley, Cottage, Borthwick which he presented to the Committee.

The Chair stated that the Parking Committee scheduled for 9:00 a.m. will be starting as soon as this is over. As we do not go beyond 10:00 a.m. we will table where we are and resume at our next meeting.

Referred to the issue of traffic backing up at the traffic circle and blocking intersections specifically at Coakley and Cottage, but also causing backups into Borthwick. Part of the problem is the existing phasing at these two intersections. Mr. Sanders explained the 3 phases, the first phase is processing traffic through the two intersections into the traffic circle; the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase is the southbound traffic; the 3<sup>rd</sup> phase is Borthwick. When you get to the final phase where the side street green comes up on Coakley and Cottage the back up from the traffic circle queued into Coakley and Cottage blocks the intersection and effectively your green time on Coakley and Cottage is useless as you can't get onto the main line which is a frustration heard from TAC as well as some of the public testimony at TAC. We were charged with the task of trying to change the phasing, allow some gaps on the main line and pull some of the through traffic back so the side streets can get out. We are proposing is to coordinate those two signals so that we can accomplish that. Initially the Borthwick side street come up with the northbound through traffic and left turns into Coakley to progress traffic to the traffic circle. The next phase would be the northbound with a left turn into Borthwick with the through traffic at Coakley and Cottage again processing traffic into the traffic circle and the 3<sup>rd</sup> phase is the through traffic on the Bypass, in both directions. This is still pumping traffic into the traffic circle, not all that different from what we are seeing in the existing phasing. The key difference is the 4<sup>th</sup> phase which is a maximum recall on the southbound left turns both into Cottage and into Frank Jones Center. There is not a significant heavy demand for those left turns, but when intersection is put on maximum recall, it would come up every cycle and not necessarily at every cycle is there going to be a vehicle or two at that intersection. The purpose of the phase is to allow while this southbound traffic is going, those left turns are allowed to go into Cottage and into the U-Haul and allows the traffic circle to process all the traffic going into it and clear the intersection so when the next phase comes up the side streets actually have a cleared intersection.

Christina Westfall thanked Mr. Sanders for spelling this out. The left hand turn lane advance will turn green even though there may not be a vehicle there is allowing time for cars to be process in the circle, is this correct?

Mr. Sanders responded "yes" that is the key point.

Ms. Westfall asked if the on-demand or as needed crosswalk be the same benefit as allowing the circle to also generate should there be pedestrians that will activate that signal? Wouldn't it be an added benefit to go across that crosswalk to clear the circle and giving time for that to happen? This has come before us several times for a crosswalk at that intersection. Feels it is unrealistic to expect that there's not going to be any pedestrians there, especially with restaurants and businesses there. Realizing it is up to the state to approve signals and crosswalk asked that you consider putting a sidewalk on your portion to meet that crosswalk that hopefully the state will put in based on Ms. Finnigan's request.

Mr. Sanders will have this conversation with his client and feels they will be receptive to that.

Mr. Sanders referred to the blue and green portions of the proposed plans before the Committee.

Ted Gray is pushing for the sidewalk and crosswalk because people will be crossing there and would be nice to see an elevated crosswalk there. In his opinion feels there will be a lot more pedestrian traffic and a lot more vehicle traffic when and if this goes through.

Deputy Chief DiSesa asked why is an elevated crosswalk a "pie in the sky"? There is one on Market. Feels if we explored this possibility would solve a multitude of issues at that intersection. Queues back are huge during rush hour and agrees with Mr. Gray and the restaurants will attract people in the neighborhood.

The Chair also agrees that adding that crosswalk in changes this whole theory and also what we are hearing from the neighborhoods and from our experience of a project like this, you are going to create pedestrian foot traffic. Seems like elevation will help accomplish 1. provide safe crossing and 2. not having this fail. Thinks the idea of doing this is fabulous, actually will correct some of the issues we are having down there. Throw in a couple of pedestrian phases in there, we are back to the same situation, if not worse. As we move forward with this would like to keep that line open to be able to have an elevated pedestrian crossing.

Debbie Finnigan asked about trucks accessing the site and at some point the entrance off the Bypass will be closed and based on the truck turns as shown the trucks will not be able to access the site from Coakley Rd., as they will cross over into the oncoming lane in order to do that. At some point in the future your client is going to be responsible for widening that out. It will be their responsibility to take that on, not the City's or the State's.

