



CITY OF DOVER

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMISSION MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting
Meeting Location: Police Department community room, 46 Chestnut Street
Meeting Date: **Monday, September 22, 2025**
Meeting Time: **6:00 pm**

1. ROLL CALL

2. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Review/approval of minutes from June 23, 2025
- B. Fourth Street parking concern – resident request
- C. Citizen correspondence RE: NHDOT changes to Rte 9/Rte 155 intersection

3. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Tennyson/Henry Law intersection three-way stop petition
- B. Hubbard/Middle intersection sight obstruction concern
- C. Tolend Road truck traffic concern
- D. Arch Street traffic concern
- E. Washington/Payne all-way stop proposal

4. CITIZENS FORUM

5. MEMBER COMMENTS

6. CONFIRM NEXT MEETING DATE

7. ADJOURN

Speidel, Marn

From: Deborah Goard <deborah.goard@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2025 11:40 AM
To: Transportation Advisory Commission - All; Dover School Board
Cc: Boston, Christine; Shanahan, Dennis
Subject: Request to address safety concerns with intersection of 155/9/Bellamy Road, including safety of students

Security Notice: External sender. Use caution with hyperlinks or attachments.

Transportation Advisory Commission members and School Board members,

I'm reaching out regarding concerns for pedestrian safety while crossing the intersection of 155/9/Bellamy Road and to request the City, in conjunction with the School District, write a letter to the NHDOT State Traffic Engineer in support of the addition of a no turn on red sign while the pedestrian crossing light is active. This is the same sign that was installed on Route 108 and the off/on ramp to Rt 16 South by the Middle School.

As you may be aware, last year NHDOT conducted some work at this intersection. As a part of this work they removed the pedestrian walk signal and crosswalk that allowed the crossing of the east side of the intersection directly from Bellamy Road to Route 9, including the neighborhood I live in. From talking to NHDOT staff, this was removed as the crosswalk wasn't straight and has a median obstruction which is not compliant with ADA rules for blind people. Rather than redo the median or otherwise realign the sidewalks they removed the crosswalk and walk signal.

The removal of this crosswalk and pedestrian signal has made an already dangerous intersection even more dangerous. This crosswalk was used by the residents of the neighborhood that I live in, which includes kids walking to and from school and after school activities. Now, people can still walk across the intersection in the location where the crosswalk was removed - it's important to note the crosswalk signal stops traffic in all directions - or if they follow the crosswalks, they now need to cross the dangerous intersection three times and likely through at least two different light cycles. This now has people, and kids, waiting while standing on a small concrete island with tractor-trailers driving by a few feet away instead of being able to cross just one side of the intersection.

My understanding is that the realignment of the sidewalk is a City responsibility. While I would also ask that this be done at some point so a crosswalk and pedestrian signal can be reinstalled, that is not what I am asking for at this time. Instead, I am asking for a more immediate and less expensive solution, which NHDOT has indicated is a \$4,000 cost for them in terms of the cost per electronic light.

I have lived in this neighborhood since 2008 and have almost been hit myself more than I can count from vehicles not stopping while turning right toward Rt 16 off Bellamy Road. This includes while using the previous crosswalk as a pedestrian as well as in a car. My three kids, who also use this intersection to get to and from school, as well as to walk home after sports at the Middle School and High School, have also been close to being hit at least a dozen times in the last few years. The most recent occurrence was within the last two weeks.

I have spoken to NHDOT staff twice about this and they have mentioned a few things to do which include: that I reach out to the City about traffic enforcement; NHDOT placement of a static yield to pedestrian sign; NHDOT placement of a no turn on red electronic sign; realignment of the sidewalk by the City which could allow the crosswalk and light to be reinstalled.

