

MINUTES

**PLANNING BOARD WORK SESSION
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE

7:00 P.M.

MAY 23, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Ricci, Chairman; Anthony Blenkinsop, Vice Chairman; Nancy Novelline Clayburgh, City Council Representative; David Allen, Deputy City Manager; Richard Hopley, Building Inspector; John Rice; William Gladhill; Karina Quintans Colby Gamester; Elizabeth Moreau, Alternate; and Jay Leduc, Alternate

MEMBERS EXCUSED: n/a

ALSO PRESENT: Rick Taintor, Planning Director and Juliet Walker, Transportation Planner

.....
I. CITY COUNCIL REFERRALS/REQUESTS

*The Board's action in this matter has been deemed to be legislative in nature.
If any person believes any member of the Board has a conflict of interest,
that issue should be raised at this point or it will be deemed waived.*

A. Request for the City to accept a temporary and permanent sewer easement at 263 Rockland Street and to quitclaim the City's interest in a sewer line to be abandoned.

Mr. Taintor pointed out that there is a two-page memorandum outlining the project, with a sketch of the plan on the back. Because every easement requires recommendation from the Planning Board, this came up as a last-minute item. Mr. Taintor said he wanted to bring it to this special Planning Board meeting because otherwise, it would have to wait until mid July due to the timing of the Planning Board and City Council meetings.

What was proposed was a 35' wide permanent utility easement to provide sewer access to the back of three lots and a temporary 5' construction easement on the side of it. In consideration for these easements, the City would quitclaim its interest in an old sewer drain line that crosses the rear of the property. What was being requested was a recommendation to accept or to acquire the easements as shown in the plan.

Chairman Ricci made a motion to accept the temporary and permanent sewer easement. Mr. Hopley seconded the motion.

Councilor Novelline Clayburgh asked if the Planning Board notified the homeowners of this action. Mr. Taintor said that they were not taking it from them, that they were going to negotiate with them, and that the homeowners were all in on it. He also mentioned that it was Housing Authority property.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

II. WORK SESSION

A. Master Plan Update.

Mr. Taintor said that the Master Plan update was a brand new process for most of the Board members and was an important process that allows them to enact zoning, adopt a Capital Improvement Plan, and so forth, and they were just getting ready to start the process leading to the adoption of the Master Plan in 2015. They wanted to hold a Work Session to give everyone the opportunity to hear an overview of the plan, ask questions and perhaps suggest ways of doing things differently.

He told everyone that they should have copies of the existing Master Plan as well as the first part of the Planning Book of NH, the second chapter of which was the Master Plan and their role. The Master Plan was a Planning Board document that they were bringing to the City Council because they were also involved in enacting regulations and developing the Capital Improvement Plan, even though it was primarily a Planning Board document.

Mr. Taintor gave the definition of the Master Plan as a reference document that has a lot of information in it about current and projected conditions. He said it is a collection of narratives, maps and data about the development of the community, and that it is usually organized into chapters that are set forth in the State statute. In addition to the existing conditions information, it is also a collection of policies, goals and recommendations to guide land use decisions.

He explained why a Master Plan is prepared in the first place. One reason is to develop an overall vision and direction for the City's future development, and one of the required elements of the Master Plan is a vision statement. The second reason is to provide a rational basis for zoning and land use regulation. Zoning can be upheld more easily if it is consistent with what is set forth in the Master Plan. Conversely, if it contradicts what is in the Master Plan, it can be challenged. The Master Plan serves as a guide to orderly growth and helps them to understand current conditions, and it is also important because it fulfills legal mandates to have a Master Plan and to keep it updated.

Mr. Taintor said the statute states that revisions are recommended every five to ten years in Portsmouth. There is a fairly substantial, complete overhaul of the Master Plan every ten years, and that was something they could look at differently in the future. He said the Master Plan should also be updated when there is a sense that the existing plan is not taking the community in the direction it wants to go. He said sections could be updated as needed between major updates, and if there was a major zoning change that needed to be done that was not really consistent with the Master Plan, one would look at the Master Plan to see what should be updated relating to the zoning change.

