

## **APPENDIX D - MEETING NOTES**

**Meeting Notes**

Bath Road Master Plan

October 4, 2012 Steering Committee

Prepared by: Tom Errico/Mitchell Rasor

---

**Attendees**

- Steering Committee
  - Wayne Averil
  - Don Jones
  - Gary Crosby
  - Peter West
  - Troy Cline
  - Heather Pitcher
  - Al Cohen
  - Ed Polewarczyk
  - Judy Colby
  - Laurie Smith
  - Misty Parker
  - Gerry Audibert
- Consultant Staff
  - Robert Faunce
  - Tom Errico
  - Mitchell Rasor

**Agenda**

- Introductions
- Review Draft Project Schedule
  - Misty reviewed the project schedule and noted that the next Steering Committee meeting would likely be in early December. The study is expected to be completed in May 2013.
  - The SC noted that public meeting schedule changed from prior information. Misty noted that the public meeting schedule was revised to give the public more material substance.
- Draft Mission Statement
  - Mitchell reviewed the draft Mission Statement
  - The SC asked what does adjacent to Bath Road mean? Mitchell noted that in general it included the land parcels that abut Bath Road.
  - The SC discussed the use of the description “auto-oriented” in describing the corridor. A consensus was reached that Bath Road is auto-orientated because of the lack of public transit and pedestrian/cyclist options. Mitchell noted that the plan would be assessing that issue.
  - The SC noted that multi-modal aspect will be a component of the Plan.
- Draft Existing Conditions Information - Transportation
  - Tom presented the existing traffic volume data collected in the corridor. The SC asked why the daily traffic volume at Ward Brook was substantially lower than at Old Bath Road (N). Tom noted that they were

from different years. Additionally, Tom noted that the methods for estimating AADT volumes were different. The Ward Brook location is not factored but an actual AADT, while the Old Bath Road (N) location is factored according to the state-wide factors applied by MaineDOT.

- Tom presented the existing level of service conclusions for both intersections and roadway segments. The SC was surprised that the level of service for Bath Road was 'D' when prior By-Pass studies indicated worse conditions. Gerry noted that the By-Pass conclusions were based upon long-term future growth conditions versus existing conditions.
  - Tom presented vehicle classification information and noted that while on a percent basis it is lower than other major roadways in the State, it has a significant number of trucks (900) on a daily basis.
  - Tom presented crash data and noted that there are no High Crash Locations per MaineDOT criteria in the study area. Tom noted that some segments had a number of collisions and poor access management conditions may be a factor.
  - Tom presented vehicle speed information and noted that speeds are generally consistent with posted speed limits with the exception of north of Old Bath Road where speeds are higher. However, speeds are significantly lower than the posted speed limit in the northbound direction during the PM peak hour due to existing congestion in the village area.
  - Tom presented examples of access management non-conformities (driveway spacing, corner clearance, driveway width, number of driveways). The SC asked how access management can affect traffic mobility and safety. Tom noted that unmanaged driveways have been proven to be a factor in higher crash rates and reduced mobility. Driver confusion is a factor in unsafe roads and impedes traffic flow. Additionally, vehicle turn movements occurring in close proximity to each other can result in higher crash rates and reduced mobility.
- Draft Existing Conditions Information - Zoning, Comprehensive Plan, and Land Use
    - Mitchell noted at the beginning of the presentation that the Town prepared a Comprehensive Plan in 2008 and that the planning process for this study should refer back to relevant recommendations for Bath Road. The recent adoption of the Village 2 District is a good example of implementing a recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan. It addresses the goal of limiting "strip" development from the town line to the village while promoting the appropriate scale and type of development and it introduces new standards for a transition zone to the Historic Village District.
    - Mitchell presented the Existing Conditions and Zoning Analysis Memo stating that the findings were summarized in the following areas: Zoning, Comprehensive Plan and the Land Use Ordinance Analysis; Character Areas; Visual Inventory; Environmental Constraints; and Infrastructure.

