



## **Pine Point Study Committee**

### **Report and Recommendations to Scarborough Town Council**

**December 10, 2009**

#### **Committee Mandate and Membership**

A memo from the Scarborough Town Clerk was sent to the proposed membership of the Pine Point Study Committee on August 26, 2008 to inform them of the Committee's membership, mandate and the date of the first meeting (attachment 1). The mandate of the Committee was to make recommendations to the Council on the following:

1) Sidewalks and pavement width on Pine Point Rd from E. Grand to King Street with consideration of the curve or turning radius from Pine Point Rd to King Street, 2) Re-working of the directional island at the end of Pine Point Rd and 3) A plan for development of and access to the 'open space parcel' provided by Beach Walk.

Membership of the Committee included the following:

Carol Rancourt - Scarborough Town Council  
Jay Chace - Scarborough Planning Department  
Jim Wendel - Scarborough Town Engineer  
Mike Shaw - Scarborough Public Works  
David Jackson - Public Safety  
Nick or Peter Truman - Lighthouse Motel  
Joe Tedeschi - Sand Dollar Motel  
John Wiggin - Beach Walk Association  
Jack Callahan - Pine Point Resident - At Large  
Elaine Richer - Pine Point Residents Association

Ron Owens - Scarborough Town Manager - Advisory (through 10/30)  
Tom Hall - Scarborough Town Manager - Advisory (after 10/30)  
Dana Morris-Jones - Facilitator

## **Process Agreements**

At the first meeting, the Committee took time to review its mandate and agree on several procedural elements, including the following: (See Power Point – Attachment 2)

- Guidelines
  - Outcomes
  - Attendance
  - ‘Parking Lot’ for items outside mandate
  
- Decision Making
  - Definition of Consensus
  - ‘Gradient of Agreement’
  
- Focus on Shared Interests

## **Meeting Schedule**

The Committee met on the following dates in 2008:

Sept 10	Oct 23
Sept 18	Oct 29
Oct 2	Nov 6
Oct 7	Nov 20
Oct 16	Dec 9

See power point slides for meeting agendas.

All meetings, except Oct 16 which took place on site and at the fire station were video taped and summary notes were provided to membership

## **Recommendations**

One of the greatest challenges faced by this Committee was to stay within the scope of the mandate because so many of the design elements impact and are intertwined with others that are outside the mandate. For this reason, a ‘Parking Lot’ (running list of topics) was used to record issues of interest to Committee members but outside the scope of its work.

Unless otherwise indicated, the recommendations below represent some level of consensus by Committee members. Level of consensus was determined by each member expressing his or her level of support, as follows: 5 = Fully endorse, 4 = Agreement with reservation, 3 = Neutral, will support, 2 = Disagree, will accept, 1 = Will not accept or support

1) Width of pavement and dimensions of travel lanes, shoulders, esplanade and sidewalks

All agreed that having a sidewalk, esplanade and shoulder on both sides of the street was desirable, however, there was disagreement about the specific dimensions.

The major issue with regard to dimensions was a philosophical split between planning & engineering professionals and some residents about the relationship between overall pavement width and public safety. While some residents believe a wider shoulder provides greater safety for bicycle riders, the town staff and public safety representative believe that wider pavement, even when that includes a designated shoulder, encourages vehicles to travel faster, thereby creating a less safe condition for bicycles.

The following 2 competing proposals received similar levels of support and non – support, though Proposal B is slightly favored when all 10 committee members are included. Both of these outcomes are listed here at the request of some committee members. The committee is asking the Council to make the final decision. Please note that there is consensus on the width of travel lanes and sidewalks; only the width of shoulder and esplanade remains to be identified.

Proposal A:

11 ft travel lanes, 4 ft shoulders, 5 ft esplanades, 5 ft sidewalks

Support as follows:

3 x 5, 1 x 4, 2 x 3, 1 x 2, 1 x 1.5 (8 people, ave = 3.56)

Proposal B:

11 ft travel lanes, 3 ft shoulders, 6 ft esplanades, 5 ft sidewalks

Support as follows:

5 x 5, 2 x 4, 2 x 2, 1 x 1 (10 people, ave = 3.8)

2) Design for Intersection at Pine Point Rd and King Street, including turning radius and directional island

This task was made difficult by the somewhat conflicting interests of pedestrian access to the beach, pedestrian safety and the reality of the dimensions of the available space given the boundaries of public and private ownership.

