



TOWN OF
NEWMARKET
NEW HAMPSHIRE

Public Transportation Advisory Committee

May 14, 2025 at 7:00 PM

Town Council Chambers

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Present: Sönke Dornblut (Town Council Rep), Mike Hoffman, Madeleine Faust, Carol Gulla, Austin Johnson, Lyndsay Butler (Town Engineer)

Sönke Dornblut opened the meeting at 7:02 PM.

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Minutes

a. Review of Minutes: April 9, 2025

Action

Motion: **Mike Hoffman** motioned to approve the minutes of April 9, 2025.

Second: **Carol Gulla**

Discussion: None

Vote: **Approved 5-0**

3. Regular Business

a. Road Typology Mapping Exercise

Lyndsay reviewed that the intention is to continue the discussion from last meeting's mapping exercise, for what categories of streets they want and how to structure the categories.

Sönke asked if this will be utilized by DPW or developers; **Lyndsay** clarified that the goal is for it to become a tool for both, and the end-goal is to craft a policy, similar to the one for Lebanon, NH.

The committee continued to review the document from Lebanon.

Lyndsay noted that there are some existing town standards and specifications for roadways, but that they are more specific to utilities.

Public Comment:

Holly Petitt, 41 Bay Road, expressed support for getting the COAST bus back in town, as she has a son going to UNH in the fall, and it is helpful for commuters without having to drive, and it supports more independence for this situation and for others that do not have a car.

Sönke explained that there is still some existing COAST service, but is essentially more of an on-demand service that goes from Newmarket to Exeter, and can take people

anywhere along the old route. It does not go to Durham though, but they do wish to try to work on expanding the routes, but that funding is limited for public transit currently.

Discussion returned to the road typology topic. **Lyndsay** commented that some of the elements for road specifications and typologies could be incorporated into the site plan review and subdivision standards, and also into the parking ordinance.

Sönke commended the simplicity of the example from Lebanon.

Discussion continued to what functional classes and names would make sense for Newmarket.

Mike brought up having separate standards for the historic district. **Madeline** also commented on the expansion of downtown, and connecting town hall into the downtown. **Sönke** recommended using a different word other than downtown or place making. **Mike** suggested village core, and that it can be codified for where that area is. There was consensus for village core wording as a placeholder.

Further discussion continued, including regarding streetscapes for transitioning drivers from different areas of town. **Lyndsay** noted that the elements for transitioning don't necessarily need to be classified, but it just needs to be known where it does shift.

Mike noted how it was worked on to have the transition into downtown have visual cues for cars to slow down, with the road narrowing too. **Madeline** questioned if it does need to be quantified what the transition looks like.

Sönke added the goal that the destination streets would be designed to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, motorized vehicles, and spoke to the evolution of the downtown area with more signage to help with that transition.

Discussion continued for the different typologies, signage, different standards for neighborhood streets, and examples such as permeable asphalt and a curve to the road to deter it from being used as a through street, which could be used for new developments at least.

The impact of delivery services on neighborhood streets where drivers may be unfamiliar with the neighborhoods and nature of the streets was also brought up.

Austin raised that the connector and collector in the example are a bit redundant with each other. Discussion ensued further on the definitions, and that the "local link" typology from Lebanon may not apply to Newmarket and can be removed.

The committee also discussed the example images included for different street designs, including highlighting trees, lighting, and a more distinguished separation between the road and the sidewalk. Cobblestones were also discussed as a tool for helping slow traffic and the benefit of the noise alerting pedestrians to cars.

It was also discussed as an idea that instead of having a raised curb for the sidewalk, to have it be the same level but a different surfacing to be visually different, which would help with plowing on narrower streets.

Plantings were discussed further as well, with concern noted for creating a green desert with no trees. Storm water planters were highlighted as an option too with the proximity to the river.

For next steps, **Lyndsay** suggested that before next meeting members could collect photos for examples of regional connector or local collector streets for looking at streetscape elements, and that she can try to gather more complete street policy examples.

b. Parking study update

Lyndsay noted this was conducted May 8, 9 and 10, and was completed. SRPC will be compiling the data and will have more information for putting together a report.

Mike noted that parking is a common concern that is mentioned often by other town committees as well, and that it should be kept at the forefront of discussions.

Discussion continued for how the parking study can help inform the capacity and usage of town parking as some lots are underutilized, which then leads to having increased signage to guide people to those lots. EV chargers were also discussed.

c. Other local and regional updates

4. Other Business

a. Items to discuss at the next meeting (June 11, 2025)

5. Adjourn

Action

Motion: Carol Gulla motioned to adjourn at 9:05 PM.

Second: Madeleine Faust

Discussion: None

Vote: Approved 5-0

Respectfully submitted,
Bridgette Grotheer
Land Use Administrator

DCAT:

https://videoplayer.telvue.com/player/XSekkdEeRsk0JHQVHAvKJVka7_5VjxKP/videos