While I appreciate the placement of the yield to pedestrians sign and understand that is a step NHDOT may need to take first, I don't believe this will be effective. For the electronic no turn on red sign to be installed faster, it was suggested that a letter from the City and School District requesting this sign would be more effective than just a request from myself as a private citizen. For this reason, I am requesting a letter be written to the State Traffic Engineer as:

- People do not come to a full stop to take a right off Bellamy Road. This is especially bad during high traffic times, including teenagers driving through here when school is out. One of my daughters was almost hit two days in a row by the same high school student who neither stopped, nor looked to see if anyone was crossing when the light was red and the crosswalk signal indicated it was in use.
- This intersection has deemed the neighborhood I live in a "Dangerous Neighborhood" which is why we have a school bus despite being within the distance required for walking to Woodman Park, DMS and DHS.
- Despite the bus service, the distance to walk to DHS, through this intersection, is the same as it is to walk to the bus stop. Our kids walk or, in bad weather, are driven to DHS for this reason.
- Kids in my neighborhood and those that live down Route 155 walk home from after school sports and activities using this intersection as there is no bus option and parents are at work when sports/activities get out.
- It's my understanding that kids who live in the apartments off Route 155 are not bussed to DHS and use this intersection to cross over to the sidewalk on Bellamy Road.
- Other residents consistently use this intersection as well to walk to school events, walk their dogs, exercise, walk downtown, walk to work, etc.
- With the proposed additional 800 housing units off Route 9, more housing units being built on Route 155 and more industrial buildings currently being built off Route 9 there will be an increase of traffic flow in this location, likely causing more of a decrease in pedestrian safety at this intersection.
- The installation of this sign can be assumed to significantly reduce negative interactions with pedestrians as cars consistently do not stop while the crosswalk signals are on and the light is red. Especially for those coming off Bellamy Road.
- The installation of the electronic sign, I believe, is important whether or not the sidewalk is realigned and a crosswalk and walk signal are reinstalled leading directly from Bellamy Road to Route 9.
- The addition of the electronic sign, while a \$4,000 unit cost for NHDOT, is a lot cheaper than what would be the result of a serious injury or death to a pedestrian.

If this is something that should also be discussed in person before the Committee or School Board, or before another committee, board or City staff member, please let me know and I am happy to do that. I am also willing to meet with anyone to look at the intersection if that would be helpful, as well as offer to help draft a letter for this request to send to the State Traffic Engineer, Lee Baronas.

I look forward to the City and School District's response.

Sincerely,

Debbie Goard
6 Beverly Lane, Dover

Petition for a Three-Way Stop at Henry Law Ave and Tennyson Ave

To: Dover City Hall – April 15thth 2025

We, the undersigned corner residents of Henry Law Ave and Tennyson Ave, respectfully request the installation of a three-way stop with signs and paint at the intersection of Henry Law Ave and Tennyson Ave.

Due to increased traffic and speeding on our street, this intersection has become increasingly dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists alike.

Many vehicles fail to slow down coming up and down the Henry Law Ave hill, creating a safety hazard for children, pets as well as residents entering and exiting their driveways at this intersection. A three-way stop would significantly improve speed control and reduce the risk of accidents.

We believe that implementing this measure will enhance the overall safety and livability of our neighborhood. We appreciate your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Name	Address
Amy & Ryan Donahue	176 Henry Law Ave, Dover 207-318-0903
graca & Lucio Oliveira	181 Henry Law Ave Dover 603 674 3642
Michael Lee	174 HENRY LAW AVE, Dover NH.
Richard Watts	30 Tennyson Avenue Dover NH
Stephen Shingubani	31 Tennyson Ave Dover NH
Janet Ford	178 Henry Law Ave Dover NH

Speidel, Marn

From: Speidel, Marn
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2025 2:37 PM
To: 'rewindsf@gmail.com' <rewindsf@gmail.com>
Subject: FW: Petition for Three-Way Stop

Mr. Donahue,

My apologies for the delay in getting back to you. This has been scheduled as one of the agenda items for the upcoming Transportation Advisory Commission meeting, on Monday, September 22 at 6 PM in the Police Department Community Room at 46 Chestnut Street. If you and any of the other petitioners wish to attend to speak to your concerns, you are welcome. The committee is advisory in nature and its public meetings are fairly informal but it does follow Roberts Rules of Order. New stop signs would have to be added to the City Code by ordinance by vote of the City Council, but an endorsement from the TAC is normally a prerequisite.

