

# PINE POINT RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

## BEACH ACCESS PLAN BESIDE DEPOT STREET: CHECKLIST FROM SUMMARY OF PUBLIC FORUMS

The Association members attending the forums promoted these principles; openness, access, preservation of views, an identity, and a plan which reflects the needs and desires of the citizens, not primarily the investors at the Beachwalk or the motel owners. This is a checklist summary of positions advocated in detail in the summary.

## **BEACH ACCESS PLAN FEATURES**

#### FENCE

- 1. A three-foot high open, round, rail fence was overwhelmingly desired to protect views and establish "openness" on what is now smaller public property at the shore.
- 2. Consistent with the character of the neighborhood, DEP and Comprehensive Plan.
- 3. Planning Board members supported a rail fence style when it reviewed the Motel's site plan
- 4. Vegetation should be limited in height so it does NOT overtake the fence
- 5. Plantings, such as Sea Rose, permitted to grow unchecked would become a "fence" itself
- 6. A solid hedge of aggressive plants allowed to grow creates a "fence" and should not be permitted.
- 7. The Town should impose on itself a limit of plant height to two feet so the rail fence is not overtaken
- 8. Plants should be maintained by the Town at that height to preserve openness.
- 9. Town should draft a fence ordinance for scenic areas to prohibit high plantings to create de-facto fences.
- 10. An ordinance draft NOW will prevent efforts by private abutters to create fences of any type
- 11. The Beachwalk owners have indicated they may plant trees along the property line, a violation of conditions.
- 12. The use of "mesh," attached to a rail fence should be rejected as a visual obstruction and aesthetically unsightly, and not consistent with the character of the neighborhood.
- 13. The Town has no responsibility for protecting private property owners with fencing or mesh.

## **DROP OFF**

- 1. The drop-off is less than what the people wanted (an off-street turnaround) but is still important
- 2. Preserving vehicle access to the shore, particularly for seniors and persons with handicaps can by partially achieved by a place they can pull over and catch a glimpse of the beautiful bay.
- 3. If the drop off is eliminated there will be absolutely no place to stop except for the travel lane, which people will do as they do now.
- 4. The lure of that view or need to drop off beachgoers has for decades compelled drivers to stop wherever they chose, but that fact has never been confirmed by a careful study.
- 5. Maintain the drop off area and remove the stone wall encroachment to make the two-car drop off area safer.

## STONE WALL STRUCTURE ENCROACHMENT

- 1. Concern expressed the engineer would simply endorse the Town's long-held position and suggest the stone wall remain. Common sense should prevail.
- 2. Recent surveys presented the undeniable fact this very large structure is almost entirely on town property.
- 3. The Planning Board also expressed concerns about the wall when they reviewed the motel's parking lot site plan last month. It must go. That was our input.

#### **IDENTITY AND SIGNAGE**

- 1. We advocated for some identity for the beach access area (a name at the very least) and clear signage which invites and promotes its use by the public and visitors.
- 2. A recent rendering by the landscape architect labeled it "Ocean Gateway," a name used in the 2005 study. The Town now should avoid that name because the Trumans chose to use it for their condos.
- 3. Support suggestion to ask students at the high school to come up with some names and design a sign for the area reinforcing the fact this is a town-wide resource.
- 4. The Town Manager's question about naming it for an historical person from Pine Point was rejected because of the obvious difficulty involved in determining who deserved such recognition.
- 5. We did support an informational kiosk on the site with historical information and perhaps information about the natural resources there.
- 6. Signage which made it clear that beach parking was available at Hurd Park was agreed upon (the use of the name "Hurd Park" on the current sign was probably not clear enough to visitors).

## PREVIOUS POSITIONS PRESENTED AT TWO OTHER FORUMS BY RESIDENTS (unless mentioned above)

## **BENCHES**

1. Agreed, although the height should vary to accommodate seniors.

#### **BLOCK WALL REMOVAL**

1. Agreed the cement block walls constructed on the dunes by the motel owners years ago (on Town property) should be removed. These are not to be confused with the large stone wall in the street.

#### **6 FOOT FENCE BY NEW HOUSE**

- 1. We strongly opposed this feature of the draft plan.
- 2. The Beachwalk lot owners are prohibited from erecting fences over 42 inches (see excerpt below),
- 3. The purpose of this restriction was to protect view corridors.
- 4. It makes no sense, therefore, for the Town to install a six foot fence (which it just took down) at that location when the lot owner is prohibited from installing his or her own.
- 5. Investors should have been aware of the Planning Board's approvals and developer's representations prior to making their investment.
- 6. The lot owner should have participated in the land exchange debate to oppose it if there was a concern
  - S-31 VIEW CORRIDORS: ALL PLANTINGS AND FENCING WITHIN THE PERIMETER OF THE SUBDIVISION ("WITHIN THE PERIMETER OF THE SUBDIVISION" INCLUDES ALL AREA LOCATED ON INDIVIDUAL LOTS), SHALL NOT EXCEED A HEIGHT OF 42" TO PROTECT THE VIEWS OF THE ABUTTING PROPERTIES, EXCEPT FOR PLANTINGS IN THE FRONT OF EACH HOME WHEREAS, THE HOME ITSELF ALREADY LIES WITHIN THAT VIEW CORRIDOR. DECLARANT WILL WORK DILIGENTLY WITH ABUTTERS AND LOT OWNERS OF THE SUBDIVISION WHEN CONSIDERING PLANTINGS AND FENCING, TO NOT UNNECESSARILY OBSTRUCT ANY VIEWS TO THE OCEAN AND BEYOND. THIS SPECIFIC COVENANT CANNOT BE CHANGED BY A VOTE OF THE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION.

# **BIKE RACK**

1. The location of the bike rack indicates that there will be both pedestrian <u>and</u> bike movement along the beginning of the path or trail. The Task Force should consider ways to prevent conflicts in the name of safety, we offered.

#### **ARBOR**

1. Any structure of this type to provide shade should have no walls to obstruct views. The necessity of this was questioned.

## **PLANTINGS**

- 1. No sensitive species such as dune grass be included which would later limit any changes to the area by DEP or other rules.
- 2. There should be generous amount of grass, kept mowed, to encourage a park-like environment

## LIGHTING

1. Some provision for low level lighting should be included for safety, security and for off-season use when days are very short.

## WINTER ACCESS

- 1. Provisions should be made to maintain a clear path during the winter (perhaps the way sidewalks are cleared).
- 2. Depot Street was always plowed so residents could drive to the shore year-round.
- 3. With the street now closed and owned by the Trumans, winter residents should enjoy access in the winter.

#### **PATH MATERIAL**

- 1. When pavement is removed from this site, any future consideration of restoring impervious surfaces may not be possible due to the site's location in the frontal dune and more and more regulation as time goes by.
- 2. Since the entire portion of the site which was once the Motel's parking strip is currently impervious, it was strongly suggested that as much pavement as possible be retained for the trail or walkway, bike rack area, arbor area and other areas not devoted to plantings.

#### **FORCE OF ORDINANCE**

- 1. The final plan for this public area should be put in the form of an ordinance like that for the Scarborough River Wildlife Sanctuary.
- 2. This would provide more permanence and the force of local law to ensure the plan is not easily altered and the specific requirements are enforceable.

# THE TOWN'S RECORD OF COMMENTS AT THE PUBLIC FORUMS

We suggest a more detailed record of the three public forums be provided to the public, Planning Board members and the Town Council.