- The Comprehensive Plan emphasizes that the Town should prepare a specific Master Plan for Bath Road. This SC is directly related to guiding that effort.
- The primary recommendation from the Comprehensive Plan in regards to Bath Road is that it should not become a non-descript, over developed corridor, but that it should be attractive and diverse, adding to the value of Wiscasset as a tourist destination.
- Mitchell introduced the idea of “Character Areas” – different types and patterns of existing development along Bath Road. The five mapped character areas include: Traditional Roadside Development; New Development; Strip Development; Residential Development; and Residential Mixed Use Development. The SC commented that this was a new perspective of looking at the corridor. The SC noted that this might suggest future growth scenarios, such as a local business district from Grover’s Tire to Birch Point Road, but the SC also does not want to limit property rights.
- The Visual Inventory looked at different existing edge conditions along Bath Road including: Forested Edge; Commercial Edge; Field Edge; Power Lines; and Mixed Residential Edge. A SC member asked for clarification on “edge” and it was clarified that “edge” meant the character directly fronting the right of way.
- Mitchell described how “Objects” were also part of the Visual Inventory with descriptions of different types of signs. Examples included a free standing sign and a business where the extensive visibility of inventory in front of the building was the “sign” of the use, which to some might appear as clutter.
- Mitchell described how another important aspect of the Visual Inventory for Bath Road was the relationship between Sight Lines and Focal Points. Long sight lines are directly related to the nature of the rolling terrain - with low points at the four stream crossings - and general long and straight stretches of road segments that terminate in either developed or undeveloped focal points. The long sight lines – or views – down straight alignments of the corridor create segments that could potentially inform an overall vision for the corridor as a “place” with variations in character. Does a certain segment have a more rural feel with preserved stands of trees fronting Bath Road and does another segment have a more commercial feel with quality architecture, landscaping and signage?

The focal points directly relate to the long sight lines where in the distance the terrain rises and the road turns. These locations might become areas to preserve – such as a stand of trees – or areas where a project may be developed or redeveloped with a visible icon like a tower or steeple. As shown in the analysis, three of the high point / focal points are existing intersections: Route 144, Old Bath Road, and Birch Point Road. These

intersections might become more defined “nodes” providing well-planned access to new development on land not directly fronting Bath Road. In summary, Bath Road is comprised of a series of long sight lines terminating at focal points. The sight lines and focal points should inform the Master Plan, helping to implement the goal of the Comprehensive Plan by creating a diverse and attractive Bath Road rather than strip development from the town line to the village.

- Mitchell noted that an interesting finding from the Sight Lines and Focal Points analysis is that the major high points are located at existing intersections: Route 144; Old Bath Road; and Birch Point Road. It was also noted that the study area has two low points at either end comprised of water: Montsweag Brook and Holbrook Pond.
- In terms of Environmental Constraints it was noted that there is developable land along Bath Road, but the information from the Environmental Constraints Map should ultimately be cross-referenced with other analysis maps and the Comprehensive Plan to develop a better understanding of how the corridor could develop. This information may help the SC formulate a vision for future development potential in the corridor.
- Mitchell presented a map showing that water and sewer serve the area. There are no known capacity issues for future growth scenarios.
- General Comments
  - The SC asked what are the permitting implications of existing LOS's? Are these a limiting factor to take into account now in terms of future land use / capacity? Will you be able to predict traffic mitigating needs from the concept planning and growth scenarios? It was noted there is a specific MaineDOT Traffic Movement Permit process that requires projects to meet LOS standards and to implement mitigation improvements, if necessary. In general, this process focuses on intersections, as intersections generally are the controlling factor in roadway capacity. New organized development patterns may create less curb cuts and more defined intersections that would improve access / capacity coordinating the required traffic improvements, distributing the cost of these improvements, and streamlining permitting for developers.
  - The SC noted that three curb cuts at the Irving Station are needed and closing a curb cut is not recommended.
  - The SC noted that the report/graphics mislabeled the Market Place Plaza.

**Meeting Notes**

Bath Road Master Plan

December 17, 2012 Steering Committee

Prepared by: Tom Errico/Mitchell Rasor

---

**Attendees**

- Steering Committee
  - Wayne Averil
  - Don Jones
  - Gary Crosby
  - Peter West
  - Troy Cline
  - Heather Pitcher
  - Al Cohen
  - Ed Polewarczyk
  - Judy Colby
  - Laurie Smith
  - Misty Parker
  - Gerry Audibert
- Consultant Staff
  - Robert Faunce
  - Tom Errico
  - Mitchell Rasor

