

DOVER PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES OF MEETING

Meeting held: December 16, 1986 in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building in Dover, New Hampshire.

Members present: Harold Preston-Chairman, Thomas Scharff, Otis Perry, Pierre Bouchard, H. Les Elder, Patricia Torr.

Alternates present: Michael McDonnell, Joseph Etelman, Jack Kepics.

Also Present: Bill Collins-Planning Director, Berrie Donovan-Recording Secretary.

Mr. Preston reconvened the meeting at 7:10 P.M. and explained the procedures for the evening. He explained that the last meeting had been recessed therefore this one is to be reconvened.

**Discussion on the Haggemiller proposal (Aspin Ridge) on Longhill Road.**

Malcolm McNeill, Attorney representing the developers, explained that he had mailed letters to abutters notifying them of this meeting, as well as to Chris Calivas, attorney representing an abutter. He noted that there are two concerns to resolve: 1) will this subdivision adversely affect offsite properties, and 2) is the design of the septic systems on site going to contaminate the wells. He noted that the developers have an agreement with Mr. Byrnes to purchase the land in the Sixth Street/Longhill Road area to redesign that intersection. He presented a plan indicating well sites and septic locations noting that the distances between the septic systems and the wells has been increased. Attorney McNeill further stated that two geologists are present for this meeting to discuss the hydrogeologic report, and that the engineer for the project, Ray Shea is also present.

Mr. Jaworski of Jaworski Geotech who prepared the hydrogeologic report, explained his background and the manner in which the report was presented. He explained that he received data from Holden Engineering which he used to determine the impact of the septic systems on the groundwater quality to abutters as well as to those systems within the proposed development. He noted that he made use of available data; seasonal high water table as well as info from the test pits. He noted that approximately 25% will infiltrate and 75% would be drainage, that the drainage will move away, rather

than toward the abutters. Mr. Jaworski presented a plan showing land contours and compared it with the plan showing wells and septic systems. He noted that there is no bedrock data and he could not answer whether the wells would be contaminated. He further noted that he would be concerned with how fractured the bedrock is and noted that any wells would have to be sealed. He noted that bedrock can be drilled for evaluation, and water flushed through at the time of installation of the well to determine the effectiveness of the seal.

Mr. Scharff stated that the bottom line is that no conclusion can be made on the basis of available information.

Mr. Jaworski stated that he would not go so far as to say that drinking water would be safe, and that he would make sure the wells were correctly installed. He noted that a computer modeling of the site with input of the septic system at each point the water is entering and leaving the site, and the full characteristics of the soil and bedrock would be necessary to justify the modeling. He noted that conservative assumptions indicate the plan is okay and that this project does not warrant a computer modeling which he has done for shopping centers, hospitals, etc. He noted that wells should be sunk deeper to draw from less contaminated water.

Mr. Bouchard asked if all wells would be contaminated if one is, to which Mr. Jaworski responded they would not. The State calls for a 75 foot radius around the fractured zone.

Mr. Bouchard asked Mr. J. [unclear] subdivision such as this has not, but deals more

Mr. Bouchard asked Mr. J. [unclear] would be no contamination could not.

Mr. McNeill asked Mr. J. [unclear] Jaworski has discussed the explained that wells in 300 feet (Haggenmiller)

Mr. Bouchard asked Mr. M. [unclear] proposed development to know.

*PROVAN -  
+  
LORBER  
LONDONER? ?  
1-746-3220*

the  
involved with a  
ed that he  
als, etc.  
e that there  
ided that he  
lined that Mr.  
asures. He  
at depths of  
ls are to the  
at he did not

The second geologist, Terry Lorber, gave a brief description of his

background and noted that he was asked to review the Jaworski report in terms of hydrogeologic impact. He stated that he concurred with the report and that this is a low density project with regard to water and septic. He indicated that specification would be necessary with regard to grouting and placing the well below fractures. He noted that the someone should make sure the well contractor can perform to specs and that someone should inspect each individual well as the work goes on. He noted that there is no unusual risk in this project as long as the proper precautions are observed.

Mr. McDonnell inquired as to what safety precautions are taken after the well is grouted, to which Mr. Lorber answered that pressure tests should be administered.

Mr. Collins inquired as to how this type of well construction is policed to which Mr. McNeill responded that it could be a condition of approval that a licensed engineer be consulted.

Mr. O. Perry asked how much the extra care will add to the cost of the well, to which Mr. Lorber responded about \$1,000.

Mr. McNeill explained that the developers have agreed to all the offsite improvements, all State approvals have been obtained, an agreement has been reached on the intersection and a hydrologist's report has been provided. He noted that there is no contradictory evidence that these systems may fail. He asked the Board to take a vote this evening based on evidence, and, if voting "no", to give the reason.

Mr. Bouchard asked if the experts would be willing to put in writing that contamination of the wells is remote.

Mr. Lorber stated that he would, as long as he is involved in the specifications of the wells.

Mr. Jaworski stated that well contamination is not probable if the wells are grouted and properly installed.

Mr. Preston noted that on the basis of the map showing the location of the septic systems and wells, 10 leachfields sit on lots with no test pit data.

