

**DOVER PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
MINUTES OF MEETING
JULY 20, 1999**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tony McManus, Jerry Reese, Margaret Stevenson, Pete Lavoie, Ron Cole

MEMBERS ABSENT: Paul Beecher, Reuben Hull, Frank Torr, Charles Maglaras, Karin Crittenden, Jeff Peasley, Jeff Mason

STAFF PRESENT: Steven Stancel, Planning Director; Bruce Woodruff, City Planner, and Jacqueline Freeman, Recording Secretary

Steve Stancel stated that the objective of the meeting is to discuss the project in an informal manner in an attempt to begin to build a consensus as to the type of project and number of units we would like to see. He reminded everyone that we are in a conceptual design phase so the Planning Board is dealing with concepts and whether or not to allow alternative design subdivision vs. a conventional subdivision. Once the Planning Board makes a decision on a conceptual design, the project then goes through the detailed engineering design phase where it will then go before a public hearing prior to the Board making any final adjustments. He said that the following are the main concerns that we've heard through the public hearings thus far:

1. Wetlands

Steve said that the wetlands were mapped by a certified soils scientist. This mapping will be reviewed and OK'd by the City's soil scientist and will also be reviewed by the City Conservation Commission prior to final approvals. The State will also review the plans for site specific and wetlands impact issues.

2. Public right-of-way.

Existence of potential public right-of-way through the project. It has been indicated that many years ago there was a public right-of-way that went through the property and that might still exist. He said the staff has reviewed the evidence presented and they feel that the data is inconclusive. It does appear that there was a public r-o-w in the vicinity of the project somewhere in the 1700's, after that it becomes very murky. Subsequent maps show a private r-o-w through the project. The City has no record or map showing an existing r-o-w through the property. There have been other subdivisions occur on this and adjoining parcels that did not show any r-o-w through the projects. Numerous title searches have occurred throughout the years with no indication of any public or private r-o-w's through the property. He said that this is an issue that is not to be addressed at this conceptual design stage, but by the developer prior to final approval.

3. Open Space.

Steve Stancel said that the existing lots were part of the original ADS and have to be part of this proposal. That does not mean that these existing lots on Hubbard should have to participate financially in any maintenance fees. He said that this is an issue between the

developer and the property owners and not an issue that Planning Board should be addressing. The original approval did require an association and fees charged to the property owners for the maintenance of the detention areas. He said the existing homeowners may be responsible for some common expenses, but that is something that needs to be negotiated with the developer at this stage.

4. Traffic

Steve stated that there are two potential concepts for the area. The Planning Department went out and hired, at the developer's expense, a transportation planner to look at both concepts, as well as, a third potential concept. The planner did several traffic counts at numerous intersections. Additionally, Planning staff went out and did traffic counts that were later compared to the transportation planner's numbers to correlate the facts. He said that Strafford Regional Planning also provided additional numbers that match the numbers of the transportation planner.

Don Rhodes, of Norway Plains, went over the traffic study. He said that the Planning Dept. contacted them about doing a traffic study and their big concern had to do with the different impacts that might result from the different types of development that is being considered, as well as, the impact of connecting a public street through the existing cul-de-sac into Hawthorn Road. He said that his study addresses those issues. He said that the first step was to do some traffic counts to get a handle on the existing conditions. He said that they did studies at 6 intersections during afternoon peak period traffic. Generally from 3:00 PM to 6:00 PM, and one of the counts went later than that. He said that the peak period on Dover Point Road is from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM, so that is when the data was gathered. He explained the numbers on his charts and went over the meaning of those numbers.