Mr. Sanders stated they understood that and added when those improvements go in place, right in/right out, there would be the connection from Coakley to Borthwick and will accommodate truck traffic.

Debbie Finnigan stated that driveway does not currently accommodate truck traffic, and you will have to come back to the City for permission to widen out that driveway. It will be the developer or whoever owns it at that time to take care of this.

Secondly, how are you going to get back to I-95 once you leave the site? The cars can make it out of Coakley Rd., while the trucks (WB-50/62) can't.

Mr. Sanders responded when the trucks are exiting the site, they will have to take a right out, go to the south and access I-95 via Borthwick.

Mr. Leo responded as far as the truck traffic goes we would set up with the maintenance person or site manager and give him the guidelines for what trucks need to do to get in and out of the site, they have to come into the site and exit the site onto Rte.1 Bypass. The truck drivers know there are certain sites they can only go in certain directions and will be given those directions using the Bypass not Coakley Rd.

Debbie Finnigan stated you will need to put "no truck" signs to not have those trucks go on Coakley Rd., where Retail A is.

Thirdly, traffic you expected from I-95, is that truly traffic that would not be in the area without this development?

Mr. Sanders responded in the area going through on the interstate system. Also referring back to the elevated pedestrian crossing, we have not put pencil to paper on that option, but says will run into the similar issue we are faced with today with the limited right-of-way on Cottage. The distance between the right-of-way at the corner and the sidewalk is less than a couple of feet. Looking at it now, can't see how it can possibly have an elevated crossing anywhere on that side of the Bypass.

The Chair had the following questions:

The Chair referred to the traffic on the site itself and noticed on the new drawings, one of the things from the site walk was the Bypass around restaurant A coming through the drive through that will be helpful to the traffic flow. Does not see one on restaurant B and his concerns with restaurant B a drive through there is not a bypass lane there, it is tight but we need something there, once someone happens to get into the wrong lane they are stuck. His concern with this is when people come out of that they either will take a left or right to come back down to the main driveway coming in off the bypass. Is the island there a raised island or striped island?

Mr. Sanders responded it is a triangle piece of island with striped island next to it.

The Chair's concern is people coming out of restaurant B taking a right looping down to the stop bar shooting across to get to the right only out of there and crossing all that traffic that is still coming in at a speed as they come off the bypass and sees this as a choking point. Also concerned with following your entrance coming in meeting the other main entrance coming in and the back access road coming behind the hotel and retail B, all of that meeting of there, is there any way of "T"ing" that intersection? It is a wide swoop that people will cut across coming around restaurant B doing it properly taking a right hand turn at the stop bar coming up and then taking a left hand turn to get out. Sees this as a choke point.

Mr. Leo responded to the drive through at restaurant B, it is not clear on the plan but the lane adjacent to restaurant B is designated as one-way so vehicles coming through the drive through will use the left hand turn and then head back toward retail B preventing them from taking right turn.



The Chair stated if that's the case please extend where you are coming out from the entrance with the stop, extend it further to the left so it forces the traffic or you have an island there. Channelize it to the left. Your road access coming behind retail B in the hotel, where that comes up to the driveway, your driveway coming off the Bypass as well as your driveway coming in off Coakley Rd., when you get to that intersection it is a neater, cleaner, neater, t'd up 4-way intersection.

Mr. Leo stated possibly looking at making it one-way behind hotel, retail.

The Chair would like to see a study on how that effects the project. Also regarding trucks, currently at what's there now, there was a lot of trucks using the facility as an overnight stay. Is your anticipation that with the new hotel, that that type of service will be something that is continued.

Mr. Leo responded "no".

The Chair stated "so you are not providing truck parking anywhere on the Lot?"

Mr. Leo responded we will be showing the required loading spaces that the City required, but not having this being a truck stop or overnight stay.

The Chair stated so the truck traffic we are talking about on this project is only for current delivered.

Mr. Sanders responded "correct.

Steve Parkinson asked about the entrance and exit to the right of restaurant B, in the ramp coming off the Bypass sees this as problematic. Traffic coming off the Bypass you're suddenly going to have someone in front of you in very short order trying to take a right as well as cars coming out there. Is there really a need for that part right there? You're within a very short distance of the Bypass. Typically when you have a ramp coming into your development, typically don't have something such as that that close to where you're coming off your higher speed.