Mr. Taintor said that the Master Plan in New Hampshire is a responsibility of the Planning Board and it gives all the statutory references. It has to consist of a set of statements and development principles with accompanying maps, diagrams, charts and descriptions in order to give legal standing to ordinances and other measures of the Plan. The Planning Board can make surveys and undertake studies and must consider the goals and guidelines of regional and State plans as well as those of

abutting communities. Mr. Taintor said he was not sure that they did that so well the previous time; he thought they spent too much time looking at abutting communities and that they may want to pay a little more attention to the other issues this time around.

The Planning Board must inform the public, Office of State Planning (OSP, which no longer exists), and the Rockingham Public Commission (RPC) and solicit public comments regarding the future growth of the municipality. Mr. Taintor said they had a series of public forums the last time around and that there were specified adoption provisions that they had to follow.

He said there are required sections and optional sections in the Master Plan. The Master Plan must have a vision statement including their guiding principles and priorities and must have a land use element showing existing and future land use. As for optional chapters, there were some that they did include in the 2005 Master Plan and some that they did not include. They included transportation, community facilities, economic development, natural resources, natural hazards, recreation, cultural and historical resources, housing and implementation, which was just a list of steps that you take to try to achieve the goals that you set for yourself. There were also optional sections not included the previous time. One was the regional concern section, and the neighborhood plan (he said they may want to spend more time on this), and community design, which has become a big issue in the City. He said they would probably be focusing on some of those things this time and giving them more time than was previously spent on them.

Mr. Taintor said that things included in the Master Plan that are not listed in the statute are open space (included with natural resources) and emergency management (which has to be done as a separate set of requirements for FEMA, which he said they do anyway). They incorporated aspects of the emergency management section into the natural hazards section, and the current project that they are doing in the Coastal Resilience Residual Section will feed into that even more. He also mentioned community services and social services, which are sections that were not required but they did them anyway.

He said there are a number of ways in which they can get public input into the Master Plan. They can do surveys. Mr. Taintor found that surveys are more helpful when the questions are focused and not general, but sometimes there is a place for general questions. Mr. Taintor thought they actually did a survey last time but could not recall the details. He thought UNH helped them with it. He mentioned vision sessions and focus groups (if they had specific topics that they wanted to spend a little more time on). They could involve civic groups and an advisory committee. He mentioned that a lot of towns put together advisory committees for Master Plans, and that the last time around, the Planning Board was essentially the advisory committee for the Master Plan, so he thought that was something they could discuss. They could also hold public hearings on the Master Plan at the very end of the process.

To keep the Master Plan alive, Mr. Taintor said it was important to make recommendations specific enough to be implementable. Going through the implementable section of the Master Plan, they were specific and tried to assign responsibility to the appropriate boards or official person who was responsible for taking the lead on moving a recommendation forward as well as timetables and priorities. They started out with an annual report to the City Council on the progress in implementing the recommendations of the Master Plan and did that for three or four years, but it fell by the wayside. Mr. Taintor said it was something they could be doing as a presentation or as a report. Time limitations were always difficult with adding more reporting requirements, but it would be important to come up with indicators or metrics to figure out if they were moving in the right direction. They could

incorporate a formal consistency review of major development proposals so that if something came up to site plan or BOA review or went to the HDC, it would fit into the Master Plan. Something for them to consider was whether the Master Plan is still working for them, and then updating it as needed.

Juliet Walker introduced herself, saying she was a Planner in the Planning Department. She was involved in the previous Master Plan process, so she was familiar with the process for Portsmouth. She said that one of the changes since the last Master Plan was issued was the increased use of social networking and online presence where community involvement is encouraged. She said that was something that the Planning Department was very interested in incorporating this time around and that they have implemented it with some of their projects.