**Agenda**

- Introductions / Project Schedule
  - Misty reviewed the project schedule and noted that the next Steering Committee meeting would be in early February.
- Presentation of Traffic Volume Forecasts and Analysis
  - Tom presented information on the following:
    - Traffic Modeling Methodology.
    - Development assumptions for the Town of Wiscasset and the Bath Road Corridor.
    - PM Peak hour traffic volume changes between 2012 and 2030.
    - Anticipated Levels of service conclusions for intersections and the roadway segment in 2030.
    - Preliminary study area intersection improvement thoughts due to future traffic volume growth.
    - Example development types and their general access needs and traffic generation estimates.
  - Comments/questions from the Steering Committee:
    - What is the HCM 2-Lane analysis? Tom noted that it is an evaluation of the corridor as it relates to the ability of vehicles to travel the posted speed limit and opportunities to pass if slow vehicles are present. HCM is an acronym for Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, the national publication on roadway capacity analysis.

- In respect to the example of a Big Box Store located on Bath Road and the levels of service conclusions, it was noted that while they meet MaineDOT permit standards, some movements are approaching unacceptable levels and vehicle queue lengths are very long. It was also noted that the example only illustrates improvement needs at the driveway and that a traffic study would need to evaluate nearby intersections and the study could require off-site mitigation needs.
  - It was noted by staff member that it is not necessarily the size of the development, but the use that determines the level of traffic.
  - Question whether introducing a signal at an intersection like Birch Point Road would just draw more local traffic to that signal, creating more congestion in addition to any new demand in the area. It was noted that shifts in traffic routings could take place due to ease of access onto Bath Road.
  - Question regarding situations where two exit lanes are created for a development how driver can see passed the other car. Noted that in some cases there are ways to stagger stop lines to maintain sight lines.
- Mitchell presented the following:
    - A Review of the “Character Areas” Map
    - A Review of Relevant Comprehensive Plan Goals for Bath Road
      - There was a question as to whether to “grow as a tourist destination” is appropriate. It was noted that while Bath Road is a regional corridor, that it should not lose a sense of local history and uses and that it should be developed in a manner as to not distract from the historic village by becoming anywhere USA. Bath Road accommodates different needs, but it is still part of Wiscasset.
      - It was noted that the “Welcome to Wiscasset” sign is not at the town line, but as one enters the historic village.
    - Presentation of Potential Development Areas
      - There was confusion about the stream buffer noted on the handout. It was noted that there is a buffer and the color copy did not depict it.
      - It was asked what criteria went into selection of the “Potential Development Area” noted on the Map. It was explained that on a “planning level” land areas that did not have environmental constraints such as wetlands, streams, and steep slopes were identified as having potential for development.
      - It was noted that for other land that does have potential environmental constraints, permitting projects become more difficult and specifically needing permits with MaineDEP (Site

Location Permit) and a National Resource Protection (NRPA) permit.

- Presentation of Visuals from other Corridors
  - It was asked whether the “Corridor, Transition, Center” graphic is Wiscasset specific. Mitchell noted that it was not, but that it is relevant to Wiscasset if one thinks in terms of the transition from Village, Village 2, to Bath Road.
- Introduction to Steering Committee Visioning Exercise

The basic structure of the exercise was presented: breakout groups with a facilitator, questions exercise, mapping exercise, and regroup to share thoughts. It was recommended to utilize the Comprehensive Plan goals and the Character Areas Map as resources. It was also noted that this is not a “site planning” exercise, but an exercise in looking ahead to the desired distribution and intensity of residential, retail, and non-retail uses – similar to creating a “future character areas map”.
- Steering Committee Visioning Exercise
  - Question Exercise

The Following questions were asked of the three groups:

1. What are the first words that come to mind when you think of Bath Road?

Summary of Responses:

- Summer traffic
- Dark
- Barren-no trees
- Accidents
- Commercial – anywhere USA
- Sign clutter
- Way it used to be
- Commercial
- Restaurants
- Way to go to Bath
- Traffic
- Franchise
- Unsafe for pedestrians
- Summer cyclists
- Service businesses
- Old local



2. What role does Bath Road play in the community?

Summary of Responses:

- Major corridor
- Connection to coast and south
- Business – services
- Commercial
- Thruway
- Local destination for services – more so than historic village
- Regional

3. What are the pros and cons of how Bath Road has developed?

Summary of Responses:

Pros

- Slow growth
- Most development has stayed
- Still some open space / undeveloped land
- Local businesses
- Convenience businesses
- Job opportunities
- Good mix of uses serving community