Mr. Sanders responded they will take a look at that to limit the access in that area, either an in or out movement only.

Mr. Parkinson stated you need to or you will have rear end collisions there.

The Chair stated the truck traffic will be significantly less than what we're currently seeing on the site because it's not going to have a place for the truckers to spend the evening, just delivery trucks, but having cars right on top of them as they are descending.

Eric Spear referred to people visiting not familiar with the area stating his concern is that without significant signage the intuitive thing would be to get back and go right out the right turn on Route I-A and then you're lost to get back to I-95 would be a nightmare. Emphasized a lot of signage to encourage people when they want to go I-95 to come out Coakley.

Ted Gray concurs with the area to the right of restaurant B, no matter what you do, he foresees at least one car trying to go out to the Bypass the inside. You

need to do something. Also concurs with the Chair in trying to straighten out the intersection below retail B to bring that out and hopefully eliminate some pavement in order to have a straight cross piece there and the intersection be approached at a 90o angle.

Fire Chief LeClaire is confused with truck traffic, it seems safer to have trucks come out Coakley and take a left. There seems to be more questions than answers at this point and assumes we're moving towards tabling.

The Chair asked if the people present wanted to make their comments today or wait, as we are tabling this to have it come back. Public comments held off for today. Other comments from the Committee.

Debbie Finnigan likes directional signage as well, but need to be careful what we put, if we start putting 95 for cars, the trucks may follow as well and need to be very cognizant about what we put on the site and where it is put on the site.

John Howe referred to the question of the 5-story hotel, will there be a restaurant there, will there be convention facilities?

Mr. Sanders responded there will be no restaurants at the hotel.

The Chair stated they usually have the breakfast, are they going to have a breakfast buffet.

Mr. Sanders responded more or less a continental breakfast.

Secondly, John Howe concurs with the idea of going ahead with the signs on both sides. Asked if we had a sense for the Army Reserve Center that the City will have to determine what its usage will be and depending on usage, wouldn't that also create a requirement for sidewalk, etc.

On a side note, the Chair stated the City itself is looking at the Army Reserve Center as becoming City property, that is not even begin the process until 2011, 2012 time frame. We have not made a determination of what that facility will be used for. This is something to keep in the back of our minds. When we look at the current crossover will be a tight area on the other side on Cottage St. and hopefully when you're putting pen to paper you'll be working closely with Ms. Finnigan to work out and if the City has to get involved to make this happen, it might behoove us to do so. Not only do we feel it's a safety issue but the neighbors have come out strongly about what we have to do for pedestrian traffic down in there.

Debbie Finnigan suggested that if the committee so wishes that they work with her on the internal issues in terms of how things get in and out of the site and circulation.

The Chair stated that if this goes to a tabling motion things we're looking for is the intersection, the Chief indicated he would like to see both sets of lights having emergency capabilities, would like to have more solid commitment for sidewalk, put pen to paper for the cross over to see if that's possible, again,

working with the City and further work done on the traffic flow for restaurant B, and so far this is where we're at.

Mr. Sanders referred to the emergency vehicle at the intersection of Coakley and Cottage.

The Chair suggested he work with the Chief on this.

Deputy Chief DiSesa asked when putting pen to paper to look at the southeast corner, not just the northeast corner and secondly, is still confused why trucks can't come out Coakley and make that left turn onto the Bypass and go to the circle, why they have to go to Borthwick.

Debbie Finnigan stated there are truck turns showed, WB50 and WB62. The WB50 goes into the on coming traffic to be able to turn that corner so they cannot stay in their own lane to make that turn. If they would like to do that, she's okay with that but it means that they need to go back and get through the other Boards if they have already gone through to approve this site. Understand that what is shown on these drawings is not a WB50, but a SU vehicle (box truck) and WB50 and WB62 can't come into the site from/to Coakley without crossing into on coming traffic.

Ralph DiBernardo, 1374 Islington St. is concerned with public not speaking today is going to leave these gentlemen coming back next month thinking if they address just the things brought up today they're going to be in a position to move forward and not having heard the public's concerns either they or you are not sure that speaking next month will have any bearing on it.

The Chair stated he asked if anyone wanted to speak at this time and no one rose. If you want to speak now, I'm fine with it.