Don Rhodes said they were able to get a good handle on the patterns of the area and he elaborated on that. He said that the trip generations for the existing homes are a pretty good indication of what they can expect from conventional single family homes. Don said if there were 35 single family homes, you might expect 30 peak hour trips in and out combined. The number of trips that would be generated by adults only are harder to get a handle on because there are no good national data on that type of development. He said that what they did is focus in on what they think a reasonable number is. He said that studies in his office show that at the low end, a retirement type of community where a lot of folks don't have cars and almost nobody is in the workforce, trip generation rates would be about .35 peak hour trip per unit. That's not what he would expect from adults only housing where they would still be in the workforce, however, it probably represents the low number and the high number would be the .85. One thing that the Institute of Transportation Engineer's data showed conclusively is that trip generation is a function of persons per household. He said that apartments show higher trips per person. He said that in order to come up to a reasonable estimate of what might be expected from adult only housing, based on about two persons per dwelling and a trip rate somewhere between the average per person rate for single family dwelling and the average per person rate for apartments, they came up with an estimate of .7 peak hour trip per unit. He said if you look at the bottom line, it doesn't make a great deal of difference. He said the

number of trips for 35 single family homes would be 30 peak hour trips. He said if it was 53 adults-only single family homes, the peak hour trips would be 37. The increase, which spread over the roadway network, isn't a big number.

Don explained the increase in the traffic at the different points on the roadway system, with the connection through to Hawthorn and without the connection through to Hawthorn Rd. Don answered questions from the audience.

Don Rhodes stated that there are factors that would affect the travel time. He said that it is a case by case basis and people tend to make decisions differently. He said that some people may be discouraged by the steep grade on Watson, the fact that people may have to wait for a signal might tend to discourage other people, there are a lot of intangible things being considered. He said the greatest number of left turns would be added on Middle Road. In the afternoon, most of the new traffic is going to be making the right turn onto Middle Road, in the morning the traffic would be making the left turn out. He said that he did a very quick analysis of that situation to see what the circumstances would be during the morning, and the delays for making a left turn is fairly long. The additional turns resulting from the development don't trigger any threshold number. It doesn't kick it from the level of service E.

Malcolm McNeill asked Don Rhodes to explained the conclusions regarding Hubbard Road west of Middle Road in terms of the traffic impact with or without the connections.

Don Rhodes explained that based on their traffic counts, there is not a lot of through traffic on Hubbard and he has come up with a trip generation rate that is a little bit lower than the national average. Don said if they were to make the assumption that there was a significant number of through traffic on Hubbard, those trips would have to be deducted away from the total that we used to come up with the trip generation. What that would do is lower that trip generation rate even lower. He said it leads him to the conclusion that there is not substantial volume of through traffic on Hubbard Road. In respect to the proposed subdivision, Hubbard Road simply doesn't offer a short cut.

Steve Stancel stated that the study showed that Hawthorne and Hubbard are not being used as a cut throughs. It appears that the traffic is going to Watson and using that as a cut through.

Mr. Pomerleau stated that the numbers look very low to him. He said that he took his own traffic count on Sunday night between 6 and 8 PM and counted 25 cars and very few were residents.

Steve Stancel said that based on the analysis, they found that there doesn't appear to be a big advantage to connecting Hawthorne to Middle Road in terms of trying to alleviate some of the traffic off of Hubbard or in trying to alleviate some of the traffic off of Watson. He said you then look at the dead end project and how that affects the traffic on the existing roadway and it doesn't appear to overburden any of the existing roadways or intersections.

Steve Stancel clarified that the original proposal, the dead end that comes out onto Hawthorn, is dead. The proposal is either to connect Hawthorn to Middle or coming off of Middle Road to a dead end.

Discussion ensued on the crash gate. Pete Lavoie stated that Doctor's Park, on Garrison Hill, has a Knox Box lock on it. The Fire Department and the owner has keys and it is only opened if there is a major emergency. Jerry Reese added that there is also a Knox Box on Washington Street along the old railroad bed.

A discussion ensued on the submission of the NH Wetland application and the process that it goes through.

Malcolm McNeill, explained that there is more open space than the previously approved ADS. There will be a net positive fiscal impact to the community that would approach \$3,000.00 per unit, as opposed to a less than break-even benefit to the plan that was previously approved. The probable school population in the 35 unit project was 25 students and in this project it was 13 .