Cons

- Random development – parcel by parcel
- Accidents due to summer traffic
- Traffic is haphazard
- Hard to enter Bath Road from side roads
- Difficult to make left turns to side roads
- Road design – adds to congestion
- 1950's / 1960's development planning skipped this area (in comparison to limited access on Route 1 in Woolwich)
- Loss of rural aesthetic
- Need more development along Bath Road

4. If you could go back thirty years, what would you have done differently in planning development along Bath Road?

Summary of Responses:

- Not a regional road – create bypass
- More compact development
- More development with fewer restrictions from State in terms of traffic permits
- Bought more land for private development
- Bought certain properties to protect rural character
- Preserve / replace roadside vegetation
- Reconsider lot size requirements
- More connections between developments to reduce congestion

5. Looking forward, how would you encourage future development while meeting the goals of the adopted Comprehensive Plan?

Summary of Responses:

- Do not try and meet goals of the Comprehensive Plan – let development occur
- Do not impose any design standards
- This is problematic and complex
- Resolve impact fee burden – particularly for smaller businesses
- Try to find ways to protect certain lands from development

○ Mapping Exercise

Each breakout group was given a Potential Development Areas Map and asked to distribute retail, non-retail, and residential uses in the study area.

Each group had to identify the location of:

60 residential units (15 yellow stickies)  
50,000 square feet of retail (10 red stickies)  
100,000 square feet on non-retail (10 blue stickies)

## Summary of Findings

### **Misty's Group:**

#### Residential

Residential uses were clustered off of Bath Road in two locations: Along the developable area overlooking Montsweag Brook and in an infill area off of Page Avenue. Eight units of housing were located in two distinct areas to the east of east Bath Road. In no case were residential uses shown fronting Bath Road. In terms of connectivity, the cluster of homes off of Page Avenue included a new connection to Old Bath Road. It also appears that the cluster of homes overlooking Montsweag Brook would either have common access to a frontage parcel at the Bath Road / Route 144 intersection or Old Bath Road.

#### Non-Retail

All non-retail uses (100,000 sf) were clustered between the homes overlooking Montsweag Brook and the back of development fronting Bath Road. There was the assumption that this could be a type of business park with access to a frontage parcel at the Bath Road / Route 144 intersection or Old Bath Road.

#### Retail

Retail uses (50,000 sf) were clustered in three locations. The first location is on the land behind Monkey C, that also has frontage on Route 144. It appears that this development would have common access on Route 144, not Bath Road. The second retail cluster was midway along Bath Road to the north and south of Bath Road on either side of the Maine Yankee ROW. It is assumed this is frontage development. The third cluster of development was on the parcel of land to the west of the Birch Point / Bath Road intersection. Again, this assumes frontage access on to Bath Road.

### **Bob's Group:**

#### Residential

Residential uses (60 units) were either clustered in the area off of Page Avenue, absorbed into underutilized subdivisions, or scattered along the eastern side of Bath Road – with the highest concentration behind Big Al's. Road networks were depicted showing that developments either used

existing streets or create new single points of access on to Bath Road, such as to the west of the Birch Point Road / Bath Road intersection. Only residential uses were distributed between the southern Old Bath Road / Bath Road intersection and the village. All retail and non-retail uses are located to the south of the Old Bath Road / Bath Road intersection.

#### Non-Retail

All the non-retail uses (100,000 sf) were located between Montsweag Brook and the development fronting Bath Road. It is noted on the map that there would be a common access point at a frontage parcel at the Bath Road / Route 144 intersection.

#### Retail

Retail uses (50,000 sf) were clustered in the “New Development” area, with the highest concentration behind Monkey C. Some of this development has frontage on Bath Road, but most of the development is accessed from Route 144.

A second cluster of retail is located to the north of Shaw’s and shares one of the curb cuts to Shaw’s.

The third cluster of retail is infill on the western side of Bath Road and is “infill” frontage development, but shares access to Bath Road with existing points of access.

#### **Mitchell’s Group**

#### Residential

Residential uses (60 units) were either clustered in three locations to the west of Bath Road: Off of Page Avenue (providing access to Old Bath Road), to the south of the Maine Yankee ROW (providing access to Old Bath Road) and in a cluster overlooking Montsweag Brook with assumed access on to Old Bath Road.