One of the primary concerns of many residents is their belief that there is a need to provide a safe 'drop-off' area for pedestrians exiting vehicles and wanting to reach the beach. The limitations of the physical boundaries of publicly owned land made this difficult to achieve.

After viewing the site and considering several design options prepared by Jim Wendel in accordance with Committee's requests and proposals, a design that creates a 'more fully defined and operational intersection' was proposed. (See attachment). Specific features of this design include:

- Directs through traffic to King Street from Pine Point and vice versa. Vehicular access to Depot Street (a short dead-end road) is a chosen maneuver by the driver.
- 2-11' Travel lanes
- 2-3' shoulders
- Sidewalk extended along frontage of Sand Dollar Motel on King Street
- 2-10' striped travel lanes on Depot Street off-set to the Lighthouse Motel side of the road r/w. This location provides appropriate definition of vehicular travel on to Depot Street, allows parked Lighthouse traffic to maneuver to and from the parking spaces opposite the Lighthouse Motel without interfering with occasional incoming vehicles, and it allows for a wide "pedestrian mall" space for pedestrian access to the beach from this intersection. Crosswalks would be provided at all appropriate locations for pedestrian safety.
- Road centerline radius from Pine Point to King Street is 49'.
- Curb Style-vertical along Sand Dollar Motel frontage on King Street. No curb along Lighthouse Motel frontage along King Street-Just pavement marking for travel lanes. Sloped curb from Claudia Way to the Depot Street leg. This is necessary to allow required access in this area to Lighthouse property for parking.
- Improvements would comply with all ADA requirements.
- Remove existing raised island and Hurd Park sign.

In addition, though outside the mandate, drainage infrastructure will be designed and extended to outside the project limits to an area in front of the Fire Barn on King Street. This infrastructure work will allow the future correction by the Town of an identified drainage problem in this area. By completing this work as part of the mandated project scope, the Town will avoid the necessity of disturbing new road construction on Pine Point Rd in order to correct the problem at a later date, thereby controlling costs and preserving long term performance of the new infrastructure.

Support for this proposal was as follows:

6 x 5, 2 x 3, 1 x 1 (9 people, ave = 4.1)

### 3) Materials for Sidewalks and Curbs

Although some residents prefer granite for long term cost effectiveness and consistency with some existing sidewalk in Pine Point, town staff members believe that concrete is the most economical solution and is consistent with other new sidewalks in Scarborough. They propose curbing being cast in place slip form concrete and poured concrete with tooled joints and edges for flat sidewalk surfaces.

Proposal: Use concrete for sidewalks and curbs as described above

Support:

4 x 5, 2 x 4, 2 x 3 (8 people, ave = 4.25)

### 4) Signage

The committee considered the topic of where to place signs directing visitors to the beach, the boat ramp and associated parking and to allay any confusion. Although all members agreed that improved signage is needed, the issue was raised that residents would want to have more time to consider the pattern of traffic flow being generated by the signs before supporting any signage. Because of this concern and because this topic was not specifically part of the committee's mandate, it was tabled.

### 5) Parcel

Many committee members expressed support for the concept of using the parcel for a 'beauty spot' which would be identified as town property and allow public access to it. However, the representative of Beach Walk Association was opposed. After much discussion, the following proposal received support:

Improve the parcel (Area 'A') as follows:

- Identify it as town property using a combination of stone and plaque
- Clean it up
- Install low impact, low maintenance hardy plantings
- Provide for maintenance by the town
- Identify right of way with stone-dust (no sidewalk)
- Keep options open for the future

Support for this proposal was as follows:

6 x 5, 1 x 4, 2 x 3 (9 people, ave = 4.4)

Note: Residents requested a stone bench be added; there was not agreement on this

### **'Parking Lot' Items**

These are items that were of interest to some committee members that were outside the scope or its mandate. It is requested that they be submitted to the Comprehensive Planning Committee or some other appropriate body for further consideration

- Sidewalks extended to the Clambake, down King Street to the fire station and in front of the Lighthouse Motel
- 2-sidewalk model continued down King Street
- Possibility of future action to create pedestrian access from the Pine Point Rd/King Street intersection to the beach
- Extension of 'drop-off' area on King St
- Signage
- Consideration of a 1-way traffic pattern