The criteria for multi-way stop sign warrants are laid out in the Federal Highway Administration's Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). With regard to the concerns outlined in this petition, some of the applicable criteria and guidance from the MUTCD [part2b.pdf](#) include:

- YIELD or STOP signs should not be used for speed control. (Section 2B.04)
- A YIELD or STOP sign should not be installed on the higher volume roadway unless justified by an engineering study. (2B.04)
- Multi-way stop control can be useful as a safety measure at intersections if certain traffic conditions exist. Safety concerns associated with multi-way stops include pedestrians, bicyclists, and all road users expecting other road users to stop. Multi-way stop control is used where the volume of traffic on the intersecting roads is approximately equal. (2B.07)

Notwithstanding these issues, the TAC has recently fielded concerns regarding pedestrian safety in this area, and City staff has not yet formulated a position on whether to support this petition. Your input will be important.

Respectfully,
Marn Speidel

Lt. Marn Speidel
Dover Police Department
46 Chestnut Street
Dover, NH 03820
(603) 742-4646

From: Bessette, Colleen <C.Bessette@dover.nh.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 3:36 PM
To: Speidel, Marn <M.Speidel@dover.nh.gov>
Cc: 'rewindsf@gmail.com' <rewindsf@gmail.com>
Subject: Petition for Three-Way Stop

Good afternoon Lt. Speidel –

The attached petition was dropped off in my office today by Mr. Ryan Donahue and I advised him that I would forward to you. Please let me know if this should be directed to someone else. If you could discuss details with Mr. Donahue on next steps, that would be appreciated!

Thank you,
Colleen

Colleen EA Bessette (she/her)

Executive Assistant to the City Manager

City of Dover

288 Central Avenue

Dover, NH 03820

Phone: 603-516-6023 | Fax: 603-516-1662

c.bessette@dover.nh.gov | www.dover.nh.gov

Dover: First in New Hampshire, First with you!

Please consider conserving our natural resources before printing this e-mail and/or any attachments.

This electronic message and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and/or legally privileged in accordance with NH RSA 91-A and other applicable laws or regulations. It is intended only for the use of the person and/or entity identified as recipient(s) in the message. If you are not an intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender immediately and delete the material. Do not print, deliver, distribute or copy this message, and do not disclose its contents or take any action in reliance on the information it contains unless authorized to do so. Thank you.

Speidel, Marn

From: Semprini, Jillian <J.Semprini@doover.nh.gov>

Sent: Thursday, April 24, 2025 10:07 AM

To: Speidel, Marn <M.Speidel@doover.nh.gov>; Mavrogeorge, Kenneth <K.Mavrogeorge@doover.nh.gov>; Kozlowski, Krystian <K.Kozlowski@doover.nh.gov>

Cc: Colonna, Mark <M.Colonna@doover.nh.gov>; Storer, John <J.Storer@doover.nh.gov>

Subject: RE: Tree Removal Due to Sidewalk Extension on Court Street

Hi Marn,

Gretchen brought this to my attention and let me know someone from the neighborhood may be reaching out to TAC.

My response to Gretchen was that removal of the tree in question is outside the scope of project; it does not need to be removed to complete the project. The city has a tree waiver process that is court ordered for trees located within the public right-of-way, which includes tree appraisal and compensation to the property owner in which the trees are in front of. This applies to all public right-of-way that were not fee acquired (Council approved), which is the majority of existing streets in the city.

The tree in question was not appraised as part of the Court St project, and would need to be if we are to remove it. If it is agreed that this tree is causing line of site issues, we can move forward with the process, but I think we should keep it separate from the Court St project.

There is other vegetation on the corner property that extends into the ROW. I told Gretchen that I will send a letter to the property owner notifying them to remove their landscaping from the ROW.