#### Non-Retail

As with the retail uses, non-retail uses were dispersed along Bath Road, but not fronting directly on Bath Road. As with the other schemes the highest concentration of non-retail was the area behind the “New Development” (e.g. Irving, etc.) fronting Bath Road. This development as with the other schemes accessed Bath Road at the Route 144 intersection

and adjacent to the Irving Station. Other non-retail was located behind Wiscasset Ford, Big Al's, and to the west of the Birch Point Road/Bath Road intersection.

### Retail

Of the three schemes, retail uses (50,000 sf) were most dispersed on this plan with all retail directly accessing Bath Road except for a development to the north of Maine Heritage Village with access to Old Bath Road (per the MaineDOT requirement for this parcel) and the potential for Route 144 access for development fronting Bath Road at the Route 144/Bath Road intersection. There was also a cluster of retail development at the Birch Point Road / Bath Road Intersection.

### **Common Themes:**

#### Distribution:

Most uses, in general, were clustered in relationship to existing development trends. For example, all schemes showed a concentration of residential development off of Page Avenue. However, all three schemes showed a concentration of non-retail between Montsweag Brook and the existing development fronting Bath Road.

Most retail and non-retail uses were clustered near the Route 144/Bath Road intersection.

#### Access:

Residential and non-retail uses did not front on Bath Road. Opportunities were explored in every scheme to create connections between Bath Road, Old Bath Road, and Route 144.

Retail uses had the highest visibility along Bath Road, with some developments directly accessing Bath Road, but in many instances there shared common access points were identified.

Most retail and non-retail uses were clustered near the Route 144/Bath Road intersection.

### Redevelopment / Infill

Besides Bob's scheme, which showed a unique approach to guiding growth to underutilized subdivisions (not redevelopment per se) no

redevelopment was show along Bath Road. New development was shown fronting Bath Road.

#### Preservation of Open Space

None of the three plans depicted certain lands to be protected/conserved. There was a general trend to not develop land to the east of Bath Road, but these areas are in general not visible from Bath Road and would not contribute to a rural aesthetic.

However, the fact that most of the plans suggest common access points for development, even frontage retail, suggests there is an opportunity to maintain existing natural features as a type of buffer.

#### Improvements to Existing Traffic Issues

The plans did not identify existing areas of concern in terms of congestion or safety. However, the fact that the distribution of most uses identified new connections (Old Bath Road and Route 144 or shared access to Bath Road) suggests that the Steering Committee was aware of the negative implications of lot-by-lot curb cuts the length of Bath Road and the positive implications of creating new connectivity or routing traffic to an existing intersection such as Route 144, Page Avenue or Birch Point Road.

## **Meeting Notes**

Bath Road Master Plan

February 13, 2013 Steering Committee

Prepared by: Tom Errico/Mitchell Rasor

---

## **Attendees**

- Steering Committee
  - Wayne Averil
  - Don Jones
  - Gary Crosby
  - Peter West
  - Troy Cline
  - Heather Pitcher
  - Al Cohen
  - Ed Polewarczyk
  - Judy Colby
  - Laurie Smith
  - Misty Parker
  - Gerry Audibert
- Consultant Staff
  - Robert Faunce
  - Tom Errico
  - Mitchell Rasor

## **Agenda**

- Introductions / Project Schedule
  - Misty reviewed the project schedule and noted that the Public Meeting would be in March given schedules and the need to prepare materials for the meeting.
- Review Study Mission Statement
  - Mitchell reviewed the Mission Statement. There were no comments.
- Review of Relevant Comprehensive Plan Goals for Bath Road
  - Mitchell reviewed the Mission Statement. There were no comments.
- Recap of Steering Committee Visioning Exercise
  - Mitchell reviewed the results of the Visioning Exercise – specifically the land use mapping exercise. SC member noted that the intensity of mixed uses at the Route 144 / Old Bath Road intersection was a common aspect of each plan.