Mr. DiBernardo had a number of concerns he hopes are included in your deliberation. Having sat on this Committee he never seen a traffic report that was detrimental to the developer. This does not infer that the reports are legitimate but why do we simply accept the report of the developer as being the appropriate information. The report indicates there will be little or no increase in traffic is contradictory to him. Feels this Committee needs to consider the isolation of neighborhoods in this community. The desirability to develop in the City is squeezing our neighborhoods day by day. Coakley Rd and the people that live there are so isolated now, this is going to add to the isolation. The raised pedestrian walkway is a great idea, but if you focus on that and the project goes through without the crosswalk because our focus was on something that can't happen, we are going to be in trouble. It is hard to believe there is not going to be pedestrian traffic. It was mentioned the Cadillac garage, the neighborhood, even the other hotels, it's not unreasonable to believe that people won't want to walk over to the choice of 3 restaurants across the street. It does have to be at Coakley Rd it can't be at Borthwick Ave. There is another issue coming up, people will not walk a block to a crosswalk and then cross and walk a block back when they can run across the street through traffic and this is exactly what will happen at Coakley Rd. Mr. DiBernardo asked the Chief when there are no crosswalks and no pedestrian signals doesn't the pedestrian have the right of

way. Can you step out into traffic and cross if the cars won't let you are you breaking the law?

Deputy Chief DiSesa stated you can not. The law says that when you step out into the crosswalk, the right-of-way attaches to the pedestrian and the pedestrian has the right of way, if there's no crosswalk and no traffic signal.

Mr. DiBernardo stated we have an obligation, this is the Traffic & Safety Committee, that pedestrian issue has to be addressed and the connection between Coakley and Borthwick that we allude to the State in 15 years would be a tremendous help to the traffic and pedestrian situation.

Al Ramano, 3 Coakley Rd. – The increase in traffic they say is 1% on Coakley, if there is an increase at the traffic circle they will go out Coakley Rd to go back on the highway which will increase traffic on Coakley Rd. Feels the sidewalk should be on the other side of Coakley Rd. Pedestrians would not have to fight traffic coming out of the development. Feels the pedestrian bridge is the best thing if it can be done.

Fire Chief LeClaire stated that there is presently a cruiser on the way to an accident at Greenleaf and the bypass, someone hit by a car. Crosswalks don't belong, just because there's a crosswalk doesn't mean it's a safe section of the road to cross, doesn't mean a pedestrian is safe crossing the street. Be really careful with this and maybe the pedestrian walkway is the way to go.

**MOTION** made by Ted Gray to table this project until the next meeting for answers to all the questions. Seconded by Jonathan Bailey. Motion passed.

## V. **OLD BUSINESS:**

- (A) **Broad Street** – Proposed Traffic Calming – The Chair referred to issues along Broad St., Broad St. from Jones Ave. and South St., there has been discussion of traffic speeds and would like to have a motion made to put into the CIP through the Dept. of Public Works the possibility of putting small islands in the road similar to entering the Woodlands for traffic calming as Broad St. is such a broad open road.

**MOTION** made by Eric Spear to have this put into the CIP through the Public Works Dept. for the possibility of putting small islands in the road at Broad St. Seconded by Jonathan Bailey. Motion denied.

Jonathan Bailey asked if we could also, if we look at island, is it something to consider of reducing overall quantity of pavement on Broad St. reducing that enormous expense of pavement letting it go back to grass.

John Connors referred to catch basins off to the side and all of that would have to be removed for drainage purposes.

Debbie Finnigan stated you need to look at drainage no matter what option you do.

The Chair stated if we have to move the drainage it would be a huge expense.

Christine Westfall asked if Broad St. is problematic in that regard, thought we had determined that speed was not an issue there, we had worked with the members of Sunbridge, who wrote to their employees asking them not to use that street as a way to work, they seemed really receptive to that and is curious if this street warrant this.

The Chair thought that the speeding on the street was still high.

Deputy Chief DiSesa stated that the stealth stat indicated that speed was not a factor. This was run before the accident with the young boy. It is not any different from any other neighborhood, even though it is a wide street, the speed was where it should be.