Ms. Walker said that the proposed schedule at this point is to focus on the existing conditions and trends over the next 4-5 months. The plan was to seek some consulting experience for two of those sections, housing and economic and transportation development, sections that she felt were the most data-intensive type of specialty areas. She felt that the other sections that Mr. Taintor talked about could be done in-house with existing staff, but that reports have been done that are related and have good information on them, and they do not require a lot of analysis. In the early fall, they would like to undertake a review of the 2005 Master Plan to see where they are, what they have and have not done, and why. She felt that this would be a good starting point for any Master Plan processes and for understanding why certain things were not implemented in the last plan, or why things have changed, or other reasons.

Ms. Walker referred to the list, saying there were three periods of time in which they would be doing focused public engagement, setting up meetings, discussions, presentations – in general, making a concerted effort to get the public involved. After the initial phase, the public interaction would happen probably in the early fall or winter. At the same time, they would need to look at other projects that are going on that might compete, such as the Form Base Zoning project that will be going through an approval process at that point.

She said that vision and goals are in review, but things have changed since the last Master Plan, so the goals and objectives would probably change in the following year. Ms. Walker said there would be another round of public forums, and then they would think about a strategic focus on plan elements and implementation components for different sections, and they would perhaps focus on natural resources. They would have a limitation plan and another round of public review and adoption by early summer of 2015. She thought it was important that they stick with the schedule in order to have an updated plan by 2015.

Chairman Ricci asked if the process lasted over two years when they did it the last time. Mr. Taintor said it did, that it finished in 2004 and went to the City Council in 2005 for approval. The City Council adopted it in February 2005.

Mr. Taintor asked if there were any questions about the process or any ideas that they may have. He said that a lot of time was spent reviewing the minutia of site plans, and this gave them an opportunity to think about Portsmouth and how they are managing development. He felt that it was an important and exciting time, but that it would also be a lot of work.

Mr. Leduc asked if Mr. Taintor could give them a sense of what worked well with the old Master Plan and what didn't work well, as well as things that they should be focused on. For example, things that were achieved or not achieved very well.

Mr. Taintor said that what worked well was the involvement of the City boards and staff in the process, and what did not work well was trying to get other people involved. Public meetings were not well attended. He felt that, with the ability to use more social media and with the new web page setup, there was more attention to City development than there was ten years ago. People were more aware of it and the Planning Board would probably get a lot more attention than they did previously.

Ms. Walker said that Portsmouth Listens was interested in being involved, and the Planning Board needed to figure out how best to coordinate with them. Portsmouth Listens had a particular outreach that worked for some folks, but the Planning Board missed a certain population by doing that because it would be a big investment of time. She said there were lots of opportunities in reaching more of the public and to get people engaged in different ways.

Mr. Taintor said that, in terms of what happened with the plan itself, they had over 100 implementation actions in the Master Plan. He thought that every one of these actions was important, but because there were so many of them, there was no easy way to get to some of them. A lot of the actions were done as part of the comprehensive revised Zoning Ordinance and were land use oriented.

Mr. Taintor said they took a two-year period to revise the Zoning Ordinance after they did the Master Plan and said that there was a limitation of capacity to do everything they wanted to do. He felt that everything was important but that they needed to prioritize better, even though people might get upset if elements were taken out of their respective sections. Mr. Taintor felt they may need to think more long term. There are things they hope to get done in six years but that would not get done until 12 years.

Ms. Walker said sometimes it is not simply completing an entire goal but making partial progress, such as putting in some measures of success (metrics), and saying they were progressing toward that action and making headway in the right direction. She thought it was important to focus on but not eliminate things from the list because if the opportunity or funding ever became available and the item was already in the Master Plan, it would be better for the community, and the Planning Board could take advantage of it. She compared it to a supporting document that is helpful for grants and felt that they needed to be realistic.

Mr. Taintor said they look at things at a City level, and that could be good and bad, that they may be missing in the Master Plan the next level down. He said it might be nice to have a section on the downtown area and look at things like traffic, parking, and historic preservation and development rather than trying to glean them from different parts of the Master Plan. He said that the same thing could tie in with neighborhoods and that they may want to look at the commercial corridors on Lafayette Road. Mr. Taintor thought that would be an important decision in the fall, and that they should start thinking about how they will structure the Master Plan. Maybe they could try and focus on these areas with a little more detail, try to bring concepts of utilities, transportation, recreation, housing and commercial development all together to focus on a particular area.