Ray Shea, engineer from Holden Engineering representing the developers, explained that as a result of the Jaworski report, some of the wells were moved to be upgradient, but the State had approved the original plan before the changes.

Mr. Preston stated that it is very rare to find Charlton soil near high groundwater and asked Mr. Shea if the remaining ten lots without test pits would perc. Mr. Shea stated that he felt confident that they would.

Mr. Preston asked if most beds would be raised to which Mr. Shea responded that they would.

Mr. Collins stated that the specs for the wells should be written tonite if the voting is to take place tonite.

Mr. Scharff asked whether this could be done if the specs are to be on a site by site basis, to which Mr. Collins replied that the specs should be outlined tonite in general terms.

Mr. Preston noted concern over the sealing of the wells.

Mr. O. Perry noted that he has more concern with the enforcement mechanism, that a fund should be set aside for pay or perhaps bonding should be considered. He further noted that he is opposed to approval of this project as it is a premature subdivision.

Mr. McNeill agreed that the specs should be a condition of approval, and that the wells could be certified by an engineer before a certificate of occupancy is obtained by the individual homeowner.

Mr. Collins noted that a homeowner's association could help take some of the burden off the City, and that with the changes in staff at City Hall, a homeowner's association would be safer.

Mr. McNeill noted that each prospective purchaser would then report to the homeowner's association, and the homeowner's association would in turn report to the Building Inspector the specifications on the well.

Mr. Shea noted that the State has safeguards and the applicant must show what is in the surrounding area.

Mr. O. Perry noted a concern with the widening of the road.

Discussion followed on the rotation of the alternates with regard to sitting on the Board. Mr. Preston stated that Mr. McDonnell and Mr. Kepics would sit on the Board in the place of George Maglaras and Nancy Sousane.

Mr. Preston declared a five-minute recess during which the developers would come up with the specs for the wells and the Board would formulate a motion.

Meeting called to order by Mr. Preston.

Mr. Scharff motioned to approve the application for major subdivision subject to the following:

1. That the homeowner's association rules state that the Building Inspector be notified of the intent to drill according to the specifications following.

2. That water supply wells be located downgradient (Secretary's note: the wording reflects the motion as set forth despite the intent to have wells upgradient) from the septic systems and shall be installed by an experienced well driller in accordance with the following:

- a. That these be bedrock wells;
- b. That they be cased from ground surface to below the surficial fracture zone of the bedrock which shall be determined by testing.
- c. That the casing shall be sealed by cement igneite grout; after grouting the seal shall be pressure tested;
- d. That the well yield a minimum supply of two (2) gallons per minute;
- e. Well installation shall be continuously inspected during installation by professional engineer or hydrologist experienced in well drilling techniques, or his or her representative. A certificate of compliance with the specifications will be provided by that inspector to the City prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy

3. That all the conditions of the Site Review Screening Committee (Technical Review Committee) will be met:

- a. That the homeowner's association will maintain the open portions of the drainage system;
- b. That construction plans of the relocation of Longhill Road intersection be submitted for approval and be constructed to satisfaction;
- c. That Longhill Road be widened to a minimum of 24 feet from the intersection of Sixth Street to a point approximately 2,500 feet from that intersection;
- d. That all homes in the subdivision be sprinklered.

Mr. Elder seconded the motion for discussion.

Discussion followed on whether two gallons a minute would be sufficient in light of the fact that a sprinkler system is involved and concern was expressed as to whether there is actually enough water in the area for this many wells.

Mr. Jaworski stated that no studies have been done on the water supply.

Vote on motion: 1-6, motion denied  
Scharff for  
O. Perry, Bouchard, Elder, Torr, Kepics, McDonnell  
against

Mr. McNeill requested the reasons for denial from the Board.

Mr. Preston declared a five-minute recess.

Mr. Preston called the meeting to order and the Board listed the following as reasons for denial:

1. There was no evidence of compatibility between the two gallon per minute requirement and the fact that the houses must be sprinklered.
2. Sealed wells disallow a recharge area.
3. There is no information on the water yield for wells.
4. The types of bedrock are unknown.
5. Mr. Jaworski could not determine whether the septic systems could contaminate the wells on the basis of information presented.
6. How does a sprinkler system work in the event of loss of electricity?
7. City water could be brought out...this project is premature; concern with health issue and contamination of the wells is paramount.
8. Concern with enforcement of engineering of well installation; there are areas of Dover to be developed that do have City water.
9. A quote from Jaworski that his study was "a simple analysis with conservative assumptions."
10. Too short a period of time to review the hydrogeologic report.

Mr. O. Perry motioned to adjourn the meeting; Mr. Scharff seconded.  
Vote: U/A to adjourn the meeting

Mr. Preston opened the workshop.

Mr. Collins passed out copies of the proposed zoning amendments and requested that each member of the Board review them.

Mr. Preston noted that condos should be considered in our Subdivision Regulations as they are currently stipulated and according to State law.

Mr. Collins noted that this would be placed in the policy manual.

Mr. O. Perry noted that a new set of guidelines should be established for condos in the Subdivision Regulations.

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 P.M.