- Draft Transportation Recommendations

Tom presented draft transportation recommendations as it relates to: 1) Intersection Improvements; 2) Corridor Improvements; 3) New Road Connections; and 4) Access Management. Comments included:

- SC member asked at what point is a signal required. What triggers this? Tom noted that there are specific criteria established by the Federal Highway Administration that generally include traffic volumes and crash history. These criteria must be met before a traffic signal is installed.
- SC member asked if land takings were required to make improvements. It was noted that signalization and access management would occur in the existing right-of-way. However, conceptual connectivity would occur outside the right-of-way and ideally be guided to a common access point on Bath Road – such as a new signalized intersection at Route 144 or Birch Point Road.
- A SC member asked why parallel connections are not located closer to the existing right-of-way rather than deeper in the property as shown. Tom noted that this would create safety issues with various turning movements in close vicinity to Bath Road. It was also noted that new parallel roads set deeper into properties adjacent to Bath Road would create new frontage, helping to tap the development potential of the land.
- A SC member noted that the northern entrance to the Marketplace Plaza provides better sight distances and the proposed improvements should direct people traveling north to use this entrance.
- A SC member noted that it appears in the draft transportation plan that the new southbound lane into McDonald's appeared to place the vehicles leaving the McDonald's driveway directly in front of the oncoming traffic, leaving little window of opportunity for vehicles to move to the northbound lane. Tom explained that the exit lane from McDonald's would extend beyond the entrance to McDonald's and the vehicles would have clear sight lines to the north of the oncoming southbound traffic. This, in theory, would ease the difficulty of making left-turn egress movements.
- As Tom proceeded to show access management issues and opportunities along Bath Road, when the presentation reached the Dunkin Donuts across from the Irving Station, a SC member noted that traffic movements in this area are complex and asked why a common



connection was not made at Oxhorn Road rather than creating curb cuts on Bath Road. Tom noted this could have been a possibility, but did not know the details of the permitting for the project.

- A discussion referencing the presentation regarding access issues with the Woolwich Cumberland Farms scenario was revisited. The project is only viable due to access to Route 127 at the back of the property – an example of a “parallel road” directing traffic to a common point at Route 1. Tom noted that vehicles may use the Route 127 / Route 1 intersection to head north on Route 1. A SC member noted that vehicles cannot turn north at the intersection and must proceed south to a loop road passing under Route 1 eventually connecting to the north bound lane. This access “can of worms” is the type of situation that can be avoided on Bath Road with planned access management.
- It was noted by a SC member that there are safety issues with school buses stopping across from Ames due to topography heading north, limiting the sight distance. There was a discussion regarding the regulations of where bus stops can be located, but that this specific situation needed to be addressed as soon as possible. It was noted that the buses are required to turn on the amber warning lights 200’ before a bus stop.
- It was noted by a SC member that the pavement markings should be revised such that a dedicated left-turn lane into Ames is illustrated.
- A SC member noted that there is a discussion to have Concord Trailways access their property (Miss Wiscasset Diner) coming north and that any curb cut closures or even a reduction in size would impact bus movements as well as the required access for delivery trucks. It was noted that Norm’s Auto, the Trading Post and the Miss Wiscasset Diner had numerous curb cuts and driveways while still maintaining the required access to the businesses. Tom noted that if Route 144 is signalized there are regulations regarding the distance to the nearest curb cut that must be met. A SC member noted that an access point off of Route 144 behind Norm’s was often used as a way of avoiding the Route 144 / Bath Road intersection. Tom noted that in the concept street connectivity diagram an access road was shown behind all of these properties, which would allow vehicles to reach the Route 144 intersection in an orderly manner. Misty noted that Norm owns 26 acres behind his property and this concept parallel road would also help connectivity to his land.

- A SC member asked why the Bath Road / Beechnut Hill Road intersection was not proposed for signalization. Tom replied that it did not have traffic volume levels or crash problems that would warrant a traffic signal.
- Bob noted that the Town has installed sewer and water along Bath Road to support growth. This infrastructure has additional capacity. It is Bath Road and the intersections that are near or over capacity. Planning for access management will encourage and allow for growth along Bath Road and the back lands while improving the capacity of Bath Road.
- It was noted that the McDonald's site has an access easement to the development parcel to the north and that a parking lot connection was made between Big Al's and the car wash – both examples of planned access management (inter parcel connectivity).
- Laurie noted that growth is going to happen. Educating the community regarding the importance of access management to enable growth is important. Laurie asked do we want Bath Road to be “anywhere” or should we use the Master Plan to guide growth in a manner that retains and adds to the integrity of Bath Road as a place, not just another regional arterial?
- Draft Land Use and Design Recommendations
  - Mitchell presented the previous analysis of Bath Road including the “Character Areas Map”, the “The Sight Lines and Focal Points Map” and the existing Zoning Map. The results of the SC Land Use Mapping exercise were also revisited.
  - Mitchell noted that there was a general relationship between the analyses, the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and the SC findings leading to three consistent areas of character and use. The proposed “zones” include:
    - “Bath Road Mixed Use” running from Woolwich to Old Bath Road south, west to Montsweag Brook and east to the residential neighborhoods. There are a number of undeveloped parcels in this area with development potential. This area is already seeing the greatest change. It was noted by the SC as having the greatest potential for a mix of uses – housing, retail, and non-retail – that could be supported by a new signalized intersection at Route 144, access to Old Bath Road, Route 144, and connections to existing frontage driveways such as the