Mr. Rice asked whether they would be using the old Master Plan as a model to begin with, or starting from scratch. Mr. Taintor said that they would not begin from scratch. He saw an updated version of this as the base from which they would spring off to something better, more useful and more focused. He thought that the old Master Plan was a good overall view of where the City was in 2005 and where it wanted to go, and he felt that it was still useful to update that, but it could have a Book II section that would focus on the neighborhoods and other areas.

Mr. Rice asked about strategic planning and whether they would have an overall vision statement that would drive everything. Mr. Taintor said that they already have a vision statement, that there was a lot of public participation early in the process in the study circles that led to the vision statement. He read the following vision statement:

“Portsmouth should be a livable, walkable City that preserves its history, lives in balance with its natural resources, protects its waterfront and views, provides a good climate for entrepreneurship opportunity, acts on social and socioeconomic diversity through affordable housing, and connects neighborhoods through multiple modes of transportation. Portsmouth should consciously support its local arts and culture and take steps to build community through citywide events, enhance and beautify common living and spaces, and neighborhood connectiveness. In these ways, Portsmouth will remain the most historical and most passionate city in New Hampshire.’

Mr. Rice said that was one of the things they were really going to be working hard on, to meet that vision statement.

Ms. Walker said that this was an opportunity to think about on-line input as a means of checking in with the public to see if the vision statement reflected their community and, if not, how they could change it. She thought it might be a way to get a head start on the Master Plan process without having to do substantial outreach in public input in the beginning but rather, use it as a starting point in terms of survey format.

Mr. Rice said it was like having a sense of place and that it would help to do the Master Plan if they understood and bought into the vision statement.

Mr. Allen asked what the Board would see on the meeting-to-meeting basis. Mr. Taintor replied that they wouldn't have much involvement with the Planning Board in the early stages of doing the existing conditions report and pulling the information from the different resources, but as they got into the vision aspect, the Planning Board would get more involved. They would start to get busy in September with meetings, public hearings and Work Sessions but they would have to be careful with the staff's time. Mr. Taintor wanted the Planning Board to be involved in the vision sessions and he thought it would include three sessions with the public, starting in the fall of 2013 and going into the fall of 2014. It would encompass setting policies, reviewing strategy and policy statement, and getting into the implementation segment. He felt there would be plenty of time for him to be involved as a regular citizen and as a Board member.

Mr. Allen thought that, with the website, there would be a greater ability than the previous time to connect with the public. Mr. Taintor said when he worked on the Newburyport Management Plan, they had a whole list of potential actions, and in a community-wide survey they asked residents as well as City officials to prioritize them. They did not name exactly who was responding but did just a summary report of the community at large and a summary report with community officials to see if there was a disconnect between them. He said he found it very interesting.

Mr. Gladhill asked, in following up with the meeting with different boards and departments, whether they would be meeting with them individually to hear their concerns or would they submit reports or memorandums on what they would like to see. Mr. Taintor said that there was a difference between a city and a town, and that it would depend on what the Board wanted. In a city like Portsmouth, it was sometimes delegated to the staff but it did not have to be. If the Board wanted to meet regularly to

discuss certain subjects, then they could, but it was up to them. It would be a valuable thing for the Board to be directly involved with the Master Plan, but it was a big investment of time. He recommended that they think about it and discuss it at a later date.

Ms. Novelline Clayburgh asked how many resident emails they had. Ms. Walker replied that they had over 2,000 emails that the newsletter was sent to. They were utilizing those lists and really starting to build them up. Mr. Taintor added that they could use the E-blasts to reach out, that they had been put together and were getting sent to people.

Chairman Ricci asked if they could get input from all the boards early on, exclusive of the City Council. He knew it would take a lot of space, but he would like to have PB, HDC, BOA and the Conservation Committee all together and having a Planning Development Plan that implements what everyone wants to talk about. He felt more would get done in that type of meeting than just meeting one-on-one with each board, and that it was more beneficial in starting different conversations other than just meeting with the Planning Board.

