



TRAFFIC SAFETY WORK GROUP

Remote Participation Via Zoom

Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020

Order Regarding Open Meeting Law

Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554

www.nantucket-ma.gov

~~ Minutes ~~

Thursday, March 18, 2021

Staff in attendance: Operations Administrator Erika Mooney; Lines and Signs Foreman Ray Sylvia; Town Minute Taker Terry Norton

Attending Members: Arthur Gasbarro (chair); Fire Chief Stephen Murphy; Police Chief William Pittman; Commission on Disability Chair Milton Rowland; Department of Public Works (DPW) Director Rob McNeil

Late arrival: McNeil 11:07

Members Absent: Jack Gardner (vice chair)

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Called to order at 10:31 a.m.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Washington Avenue Encroachment:

Gasbarro – We will accept public comment but not enter into discussion.

Janie Hobson-Dupont, 11 Washington Avenue – The parking issue affects us greatly; parking at Millie's is an issue, which has become very popular. She is very interested and encouraged by TSWG's efforts to rectify the situation. Asked that they think in terms of the whole picture of that area; one change here will impact there.

Jennifer Blate, 18 Washington Avenue – She hasn't been able to visit her property in a while so isn't fully aware of problems. In January she got a letter about an overgrown tree causing obstruction on Washington Avenue. The threat was if she didn't remove it the Town would and send her a bill; come to find out there is a bigger issue going on. Widening the street doesn't seem to rectify issues and she opposes that; seems there are better solutions.

James Pedrotty, 12 Washington Avenue – Agrees with Ms. Hobson-Dupont that the process has to be more holistic. He's been frustrated with the process and lack of a clear definition of the problem. It appears there's been a quick decision to get into encroachment abatement then once that's done, start a study; seems to be a reverse process. Asked for a hold on the encroachment issues.

Mooney – The encroachment letters are sent from Town Administration in connection with the DPW. That is standard language for an encroachment letter. When the Town is made aware of an encroachment, it takes action.

Melissa Walsh, 9 Washington Avenue – What TSWG is seeing is people who feel they have not had an opportunity to discuss this in a public forum. This is an Island of encroachment, and she feels the nature of the issue is arbitrary without evidence. Reinforced the request that TSWG do what it can to have Town hold on moving forward on encroachment issues.

Max Brown, 15 Washington Avenue – Supports the proposal to address parking at Millie's. They have exacerbated the parking issue. Concerned about the residents not having had an opportunity to interact with the Town regarding these issues. We haven't seen any safety issues that warrant removal of encroachment; removing encroaching vegetation would impact our quality of life. Noted that expansion of the road would come up to some people's front porch. There are encroachment issues all over the Island; we've heard from Ken Beaugrand, Town Real Estate Specialist, so that's why we're bringing up the encroachment issues. Considerations of footpaths, road widening, etc. seem to have been done in a vacuum. Seems accidents and injuries caused by encroachments should be part of the discussion. All the residents and side streets have

indicated there are no safety issues; the only issue is parking at Millie's. Entreated TSWG to work with residents on a comprehensive solution to the problem.

Betsy Brown, 7 Washington Avenue – She was surprised to hear widening the road was a possibility in a safe neighborhood. She's never seen a safety issue in her 40 years living there.

Susan Jemison, 5 C Street – Agrees with what's been said. One of her major concerns is that in the summer, there's a lot of traffic on Madaket Road to see the sunset; that traffic is part of the problem with parking. When there is a potential solution for additional parking behind Millie's, bringing it to our street is not the best solution.

Gasbarro – This will go on the April 15 Agenda for discussion.

III. OFFICIAL BUSINESS

1. Request for four-way stop at intersection of Surfside Road, Miacomet Road and Surfside Drive.

Documentation Correspondence; graphic

Discussion **Gasbarro** – This is a 2-way stop control. The Land Bank is in the process of creating a dog park on Miacomet Road; comments have been that we might want to be proactive for the traffic the dog park could possibly generate.

Murphy – Based off accident history, there are not a lot of incidents at this intersection. He has no recommendation.

Mooney – If the work group puts forward a positive recommendation, it will need to go to the Select Board for a public hearing.

Gasbarro – He hasn't seen any traffic studies or supporting data that this is warranted. Suggested holding over for that information. He doesn't this is an intersection of concern. He can follow up with the Director of Planning on past traffic planning. A first step might be to add another crosswalk. He's not personally convinced the benefits of a stop sign would outweigh the detriment.

Pittman – He looked up the data the last two incidents were reported in 2018: a two-vehicle accident and an accident involving a motor vehicle and bicycle. The difficulty is getting off Miacomet onto Surfside.

Nat Lowell – The mis-alignment of the intersection is what causes the problem; the telephone pole is located where you turn right coming off Miacomet Road; it should be moved. Suggested moving the pole and making the crosswalk more prominent until such time as the intersection is realigned. People try to cross there frequently.

Gasbarro – Received a letter from a Select Board member in favor of the stop sign. Asked if this should be recommended to Planning to improve the intersection.