northern entrance to Shaw's. Back lands would be accessed by a series of interconnected streets.

- “Bath Road Commercial” running north from Old Bath Road to Ward's Brook, but lacking the depth of the Bath Road Mixed Use due to residential development to the west and environmental restrictions to the east. No new connectivity behind the frontage development is envisioned. Thus the focus should be mitigating traffic and visual impacts with frontage development and redevelopment opportunities. This area was also noted for having straight rolling terrain and high points providing unbroken views of frontage development. This adds to the “strip” feel that should be mitigated with strategic access management and the preservation or enhancement of landscaping.
- “Village 3” running from Ward's Brook to the existing Village 2 District. This area – specifically between Grover Tire and Birch Point Road – already has a mix of local business, buildings set close to the road, and adjacent residential neighborhoods that could be expanded to help create a walkable “village” corridor node with streetscape improvements.
  - Misty noted that by encouraging high volume uses such as drive-thru's to locate elsewhere on Bath Road, congestion and back up traffic in the proposed “Village 3” will be relieved.
  - Tom noted that even if streetscape elements were introduced to this area such as sidewalks, crosswalks, street trees and streetlights, that bicycle lanes (shoulder space) will still be extended the length of Bath Road.
  - A new signalized intersection at Birch Point Road would make this area safer, provide access to new lands, and allow existing development to connect to a network of new streets allowing for easier movement throughout the area and opportunities for new frontage development. New parallel roads may also enable curb cut / driveway consolidation. An extension of Birch Point Road through undeveloped lands to Old Bath Road was central to the connectivity concept for this area.
  - Misty noted that like the proposed “Bath Road Mixed Use” that the proposed “Village 3” zone” has the potential for a depth of development to the east and west. New connectivity, including a Birch Point Road

signalized intersection would support this growth and mitigate traffic impacts.

- A SC member noted that the ideas for connectivity, access management and creating different zone areas make sense, but that it is important to meet with key stakeholders to discuss the recommendations in order to get their feedback and educate them on the benefits of the Master Plan recommendations. It was suggested that these meetings occur before the public meeting.
- Next Steps
    - Select a Public Meeting date
    - Meet with key stakeholders to discuss the concepts
    - Schedule a SC debrief meeting following the Public Meeting

**Bath Road Master Plan  
March 20, 2013 Public Meeting  
Public Comments and Questions**

- How is Route 1 Camden traffic dispersed
- Why use 2011 data and not current traffic counts
- 2012 counts much smaller – fewer backups in 2012
- What is the basis for the residential and jobs growth projections
- Why not do improvements now; why wait for development to occur first
- How effective are turning lanes
- What is the relationship between the comp plan future land use plan and the BRMP
- Comp plan supports connectivity
- Backage road is good for aesthetics, successful elsewhere
- Backage road on north side of Route 1 behind Shell, Irving, mall is a good idea
- Backage road on the south side of Route 1 above RR tracks will help industrial park, Westport traffic and access to Shaws
- Connect Routes 1 and 27 via Old Bath Road
- Use telephone ROW that travels behind the Yellowfront for backage road and to connect Routes 1 and 27
- Why not develop field on north side of Birch Point Road
- Protect the open approach to the village and concentrate development elsewhere
- Block the north end of Old Bath Road to protect integrity of residential area
- Bypass lane stops at diner and is unsafe
- Add right turn lane NB at Route 144
- Extend third lane through entire corridor
- Pursue landscaped medians
- Manage growth but allow for Wiscasset's best interests
- Provide developers some certainty
- Street lights – only one in corridor; it is near Dunkin Donuts and doesn't work
- Which is safer – continuous or intermittent third lane
- Raised islands prevent drivers from using third lane for passing
- Plan needs to meet highest standards and reflect town's heritage