He also asked if the Charette was being offered to local and regional planners. He had met with a planner from another town who was interested in attending because he was also doing a charette.

Ms. Walker said that RPC is on their notification list, which is the mechanism they have used.

Chairman Ricci said he thinks of Portsmouth as “the oldest child” and feels that some smaller towns can benefit from Portsmouth’s horsepower, that it may help their planning development down the road.

Ms. Moreau asked a question regarding going into neighborhoods and small communities and if the statute would allow them to have each section of town attend different meetings to discuss their neighborhood. Mr. Taintor said yes, and the easy way was to follow what the Statute said and do it citywide. The more challenging way would be to do it by neighborhood.

Ms. Moreau thought it might go smoother with just people from one section. Mr. Taintor mentioned another community that he worked in had areas that would not change residential, and that they had just focused the Master Plan on areas that were opportunity areas for positive change and enhancement. There were six areas focused on by the Master Plan in the entire community.

Ms. Novelline Clayburgh asked if the Master Plan was approved by the City Council. Mr. Taintor said it did not have to be, but they do present it and get it endorsed by the City Council. By statute, the Planning Board adopts the Master Plan and the Capital Improvement Plan. In Portsmouth, they take the extra step and present it to the City Council. Ms. Novelline Clayburgh asked if the City Council voted on it. Mr. Taintor said the City Council voted on it last time. A lot of items in the Master Plan and the Capital Improvement Plan require actions by the City Council, such as adopting zoning ordinances, appropriating funds under the Capital Improvement Plan, and acquiring land, so a lot of the key actions have to be done by the City Council and it was important that they be in agreement and work together.

Mr. Gladhill asked if the City Council could make changes to the Master Plan. Mr. Taintor said it is a Planning Board document, and technically it is not in the statute to allow the City Council to change it (but it may be in the Charter). He said the Master Plan is really the Planning Board document, but, if the City Council adopts zoning that is different than what is in the Master Plan then the Planning Board had better go back and fix the Master Plan.

Ms. Walker said they will prepare more of a detailed schedule for the Planning Board and focus on answers they need from the Board and will try to have it at the next meeting. Chairman Ricci thought it would be two meetings per month starting in September. He said he found the process quite interesting last time and recommended that everyone attend as many meetings as they could.

Ms. Walker shifted to Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning. She said Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning was recommended in the Master Plan but they had not undertaken or implemented it yet. They did a few little things for bicycle and pedestrian accommodation, for example, some policies were implemented and some infrastructure projects were done. They want to do a mode-specific plan eventually. Ms. Walker said there was a need to do this kind of focus study that would eventually be rolled into the Master Plan but would allow them to complete it within a year, then start working on actions related to it immediately and not wait for the Master Plan to be completed.

This was part of the 2005 Master Plan and has been supported in subsequent City activities. The 2010 Safe Routes to School Action Plan, focusing on Grades K-8, promotes getting kids safely to school via walking or biking. She said they were working on this and trying to implement some of the recommendations in the plan and thought it was a really good foundation for a broader Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

She said other activities include the Sustainable Portsmouth Transportation Report that was done in collaboration with Portsmouth Listens. They reiterated the need for walkable and bikeable community efforts, which are goals in the Master Plan.

Ms. Walker outlined some of the 2010 Safe Routes to School Action Plan, which includes physical improvements, school-specific engineering recommendations, education and encouragement activities, and walk-and-bike-to school days. The Safe Routes to School Action Plan is about physical activities as well as events and programming that could be done. She displayed a map showing recommendations for completing some sidewalks and re-stripping some roads that would help get kids and their parents to school more easily. The plan was well done, but she felt it was very conceptual and that there needed to be more engineering research to make sure that these were routes that could actually be implemented. She said it was a good starting point, but she would like to see the Safe Routes to School Action Plan look a little more strategically at this and ask more questions, like if there were other routes that would be preferable. Ms. Walker said that the State has funding, and they hope to hear sometime in June whether or not they receive approval for a grant that they submitted.