Malcolm McNeil stated that three issues were identified, wetlands, open space and traffic. He said that with regard to the wetlands we've given you the assurance that we are complying with the wetlands regulations, with the Conservation Commission and the State DES, and with the City's consultant. With regard to open space, he said that Atty. Tanquay is here, and the Hubbard Road persons who would have been required under the approvals that were issued in 1990 to participate in the homeowners association and to benefit from the open space were never availed to that opportunity because the homeowners association was never formed. Malcolm said they propose to provide the assurance that all of the Hubbard Road individuals that the open space to the south of their units will be larger than what they bought into. He said that they will work out an arrangement with them so that they are not impacted by the expenses that are clearly attributable to this new idea. There may be detention pond issues and other issues that would have been just as applicable in 1990 as they are in 1999, but the developer is not saying that because you were part of the original open space, you have to contribute to their private road and to the maintenance of these house lots. He said that would not be his intent.

Malcolm stated that the homeowners association has some flexibility. It's recognized that some tastes may change over time, but as for matters that are critical to the City and critical to the abutters, they are proposing that those be covered by conditions of approval that are made part of the plan. He said that from their perspective, what is the best result for the City and the best result for Planning Board and the developer is the 53 unit active adult community. He said that this is new for Dover but they feel it is the ideal spot at the ideal time.

Mr. Pomerleau stated that he hopes that the Planning Board keeps possession of the traffic study, because there will be an accident on Hubbard Road. He said that the city will have liability and he hopes that this study protects it down the road.

Discussion ensued regarding the wetlands process, the NH Wetlands Application, the Conservation Commission and the role of the City's soil scientist. Kevin McEneaney went over the changes in the wetlands regulations and how they are more stringent now than they were years ago. He explained that it's a rare subdivision that doesn't have some wetlands impact and the key is to minimize those impacts.

Malcolm stated that they have a third plan but it has not been submitted.

Mary Buese stated that she would like another plan for 35 houses that keeps with the rural nature of the area. She said that many of them who live there don't develop their whole piece of property, they leave some open as a buffer.

Steve Stancel stated that they are leaning towards a dead end concept, with private roads, coming off Middle Road, but they would like to see a lesser density, closer to 43 – 45 lots as opposed to 53 lots. Steve stated that the 35 lot concept has been approved by the Planning Board and if the second conceptual plan is approved the first one would be dead.

Steve Stancel said that the 3rd compromise plan was an attempt (before the traffic analysis was completed) towards the public road concept connecting Hawthorn to Middle Road, but then on the cul-de-sacs, you did the elderly adult community, thereby still getting increased density that they are looking for and we still get the public road that we were looking for. Steve said when the traffic analysis came out, they couldn't see a big advantage to connecting Hawthorn to Middle, therefore, in terms of fiscal positives, the private road concept is better for the City.

Gary Gilmore, asked about the old deed and the maps. He said that he finds it incredible to believe that there is no record.

Steve Stancel stated that the information that has been provided to them so far is inconclusive. He said that they have looked in the City's archives, the Engineering Department and City Clerk's Office and can't find any record of the City owning a public right-of-way.

Gary Gilmore stated that he has the deeds that says that the City owns the right-of-way. He said that he knows that the road was used and he has maps showing that road and has the old Middlebrook Farm map so he knows that road existed.

Steve Stancel stated that the road did exist as a public right-of-way at one time, however, he has seen maps that clearly show it as a private right-of-way.

Gary Gilmore stated when it was conveyed in 1968, the deed said that it did not convey the right-of-way. He said that the person conveying that deed was not conveying that road. He said that he finds it pretty outrageous that his City would be giving away property. He said that he would like to see the City addressing it and getting more aggressive on this because it is a major concern.

Steve said that it's inconclusive at this stage, but the developer will be required to address it prior to final approval.

Kevin McEneaney pointed out that the calculations for the dimensions and number of lots for the ADS subdivisions are on the plans. He said that they are well within the numbers.

Ron Cole reminded everyone that there will be no public hearing process next Tuesday night.

Mr. Pomerleau asked Ron if he could be flexible enough so that if any new development arises they would be given the opportunity to comment.

Ron Cole stated that if there were any new developments, he would open the floor. Ron explained that if the Planning Board approves the ADS concept, there will be another public hearing.

Ron Cole thanked everyone for their input and closed the workshop.