Murphy – We should wait for a study; if we see an increase in use of the crosswalk, then we could look at this again.

Kristie Ferrantella – Requested a recommendation to clean up the corner at Hatikva Way and Surfside Road. She's very in favor of improving the crosswalk; this is near a NRTA stop.

McNeil – Line painting will be done before summer. We are doing brush cutting now so will look at sight lines.

Action **Motion to refer to Planning for further study and realignment.** (made by: Murphy) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Murphy, Rowland, Pittman, McNeil, and Gasbarro-aye

2. Request for yellow no-parking line to be removed in front of 47A West Chester Street.

Documentation Correspondence, photos

Discussion **David White** – In 2010, there was no signage on the road in front of his property and people would park on the grass. He built the cottage without on-site parking because he thought he could park on the street. About a year ago, he realized there is a yellow line there. There is plenty of room to park well off the street and not impede traffic. Proposed removing enough of the yellow line to allow for one car to park on the grass in front of his cottage.

Gasbarro – Procedurally, he sees it as removal of a yellow line to create on-street parking. It does appear this is a straight section of road. Also, we need some planned work to determine if this parking is within a travelled lane or is off the road.

McNeil – The challenge for him is around the neighborhood; in this area, there isn't much on-street parking. All structures have some level of off-street parking. If we try to solve this by removing a yellow line, it isn't a dedicated space, and anyone could use it; that doesn't solve Mr. White's problem. Off-street parking needs to be rectified among the neighbors.

Murphy – Allowing on-street parking cuts down the travel lane; there is a "no parking either side" sign for this street. He fears allowing this will be detrimental to the flow of traffic.

White – Based on past use, none of the points raised are accurate. Explained issues with off-street parking. Asked if he applied for a curb cut would he get more support. If a car were to be parked there, there would be 6 to 8 feet right of the yellow line keeping the car out of the street.

Gasbarro – This would require a second curb cut permitted through the DPW. Asked if there is support for removal of the yellow line.

Rowland – Would like a plan showing conditions on the ground and lot lines.

Pittman – It is important for Mr. White to know that regardless of what his plan shows, it would be very difficult for him to support this. It would be the first request for on-street parking leading to other requests.

Gasbarro – He agrees with Chief Pittman. Suggested Mr. White look into alternatives.

Action **Motion to Deny.** (made by: Pittman) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Rowland, McNeil, Murphy, Pittman, and Gasbarro-aye

3. Request for yellow no-parking across from 10 York Street.

Documentation Correspondence, photos, Quitclaim Deed, GIS map and aerial maps, site plans

Discussion **Murphy** – They have the plan; we could extend the yellow line some but not fully.

Gasbarro – The plan doesn't show existing yellow lines and turning radii. We will reach out to the applicant for that information. It will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Action **Held for next meeting.**

Roll-call Vote N/A

4. Revisit request for short-term loading zone in front of the Roberts House, 29 Center Street.

Documentation Correspondence, graphic

Discussion **Gasbarro** – There has been discussion on this in the past; proposes moving the fire hydrant across to the west side of the street and allowing a short-term loading zone on the east side of the street. Loading would be to noon then would open to timed parking.

Murphy – Confirmed that TSWG had talked about this in conjunction with removing the India Street loading zone. With the delivery truck up far enough with the ramp down, he wants to check to ensure fire vehicles can make the turn.

Gasbarro – The India Street loading zone is a short one used by UPS. By adding this, we get a more diverse opportunity. He also hopes it would prevent double parking elsewhere.

Nat Lowell – The one-way issue was key to making this work. When we made Broad Street one way, we set up making small improvements. This isn't about the Roberts House; it's about finding a place for the drivers to unload. The yellow line is 38 feet from the corner; as is trucks use it but stick out into the road; by doing this, it will complement the current small loading zone. Doesn't think there will be an issue with emergency trucks turning left off India because the vehicle can pull right up to the curb. This loading zone could service four restaurants.

Action **Motion to recommend a short-term loading zone in front of the Roberts House at 29 Street but not to be implemented until the fire hydrant is moved.** (made by: McNeil) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//McNeil, Rowland, Pittman, Murphy, Gasbarro-aye

5. Discussion regarding Article 82 (Bylaw Amendment: Streets and Sidewalks) of 2021 Annual Town Meeting.

Documentation Warrant Article 82 of 2021 Annual Town Meeting

Discussion **Gasbarro** – This Article would regulate the minimum amount of signage and sizes. The question is does TSWG want to take a position to support this article.

Kevin Kuester, Article sponsor – Hillary Rayport can answer questions. This is a housekeeping approach in that we need to have guidelines that limit the size of non-regulatory signs.

Hillary Rayport, co-sponsor – This came out of Nantucket Historical Commission’s work on the Milestone Road signs. It would direct people specifying signs that signs be the minimum allowable size and non-fluorescent color and there be minimal duplication of signs. This does not impact regulatory signs. There is an exclusion in Article 82 for school zones and temporary construction signs. Also, this does not apply to Milestone Road since it is a State road.

Max Brown – Thinks this is a great idea.

