



CITY OF DOVER

**COCHECHO WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY
COMMITTEE - MINUTES**

Meeting Type: Public Hearing
Meeting Location: Council Chambers
Meeting Date: **Tuesday, October 21, 2008**
Meeting Time: **7:00 pm**

PRESENT: Jack Mettee (Chair), Dana Lynch, Frank Torr, Steve Brewer, Dean Trefethen, Thom Hindle, Kim Schuman

EXOFFICIO MEMBERS: Scott Myers, Jack Buckley, Mike Joyal

STAFF: Steve Bird

OTHERS: Ed Shaw, Chris Wyskiel, Otis Perry, Jerry Lynch, Ed Bleiler, Doug DeDe, Eric Steltzer

Meeting convened at 7:05 pm.

Mettee: This is the second public hearing on the guidelines. I will be giving Steve Cecil's power point presentation. We have had 21 public meetings on these guidelines. We hired The Cecil Group to assist the committee. There are 3 pieces to the property – the public park, the streets and sidewalks and the private development.

Mettee reviewed each of the slides of the Cecil power point and summarized each slide.

Mettee: Now we will open it up for public comment.

Bleiler: There is a disaster on the site due to the environmental hazards that exist. The Tolend Road landfill costs are in excess of \$20,000,000. Dickinson has done many test wells and the committee needs to know the results. There is well known evidence of contamination including influenza, printers ink, radioactive, acid, hides and waste oil. Don't let the City be left holding the bag.

Jerry Lynch: How far is the project from the river? Will it comply with state rules?

Mettee: That question is more related to the layout. Please keep the comments related to the design guidelines.

Jerry Lynch: Who would want to live near the waste being put in the dredge disposal cell?

Mettee: Thanks for your comments but your concerns are not for this committee.

Steltzer: The guidelines should contain LEED certification requirements. The project would conform too many of the standards already.

Wyskiel: I have 6 comments that I have put forth in a letter to the committee.

Mettee: Lets wait until we end the public hearing and discuss after we get together in the back of the room.

Mettee closed the public hearing after determining there were no additional comments.

Mettee: We will now review Mr. Wyskiel's letter.

Wyskiel: I will review the six points.

1. On page 2, 2nd bulleted circumstance – concerned that if the design is in conflict with state or federal law, one could argue that it could not be approved.
2. On page 5 – add 15-day window for CWDAC/DHA review if state or federal review requires plan changes.
3. On page 6, section 2, concern that all design elements be related to downtown. Modify by adding “major”.
4. On page 13, lighting table may be inconsistent with City requirements.
5. On page 18, section B-1, concerned that it specifies 4 common open space areas.
6. On page 22, section D, concerned that granite curbing is required for private areas.

Mettee: Let's review each of the Wyskiel issues and make a decision on each.

A long discussion ensued.

Committee consensus was to approve the changes in points #1 and #2.

On the 3rd point, Brewer suggested alternative that the committee approved.

On point #4, the committee consensus was to leave it as is.

On the 5th point, the committee consensus was to agree to the change.

Dana Lynch: On point #6 we could eliminate bituminous concrete as an option. He proposed the following: “All private streets, drives and loading areas will be paved with asphalt and provided with granite or concrete curbing.”

Committee consensus was to approve Lynch's language.

Mettee: I have 2 other concerns that I want to raise. First is the suggestion for LEEDs certification as raised by Eric Steltzer.

Trefethen: I think that should be in the LDA which will be more binding.

Shaw: Market will dictate whether it will be LEED certified. We should not support imposing a regulation requiring it.

Dana Lynch: Add a new paragraph on page 14, section 1.1 encouraging developer to consider LEEDs certification.

Myers: Statement should be as general as possible.

Brewer: We should encourage it, not mandate it.

Mettee: We will work on the wording for the next meeting. I have a problem with paragraph B-4 on page 25. The word “must” is used too often. It should be less restrictive.

Trefethen: Add a qualifier at the end of the paragraph.

Mettee: We need to have another meeting to give us time to make the final tweaks. We will meet again in 2 weeks; November 3 at 5:30 pm. is a possibility.

Dana Lynch moved to adjourn at 8:42 pm, Brewer seconded. So voted.