Thank you,

Jillian Semprini
Deputy City Engineer
City of Dover, NH

From: Speidel, Marn <M.Speidel@doover.nh.gov>

Sent: Thursday, April 24, 2025 8:56 AM

To: Mavrogeorge, Kenneth <K.Mavrogeorge@doover.nh.gov>; Semprini, Jillian <J.Semprini@doover.nh.gov>; Kozlowski, Krystian <K.Kozlowski@doover.nh.gov>

Cc: Colonna, Mark <M.Colonna@doover.nh.gov>

Subject: FW: Tree Removal Due to Sidewalk Extension on Court Street

Is this something we'd be willing to take a look at in connection with the Court Street project? I'm happy to go out and evaluate, and maybe send along a photo.

From: Lindsey Spagnola <lindseyspagnola@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 23, 2025 8:18 PM

To: Speidel, Marn <M.Speidel@doover.nh.gov>

Subject: Tree Removal Due to Sidewalk Extension on Court Street

Security Notice: External sender. Use caution with hyperlinks or attachments.

Good evening Lieutenant Speidel ~

I recently heard that Court Street sidewalks are going to be extended all the way to Hubbard Road (which happens to be the road me and my family live on) and that will require some trees to be removed to the left when turning off of Hubbard Road. Although it is not in the scope of the project, it seems like a wonderful time to address/remove the large tree and potential other sight line obstructions just to the right when turning off of Hubbard Road onto Middle Road. The tree has been an ongoing safety issue for years now as you are basically required to drive into the street to be able to get proper visibility to determine if no cars are coming from the right prior to turning left. Hubbard Road has a good amount of car traffic throughout the day and I believe that removing that tree (and other potential obstructions in that area) would be an incredibly smart decision to ensure drivers and their occupants stay safe.

Please let me know if I can do anything else to help keep people safe by removing this tree!

Thank you!

Lindsey French

Speidel, Marn

From: Speidel, Marn
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2025 10:29 AM
To: 'ljwilliams17@gmail.com'
Subject: FW: Hubbard rd tree

Ms. Williams,

Thank you for forwarding your concern. The City has also fielded similar concerns from others.

This issue is not quite as simple as carving out some extra funds from the Court Street project to remove this tree. The new sidewalk will not extend to that side of Hubbard Road, so this is not technically within the scope of the project. Middle Road is a public right-of-way, but it is not City-deeded property. Abutting property owners have statutory rights - even within the right-of-way - with respect to trees.

This tree must be evaluated in the context of whether it creates a *"public nuisance by reason of danger to the traveling public."* I have personally evaluated the position of the tree in relation to the sight distance for a driver pulling out of Hubbard Road, and I agree that it would be much easier to perceive approaching traffic if the tree were removed. That said, I'm not quite prepared to declare it an imminent danger to the traveling public. My understanding is that the City Engineer has also evaluated it, and reached a similar conclusion.

In this case, the property owner does not readily consent to the removal of the tree. I have conversed at length with the property owner. Among the points he raised was that this tree should already have been evaluated in connection with the layout of the Hubbard Road neighborhood. I don't have enough information to indicate whether this was done. I can attest that excessive traffic speeds on Middle Road have long been a community concern, so you definitely have to be careful pulling out of Hubbard by first clearing to the left, then inching out, then clearing to the right. The police department's records indicate that in the previous six years only one collision has occurred here (11/16/2023) and it actually did not involve this tree. A vehicle pulled out from the Hubbard stop sign into the path of a southbound vehicle (in other words, from the left not the right).

The City did explore the costs for removal of this tree. A recent estimate for its removal was \$3,100. Additionally, the "replacement cost" of the tree (a shagbark hickory) was estimated by the arborist at \$4,100. This is the amount that the City could be obligated to pay the property owner for removing the tree, unless it is truly deemed "hazardous" pursuant to NH RSA 231:145. Perhaps the property owner will change his mind and agree to accept the \$4,100, and the City will agree to expend the full \$7,200 to remove the tree.