Rowland – This would have a positive affect for the Island aesthetic; it won’t hurt, and we’ll get the signs we need.

Gasbarro – He agrees with Mr. Rowland. This is laid out as non-prohibitive guidelines.

Discussion on the motion to support:

Murphy – Asked Mr. Sylvia’s opinion if this will make a difference.

Sylvia – He normally orders the 24” signs and only uses the fluorescent signs in school zones. Most signs larger than that are installed by contractors because that’s what’s used off Island.

Murphy – Hearing that makes him more comfortable with Article 82.

Nat Lowell – The intent is good. We should be using a soft approach to fix these things and keep safety in mind.

James Pedrotty – He worked for a manufacturing company that made highway sign materials; there’s competing issues on the fluorescent color: it’s obnoxious and doesn’t fit Nantucket but is designed to be attention getting. There is also an issue of color recognition; fluorescent has message recognition because that color is reserved for where pedestrians are involved.

Pittman – Agrees with Mr. Pedrotty.

McNeil – This is regulating something currently being handled.

Action **Motion to support Article 82.** (made by: Rowland) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 3-2//Murphy, Rowland, and Gasbarro-aye; McNeil and Pittman-nay

6. Discussion of potential road improvements/parking along Macy Road, Madaket.

Documentation Graphic

Discussion **Gasbarro** – This came out of a discussion at a Select Board meeting. He created a graphic for the committee to consider creation of additional parking along the layout of Macy Road. The layout is 42 feet wide, so discussion might include whether or not the parking is in the layout or use the abutting parcel. Southeast corner shows condition of intersection with extremely soft sand. Discussion is whether to support this or similar proposal to Select Board and how it would be implemented.

Rowland – Sounds like a good idea and solves the parking issue; it looks like there’s a strip of Town-owned property, which could be used for this purpose.

McNeil – He supports this.

Pittman – He supports this.

Murphy – He supports this.

Mooney – There is a restriction on the Town’s Macy Road parcel (lot 898 on Land Court Plan No. 3092-121) that is may be used for beach and recreational purposes for use and access to Madaket Beach, which may include access and public parking and roadway purposes for the beach.

Max Brown – This is a fantastic proposal that addresses many neighborhood concerns. Asked how many cars it might be able to accommodate.

Gasbarro – He hasn’t done a study or calculation, but his sense is it would be more than 30.

Discussion on the motion:

McNeil – Suggested keeping Macy bi-directional and not having angled parking.

Gasbarro – If it were 2-directional with head-in parking, it would continue to serve a purpose should the intersection with Chicago be lost due to erosion. The head-in parking would be based upon the direction of the road.

Action **Motion to recommend the proposal for head-in parking along Macy Road.** (made by: Rowland) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Rowland, Pitman, McNeil, Murphy, and Gasbarro-aye

7. Request for “Slow” signage on Surfside Road crosswalk at Nantucket Elementary/Intermediate Schools

Documentation Correspondence, graphic, video

Discussion **Gasbarro** – This request is from Diane O’Neil, School Facilities Manager.

Pittman – The last thing we need is another sign to look at rather than the clearly marked crosswalk. The crosswalk is difficult because it isn’t at a clear intersection; cars are cued back from Bartlett Road to Larrabee Lane. He’d feel better if the crosswalk were at Bartlett Road, but he already lost that argument. What would be a better solution is for the crossing guard to be much more visible: reflective vest and sign on a pole.

Murphy – Agrees with Chief Pittman. Agrees there are design issues there.

Rowland – He’s not sure a sign would be that helpful. Wonders if other measures might help.

Pittman – Short of a flashing light, there’s nothing more you can do there.

Action **Motion to Deny the request for a sign but recommend that Planning review the necessity for that crosswalk at that location and that TSWG recommend to the school they provide equipment to make the crossing guard more visible.** (made by: Pittman) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0// Pittman, McNeil, Rowland, Murphy, and Gasbarro-aye

IV. OTHER BUSINESS (Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance of meeting)

1. **Pittman** – Going back to the public comment, pointed out that the Select Board adopted a new rule governing public comment at a public meeting regarding cutting people off during public comment. You shouldn’t stop someone from talking about whatever they want. You can establish maximum time limits for someone to talk. The Select Board adopted 3 minutes for speakers making public comments. He’d like TSWG to adopt those same guidelines.

Gasbarro – That would be appropriate for formal adoption on the next agenda.

2. **Gasbarro** – He’s hopeful Old South Road at the Richmond project will be addressed soon.

3. **McNeil** – Asked if Mr. Gasbarro had checked back on the four proposed moped-parking areas being impacted by outdoor dining.

Gasbarro – It’s up to the Town Manager at this point.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. The minutes of January 21, 2021.

Action **Motion to Approve.** (made by: McNeil) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Rowland, Pittman, McNeil, Murphy, and Gasbarro-aye

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Action **Motion to Adjourn at 12:34 pm.** (made by: McNeil) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 5-0//Rowland, Pittman, McNeil, Murphy, and Gasbarro-aye

List of additional documents used at the meeting:

1. Draft January 21, 2021 minutes