Ted Gray stated Broad St. is no different from Islington, South Street, Pleasant, Aldrich Road. People disregard signs, a lot of people don't care. Feels the Police are doing the best job they can to try to control speed, but to do the islands would be opening the door to what's already, in his opinion, a poor situation.

John Connors stated that the Woodlands was put in by a private contractor, it wasn't a City project.

Mr. Howe asked if we heard from the neighbors since the letters and do we know if the problem has gone away.

Debbie Finnigan stated she has not heard anything and a letter was sent to Sunbridge concerning the issues.

Deputy Chief DiSesa has not heard any feed back at this point. 85% of the cars the speed was unremarkable and doesn't remember it an issue per say, more of a perception issue. Traffic enforcement has increased significantly over the last 6 months and have been slowing people down on Broad St. and will continue to monitor. Doesn't feel he can vote for this as the issue is necessary for that particular street. When we stop cars we find that the cars are people who live in the neighborhood. It's a combination of the three E's, Education, Enforcement and Engineering. Not in favor of islands for that street.

- (B) **Dunlin Way** – Request for a Gate – Deputy City Manager Cindy Hayden speaking on behalf of the City Manager stated that the residents have expressed concern on Dunlin Way about traffic speeding through there, littering on Portsmouth Boulevard on the residential part not yet developed. When Osprey Landing was redeveloped the residential side area was set aside for the right-of-way for a cul-de-sac and the intent was to look at it in future years. The City Manager discussed with staff and owners of the properties and the consensus was that it be a good idea to try it on a pilot basis and work out any bugs that exist.

Debbie Finnigan asked what happens if someone has to turn around, would they be turning around on people's property or are we going to do something to enhance that ability, otherwise they will be driving on people's grass?

Cindy Hayden responded that they actually looked at this issue and have discussed it. The residential end is very short section of street so people will see that it's a dead end and we can place a "dead end" sign. On the non-residential

side coming from Portsmouth Boulevard, intend to put up a chain and also to keep people from littering, and there is plenty of room to turn around in that area.

Eric Spear referred that there wasn't a speeding problem and as there was construction going on, it was proposed to run a stealth stat now that construction is complete.

Deputy City Manager stated this is an issue that the residents have brought up for several years and again, it's not a high quantity, but there was an accident there and people go at high speed.

Christine Westfall commented she's not sure it's just speed, it is the safety part of it as well, it was designed to have it as a cul-de-sac and it is important that we address that. Asked if emergency personnel have some way to access that if they need to, is the chain locked?

Deputy Chief DiSesa stated it is not so much an issue for us as it is for Fire.

Chief LeClaire stated he has concerns with this, his first thought was it doesn't make any sense and went out and looked at it. His first concern with the safety of the resident of Osprey Landing. If there's a fire on Dunlin Way we would go the most direct route which is straight down Portsmouth Boulevard. If the fire was at Spinnaker we would pass 16 residential units. If that access was blocked we would have to go through Osprey Drive, Dunlin Way, we would pass 158 residential units. Kids playing on the sidewalk in the street, it is a smaller street and would make no sense for us to go that way. Is it a longer route, no, actually if you come in from Woodbury it is 7/10's of a mile. If you come in and went Blue Heron, it's 7/10's of a mile, if you go in Blue Heron you'll pass 188 residential units. There are 346 residents or more in that neighborhood. Again, if you want to try the pilot program, if the concern is illegal dumping, chain off the area of the dumping. It is the most direct access for emergency vehicles without endangering even more people. His concern with the pilot program is the chains that go up rarely come down and is the benefit for 16 residences out weighs the rest of 158 or 188.

Christine Campbell 4 Dunlin Way is in favor of the gate, a petition has been signed, cars come out Osprey Landing going down our street going 40 MPH. During evening rush hour go very fast, around 5:00 pm. There is a 15 MPH sign but is coming from Blue Heron, no sign stating what the speed limit is. The developer gave us a plan of the neighborhood with the cul-de-sac, we were all blind sided by the developer. There is a breakaway gate at Spinnaker and feels that is a quicker way.

Chief LeClaire responded that given the option of responding to an incident on main roads as opposed to cutting through condominium project.

Christine Campbell stated cars whiz by with tracks down their street.

Deputy Chief DiSesa stated the stealth stat is useless once snow gets on the ground. The Police have done direct controls all time of the day and night and he personally unofficial monitoring in an unmarked cruiser. Sees people abide by the rules not to say what you're seeing is not happening, but I don't see it happen

when I'm there. I'm seeing controlled speed and are still out there and will keep being there and working with you in the neighborhood watch.