I've attached a link to a couple of applicable State statutes. There are also other statutes within this same section of the code.

[Section 231:141 Acquisition of Trees.](#)

[Section 231:145 Removal of Certain Hazardous Trees.](#)

Further discussion on this issue has been added to the agenda of the upcoming Transportation Advisory Commission, which will meet on **Monday, September 22 at 6 PM in the Police Department Community Room, 46 Chestnut Street**. You are welcome to attend this meeting to speak to your concerns. The TAC will likely be asked to evaluate for themselves the danger posed by this tree, and to vote whether or not to endorse its declaration as a hazardous tree. The committee's endorsements are advisory only, but do help guide the decisions made by City staff.

Respectfully,
Marn Speidel

Lt. Marn Speidel
Dover Police Department
46 Chestnut Street
Dover, NH 03820
(603) 742-4646

-----Original Message-----

From: Laura Williams <ljwilliams17@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2025 5:05 PM
To: Speidel, Marn <M.Speidel@doover.nh.gov>
Subject: Hubbard rd tree

Security Notice: External sender. Use caution with hyperlinks or attachments.

Hi Lieutenant Speidel,

I got your contact from Gretchen Young, my neighbor. I live on Hubbard rd. I hear the town is removing the 3 trees to the left of Hubbard (as you are leaving Hubbard rd onto Middle Rd) as part of a sidewalk project. I am emailing about the sight obstruction pertaining to the tree on the right as your leaving Hubbard rd. So many near misses have occurred because of that tree. It obstructs your view while taking a left onto Middle Rd. Please consider removing this tree as well.

Thank you,
Laura Williams
Sent from my iPhone



TITLE XX TRANSPORTATION

CHAPTER 231 CITIES, TOWNS AND VILLAGE DISTRICT HIGHWAYS

Trees and Roadside Growth

Section 231:141

231:141 Acquisition of Trees. – It shall be the duty of the tree warden to examine the trees growing within the limits of town public ways, village commons, parks, cemeteries, and other public grounds, and to designate from time to time such as may be reasonably necessary for the purpose of shade or ornamentation and to acquire them in the name of the municipality as hereinafter provided, if it can be done, either by gift or by purchase if at a fair price and funds either public or private are available. Failing in this, he or she may take said trees, including the right to maintain the same as shade trees, for the use of the town or city by appraising the fair value of the same and by causing to be served upon the owner thereof a notice of such taking, which notice shall state the number of each variety of tree so taken, the location of the same as near as practicable, and the value thereof as fixed by him or her, or by a committee selected for the purpose, and also by filing a copy of such notice as attested by him or her with the town clerk. If the owner shall be satisfied with the value stated in such notice, the tree warden shall cause the same to be paid to him or her forthwith. If the owner shall be dissatisfied, he or she may, within 30 days after said notice has been served upon him or her, but not afterwards, apply to the selectmen to assess his or her damages. Such proceedings shall thereupon be had, including the right of appeal, as are provided in the case of assessment of damages in laying out of highways by selectmen; and thereupon such damages, if any, may be awarded as shall be legally and justly due to the landowner.

Source. 1901, 98:3. 1909, 93:1. 1925, 89:1. PL 93:24. RL 109:24. 1945, 188:1, part 23:3. RSA 253:3. 1981, 87:1, eff. April 20, 1981. 2012, 24:2, eff. May 2, 2012.