They are pursuing a Bicycle-Friendly Community Designation Program that has a requirement of having a Bicycle Master Plan. She said that it was a good process to go through because it has a checklist for which different activities can be checked off that were done for the community to be eligible for that designation. It is a well-recognized national program. A lot of biking communities are on the list, and she felt that it put them in a class where lots of other proactive active communities are doing it. There was also a similar Walk Friendly Community Designation Program they wanted to pursue.

She said the Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan is sort of a mini master plan. It takes a comprehensive approach that focuses on bicycle and pedestrian efforts. It identifies needs, it justifies improvements that may be incorporated into the Capital Improvement Plan, provides a roadmap for implementing those improvements, and it guides the funding and investment in those areas. She said it is also a way for them to evaluate and monitor those improvements over time.

Ms. Walker concluded by saying that it helps build support for the project to be implemented and helps raise awareness in the community. It helps them be more strategically competitive for grants in those areas as well as for bike-friendly community designation. Most important, it can be integrated into their broader planning efforts. Ms. Walker handed out a Case Study about a California city that, after adopting a Bicycle Master Plan, acquired more than a million dollars for bicycle infrastructure projects in a single funding cycle. The plan's detailed priority project list was instrumental in securing those funds.

There have also been studies about communities that have done bicycle and pedestrian master planning or mode-specific plans that resulted in increasing the use of transportation modes where you could see parallel data on people walking and biking more as well as the safety improvements in those areas.

Ms. Walker said the reason that it would be better to focus on a Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan rather than rolling it into a large transport analysis was that it let you focus your energies on just those two things, and allowed you to be more specific than in a broader master effort. It helped give legitimacy to those two modes of transportation, and the process itself might be as important as the planning effort.

Some of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan components that reflect what would be in a master plan are public engagement, vision, goals and objectives, existing conditions, and identifying projects (which may be a bit more different than a master plan because you might see more of an implementation section that would be tied direct to capital improvements and may be have a shorter timeframe for implementation). Last but not least, evaluation and monitoring techniques could be used so that they would know if they were actually succeeding in these areas.

Some of the outcomes of the plan would be engineering/infrastructure recommendations, such as locations for bike parking, how to improve on-road networks, shared-use paths, traffic calming methods, sign and signal guidelines, and improvement to transit stops.

Another outcome would be education and encouragement, such as sponsoring bicycling and walking events, doing commuter outreach programs, increasing the use of bike and pedestrian modes, coordinating with public transit, and looking at the potential for bike sharing and whether it was relevant and useful for the community.

Enforcement and safety would be another outcome, such as enforcement of laws and how they support bicycle and pedestrian activity, training for police officers, driver and biker education training, bike and foot patrol.

The last outcome Ms. Walker spoke about was evaluation and planning, which involves monitoring and increasing bicycle and pedestrian use, making it safer by tracking and addressing accident locations, doing targeted investment in certain neighborhoods that have less access to these modes, capital improvement planning, going after additional funding, and reviewing design standards.

Ms. Walker said they would like to kick this off and use a consultant. Even though they have transportation staff who could help with the plan, she said it would be nice to have someone come for the data collection and innovation and cutting edge recommendations, She felt that, with a consultant, the plan could be done very quickly, maybe nine months.

Mr. Rice asked if part of that would be a Blue Ribbon Committee of people who want the plan and/or are cycling residents. Ms. Walker replied that they certainly would want to see some sort of committee support for bicycle and pedestrian planning and implementation, and they would consider recommending a bicycle and pedestrian advisory type of group beyond the Master Plan stage. She said it would take the form of someone who has actually biked the roads and was aware of conditions, someone who had real experience. They have started talking to people who are 'ready to go' and ready to be involved, and they show good enthusiasm.

Chairman Ricci asked if the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan would be a separate document from the Master Plan or part of the Master Plan. Ms. Walker said it would actually be similar to what is being produced for the Coastal Resilience Study. It would be a separate document but most of the elements would be included in the Master Plan. It would be a stand-alone document at first that they would start acting on immediately. She said sometimes it was helpful to have something to extract from for funding if going after certain designations.