Richard DiPentima 16 Dunlin Way that when Greenpages was going to develop on what's now Portsmouth Boulevard, a cul-de-sac was planned joining Dunlin and Portsmouth Blvd. There was no objection by the Fire Dept. at that time. That area is still liable for development which would increase traffic on Portsmouth Blvd. and then impede the traffic of the fire truck coming down Portsmouth Blvd. coming down Dunlin. Secondly, we were proposing a break away gate that exist in Osprey Landing, two gates entering into Spinnaker Point, Osprey Landing. If a breakaway gate put on Dunlin and Portsmouth Blvd. the Fire Dept. would be able to come through that. Lastly, if this proposal is rejected again, we would hope that at least some consideration would be given to speed tables being placed at the beginning of Dunlin Way. There is no speed sign saying 15 MPH as you come in from Portsmouth Blvd. to Dunlin. Also would appreciate some lighting, it is totally dark and prohibitive of people walking at night.

Debbie Finnigan stated the City has not put in speed tables or bumps, we have considered putting in roundabouts and this may be an indication to do that because people will be forced to slow down. There are other alternatives to help slow down traffic.

Deputy City Manager Cindy Hayden stated what we are trying to do is to get a trial, and what you are going to see over the coming years is a lot of changes on the non-residential side, the right-of-way was set there for a reason. The City Manager and the Deputy City Manager would like a pilot gate put therefore a six month trial.

Fire Chief LeClaire is not opposed to a pilot program, it is a trial to see how it goes for six months, the gate at Sherburne Rd and other that have gone up, to isolate neighborhoods from other people, the City of the Open Door is becoming the City of the Gate.

**MOTION** made by Jonathan Bailey to follow up with the City and install the pilot program gate as specified by the residents in the City for 6 months. Seconded by Christina Westfall. Motion passed.

Eric Spear is still frustrated with all the numbers back from the stealth stat suggests there is not a speeding problem but the neighbors see there is a speeding problem. How do we define success when the gate is put in, how do we know the gate is doing what it should do. If there's no speeding problem will it reduce a problem that doesn't exist. After six months if there could be a stealth stat during this period then we can compare that people are or are not slowing down. When the pilot is done how do we know we've had a successful gate or not and using the stealth stat would help.

Deputy Chief DiSesa stated you won't have the stealth stat for the winter months, won't happen until April or May. Keep in mind that the stealth stat looks at the overall traffic pattern and looks at the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile and 50 percentile, every neighborhood will always have a car that exceeds the speed limit. 50% of the

cars and 85% of the cars are doing the speed limit or few miles above it which is reasonable for the street.

- (C) **Miller Ave.** – Request for 20 MPH sign – Report back Police Department – Deputy Chief DiSesa stated the stealth stat between South and Lincoln. 11,000 cars in a 48 hour period, 50% doing 28 MPH as opposed to 25, 85% 32 MPH, the 10 mile base was 24 MPH and the average speed was 26 MPH. There was a spike of 48MPH, extremely fast there and also had someone doing 10 MPH. Not an area of concern.

**MOTION** made by Ted Gray to accept report as presented. Seconded by Christina Westfall. Motion passed.

- (D) **Marcy/Gate Streets** – Report back Police Department - Deputy Chief DiSesa stated the stealth stat was out for 36 hours, looked at 4600 cars, posted 20 MPH, the minimum speed was 10, the maximum speed was 36. 85% of the cars were doing 26 MPH, reasonable for this area and 50% doing 22 MPH. The 10 miles that most cars were doing was between 18 and 27 MPH indicates the average speed being 21 MPH in posted 20 MPH. Speed is not an issue here.

**MOTION** made by Ted Gray to accept the report as presented. Seconded by John Connors. Motion passed.

**VI. CORRESPONDENCE:**

- (A) **Broad Street** - Intersection of Sagamore/South Streets – Letter to Sunbridge dated October 22, 2007 attached
- (B) **Rte.1 Bypass at Coakley Road** – Traffic Signal – Letter to NHDOT dated November 14, 2007 attached)

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Respectfully submitted,

---

Elaine E. Boucas, Recording Secretary