TITLE XX TRANSPORTATION

CHAPTER 231 CITIES, TOWNS AND VILLAGE DISTRICT HIGHWAYS

Trees and Roadside Growth

Section 231:145

231:145 Removal of Certain Hazardous Trees. – Notwithstanding the provisions of other sections of this subdivision and subject to the provisions of RSA 231:157 and RSA 231:158, the commissioner of transportation on class I and III highways, and state maintained portions of class II highways, and the governing bodies of cities and towns and the county commissioners for unorganized places on class IV, V, and VI highways and town maintained portions of class II highways may declare any tree, either alive or dead, situated within the limits of highways, roads, or streets to be a public nuisance by reason of danger to the traveling public, spread of tree disease, or the reliability of equipment installed at or upon utility facilities authorized under RSA 231:160 or RSA 231:160-a. After such declaration by such authority and notice to the abutting landowner on whose property such tree is located the said authority shall within a reasonable time remove the same without compensation or cost to the abutter. However, no such declaration and notice shall be required when the delay entailed by such declaration and notice would pose an imminent threat to safety or property, including electric transmission and distribution lines. Nothing in this subdivision shall be construed to relieve the public utility companies of their accepted responsibility of tree trimming and tree removal for the protection of their lines, or for the construction of new lines, or to alter the provisions of RSA 231:150-182 in any manner. The state and municipal authorities may require of the public utilities owning lines which pass through or near a tree or trees which are condemned for removal as a public nuisance to assist in their removal at their expense by either the temporary removal of their lines or by causing to be removed at their expense the top portion of said tree or trees from a point below their lines.

Source. RSA 253:6-a. 1959, 135:1. 1981, 87:1. 1985, 402:6, I(b)(3). 1991, 134:1, eff. July 19, 1991. 2009, 267:2, eff. Sept. 14, 2009. 2012, 24:5, eff. May 2, 2012. 2015, 89:1, eff. Aug. 4, 2015.

Speidel, Marn

From: Speidel, Marn
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 9:54 PM
To: 'traceyl@atlanticbb.net' <traceyl@atlanticbb.net>
Subject: RE: Tolend Road Truck Traffic

Ms. Lauder,

Your correspondence has been added as one of the agenda items of the September 22 TAC meeting, which begins at 6 PM in the police department community room, 46 Chestnut Street. Even if you can't make the meeting, your correspondence will be noted for the committee's record.

As I've explained, truck traffic to and from Brox Industries (a property in Dover) cannot be limited under the City's current ordinance as it is considered a local point of origin or destination. So, those trucks may travel via Tolend to Watson to Sixth (a designated truck route) or via Tolend to Columbus to Littleworth (NH Route 9). Dover contracts with Waste Management for its Citywide trash and recycling collection. I believe that WM trucks that are specifically assigned to Dover's trash and recycling collection routes should be permitted on any trash day, not just Tolend Road's designated day. Forcing them to traverse the long way around on the other days would inevitably lead to higher costs for the City's taxpayers. But this is something the committee can discuss. WM trucks that are hauling dumpster containers or from other origins are not permitted on Tolend. I have been in contact with the City's Solid Waste Coordinator and the WM regional route supervisor to remind them of this, and WM has pledged to reinforce the prohibition with its affected drivers.

Incidentally, I did stop a tractor trailer driver on Tolend Road earlier today. The driver was making a series of deliveries in Dover and was attempting to navigate from the industrial park off Route 9 to another delivery point off Sixth Street. I educated him about the ordinance and explained the proper route for him to take. He actually admitted he has used Tolend previously during these deliveries and said he would pass the information his colleagues. So, hopefully that helps reduce the occasional offending tractor trailer.

Respectfully,
Marn Speidel

Lt. Marn Speidel
Dover Police Department
46 Chestnut Street
Dover, NH 03820
(603) 742-4646

From: traceyl@atlanticbb.net <traceyl@atlanticbb.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2025 12:52 PM
To: Transportation Advisory Commission - All <TransportationAdvisoryCommission-All@doover.nh.gov>
Subject: Tolend Road Truck Traffic

Security Notice: External sender. Use caution with hyperlinks or attachments.

Greetings from 250 Tolend Road,

I'm writing to ask for your assistance addressing the volume (and speed) of truck traffic on Tolend Road. I've been in contact with Lt. Speidel to address this concern and understand new signs have been ordered to help alert truck drivers to the ordinance but think we need a multi prong approach to deal with this challenge.