Chairman Ricci asked how involved DPW was in the plan, given the impact to roads and sidewalks.

Mr. Allen said DPW was very involved. He said that Ms. Walker has been meeting regularly with the Transportation Director and the DPW Foreman so they could be coordinated in their efforts because there was a lot of detail associated with this. DPW will be implementing the plan and they need to understand the background because the bicycle pieces and mechanisms are new to them and they will need guidance.

Mr. Taintor said that it was important for a consultant to come in who specializes in bicycle and pedestrian planning because the consultant will really understand the connection between federal highway requirements, for road markings, for lane widths, and how those requirements can be adjusted or accommodated for bicyclists. He said it was important to have someone who understands the technical aspects of bicycle lane design and facility design and how it interfaces with vehicular design. The Planning Board is responsible for adopting the Master Plan but is also responsible for reviewing and adopting any plan that relates to the development of the City. Therefore, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan has to be adopted by the Planning Board. The Coastal Resilience Study may be adopted as a separate element of the Master Plan. He said the Form Based Zoning Project would have a vision plan coming out of the Charette in June that could be adopted by the Planning Board as a separate element of the Master Plan for the downtown area. He recommended that they think about all these issues as not being separate but relating to each other, and think of them as building up a Master Plan over time.

Ms. Quintans asked how the current study circles would be involved in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and the overall Master Plan. Mr. Taintor said he didn't know where the study circles would go, but said that they were very involved in the April Transportation Policy Report and would be reviewing it and making recommendations, and then the City Council would look at it in June. They would be making recommendations on it, and it would feed right into the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan because there were bicycle aspects to it, including the recommendation to have a complete streets policy to pursue bike-friendly and walk-friendly community status. Parking was the big thing with the study circles and they were less involved in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

Ms. Walker said that the effort is a separate citizen-driven effort but it was very important that the Bicycle Plan be used as a foundation for the Master Plan. Mr. Taintor said the Sustainable Portsmouth

Group did their Sustainable Transportation Plan in 2010 and that it would feed into the transportation element of the Master Plan as well.

Mr. Leduc said he assumed that communicating with neighboring towns like New Castle, Rye and Greenland would happen as well. Ms. Walker said it was even more important with bicycle planning, even at the State level. She said that so much of what was happening regionally was going to impact how successful they were in connecting people with bikes.

Mr. Leduc asked if that was one of the earlier-on processes. Mr. Taintor said the RPC is very involved in the East Coast Greenway Planning (eventually off-road multi-use path) and also in the NH Coastal Scenic Byway Program that currently follows Route 1-A along the coast and has the ability to provide for off-road facilities alongside it as well. RPC is about to start updating its Corridor Management Plan for that byway, so that would affect their relationships with New Castle and Rye. He said they were also working on the off-road bike path connecting Pease to Greenland, so there were a lot of regional projects going on that they would be part of.

Ms. Walker brought up the two upcoming programs. The Coastal Resilience Workshop would take place on the following Wednesday and would be open to the public. The Form Based Zoning Charette, which is the initial way they would get public input, was a multi-day Charette. They would get a vision plan and a draft zoning ordinance and would continue with the public process for adopting whatever came out of it. There would be an interim meeting the evening of Market Square Day, at which Ms. Walker would have her own booth in Market Square. The final presentation would be on Monday night.

Mr. Taintor said there was a meeting planned for the following Tuesday, a Work Session with City Council on the concept of developing a moratorium.

Ms. Quintans said she looked at the website for the Charette and asked if it was an option for the land use boards to attend the Friday meeting.

Ms. Walker said there were three round table discussions scheduled for Friday that were open to the public, but the land use boards would be getting a targeted invitation the following week to participate. She said it was optional but it would give an opportunity for folks having a similar involvement in the City to come in and have a dialog with the members. The discussions would be held at the Open Studio on Daniel Street on Friday, June 7th.

.....

III. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Ricci made a motion to adjourn at 8:15 p.m. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Joanne Breault
Temporary Secretary for the Planning Board January 16, 2014.