I have been collecting data via a security camera for a few months and have counted at least 74 trucks (Brox and Waste Management) in one day! And, many of these trucks exceed the 30 MPH speed limit. Today, I just saw three large WM trucks going West (toward Glen Hill) and one 18-wheel trash truck going East toward Dover. I understand the ordinance means that these WM trucks should not be on Tolend unless it is trash day (Friday) and the 18 wheeler should not be on this road at all.

Obviously, the volume and speed of this truck traffic is not only very dangerous to the walkers and bicyclists who use Tolend Road, it also significantly impacts the quality of life for those of us who reside on Tolend Road. Please let me know what I can do to contribute to a solution to this difficult challenge.

Best regards,
Tracey Lauder

Speidel, Marn

From: Speidel, Marn
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 7:54 PM
To: 'Nancy Coady-Carroll' <coadycarroll.nancy03@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Speeding on Arch Street

The next TAC meeting is on Monday, September 22 at 6PM at 46 Chestnut Street. The committee normally recognizes correspondence that was sent to the whole committee as an agenda item. You are welcome to attend, but not required. You recently had the opportunity to address the committee regarding the same concerns.

While I do not speak for the committee, the police department did recently collect some traffic data that could be used in evaluating traffic speeds in connection with traffic calming measures as you have described. Over a one week period from August 27 to September 2, data was collected by radar in the northerly direction while the speed awareness trailer was in place. Average volume of traffic northbound per day was 4,096 vehicles, with average speed at 25.17 mph and 85th percentile speed at **32.95 mph**, the posted limit being 30. This is very close to the 85th percentile northbound speed distribution (**34 mph**) that was recorded from counts last August conducted by the Strafford Regional Planning Commission.

Lt. Marn Speidel
Dover Police Department
46 Chestnut Street
Dover, NH 03820
(603) 742-4646

From: Nancy Coady-Carroll <coadycarroll.nancy03@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 11:27 AM
To: Speidel, Marn <M.Speidel@dover.nh.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Speeding on Arch Street

Security Notice: External sender. Use caution with hyperlinks or attachments.

Good morning
When is the next Meeting?
Neighbors were pleased to see the attention to these issues.
Thanks

Nancy

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Nancy Coady-Carroll <coadycarroll.nancy03@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Aug 24, 2025 at 8:32 PM
Subject: Re: Speeding on Arch Street
To: Speidel, Marn <M.Speidel@dover.nh.gov>

Great. When is the next meeting

Nancy

On Sun, Aug 24, 2025 at 1:25 PM Speidel, Marn <M.Speidel@dover.nh.gov> wrote:

Ms. Coady-Carroll,

Thank you for your message, I will add this correspondence to the agenda of the next TAC meeting.

Regards, Marn

Lt. Marn Speidel

Dover Police Department

[46 Chestnut Street](#)

[Dover, NH 03820](#)

(603) 742-4646

From: Nancy Coady-Carroll <coadycarroll.nancy03@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 9:02 PM

To: Transportation Advisory Commission - All <TransportationAdvisoryCommission-All@dover.nh.gov>

Subject: Speeding on Arch Street

Security Notice: External sender. Use caution with hyperlinks or attachments.

Once again, I write to request that the issue of excessive speed be addressed. Studies have been done on Arch Street traffic counts and speed, however the most recent was in the summertime when the volume is less than during the school year.. Excessive speed is a constant factor despite the often and welcome presence of the police. The design of the street makes it just too easy to use excessive speed. While we appreciate the fog lines that were installed last year, more needs to be done.

Many fellow residents of Arch Street advocate for the use of such traffic control and calming measures such as have been installed in Portsmouth. On behalf of the residents of Arch Street I urge you to give careful consideration to the traffic calming on BartlettStreet and Aldrich Street as potential calming measures that could be installed here.

Arch Street is used by many school age children as well as dog walkers and pedestrians from the surrounding area.

We need to do better to make our neighborhood safer for all.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nancy Coady-Carroll

17 Arch Street

603-493-2733