



DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
CITY OF DOVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03820

TIMOTHY C. SHELDON
DIRECTOR

TEL. (603) 742-3551

LINDA L. CLARK
CD COORDINATOR

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Board Members
FROM: Kathy Brown, PB Secretary
DATE: April 25, 1985
RE: Planning Board Minutes of April 18, 1985

Please be advised that the minutes which were originally dispersed relative to the above-referenced meeting, contained an error on page 5 with regard to the proposed minimum land area for lots within the RM-12 zone. Attached please find the corrected information.

**DOVER PLANNING BOARD
WORKSHOP SESSION
MINUTES OF MEETING**

Held: April 18, 1985
City Manager's Office
Municipal Building
Dover, NH

Members Present: Chair George Maglaras, Vice-Chair Harold Preston, Stephanie Faria, Robert Steele, R. Craig Williams, J. Andrew Galt, Pierre Bouchard.

Alternate Members Present: Robert Seaver, Otis Perry.

Other: Planning Director Timothy Sheldon, Recording Secretary Kathleen Brown.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

ITEM #1: Proposed revisions to the RM-12 zoning designation.

Mr. Sheldon reviewed his proposal for revisions to the RM-12 zone and noted that he had made one addition to his suggestions since the last meeting. He recommended that since the Board indicated a dissatisfaction with the R-12 zone simply by virtue of their denial of a petition requesting such a zone, that the single family development in the RM-12 zone should be permitted using the guidelines in the current R-20 zone. He clarified that the R-20 development regulations would be applied solely to single family use, in an effort to make this type of development less dense and more in keeping with the character of the area.

Mr. Maglaras suggested that the Board consider reviewing the current design and construction specifications for private driveways for multi-family development, as a means of controlling density. This issue was scheduled for discussion after the RM-12 zone revisions have been completed.

Mr. Sheldon noted that he has included land areas dedicated to roadways (municipal/private), utility easements/ROW'S and those areas supporting the federally designated floodplain, topographic slopes in excess of 20% and the surface area of the existing waterbodies and wetlands to be deleted from the tract's gross developable land area. He suggested that the Board discuss each

item and decide if it is suitable for inclusion in the net density calculations. Mr. Sheldon stated that the density calculations are pertinent only to multi-family development, as single family development is dictated by lot size and frontage requirements. Mr. Sheldon further explained that in multi-family development there is no spacial separation between lots, and therefore clustering of the units may be permitted given the proper dimensional requirements. He suggested that the Board may want to consider limiting development to 4-plex structures, rather than 6-plexes as permitted under the existing zoning. He also recommended that the Board consider limiting the number of flats permitted to be constructed in a project to about 20%. He noted that the 20% figure would help to eliminate any suggestions of discrimination.

The Board discussed each item presented by Mr. Sheldon individually.

SLOPES:

Mr. Sheldon noted that development on slopes in excess of 25% could be limited by amending the Conservation District to include such a provision. He suggested that this may impact some property owners heavily, while others would be virtually unimpacted. The Board discussed the standard which could be used to determine "steep slopes." Upon the recommendation of Mr. Sheldon, it was decided that 20% was the most reasonable standard and that which should be adopted by the Board. **The Board agreed to include those areas in excess of 20% slopes in the calculations used to determine the net developable land area of a property.** Mr. Sheldon reminded the Board that the proposed revisions to the RM-12 district would not preclude development on the environmentally sensitive areas, rather it would prohibit the inclusion of these areas in the density calculations. The Board raised concerns regarding the possibility of property owner cutting and/or filling the land so as to eliminate the steep slopes and thereby bypassing the proposed requirement. Mr. Sheldon suggested that a map highlighting the existing topography of the City could be developed with the help of student interns, as a means of double-checking an applicant's representation of the slopes on his/her property. In the short

term, it was suggested that the Site Review Ordinance be amended to require a developer to specify any slopes in excess of 20% on the plan presented to the Board.

UTILITY EASEMENTS/ROW'S:

Mr. Sheldon suggested that, in his opinion, the inclusion of utility easements in the listing of items used to calculate net density may be unnecessary. He explained that the land designated for utilities and roads is developable land, simply by virtue of its use. Mr. Steele stated that he would like to see the public and private roadways and utility easements be excluded from the developable land calculations. The Board discussed the advantages of each of these views and after taking an informal vote determined that **ROW'S and utility easements would be excluded from those characteristics which will be used to determine the net developable land area of a property (5-4 with Steele, Galt, Preston and Williams opposed).**

WETLANDS:

The Board unanimously agreed that the surface area of waterbodies and wetlands should be included in determining the net developable land area.

FLOODPLAIN/FLOODWAY:

Mr. Sheldon explained that the floodway is defined as the actual course of the waterway. The floodplain is that section of land which abuts the waterway and which has the potential for flooding during once every 100 years. Federal law permits construction within the floodplain as long as the owner is willing to meet all pertinent guidelines for development. Mr. Galt suggested that although the floodplain may be built on, it's area does not necessarily need to be included in the net developable land for purposes of calculating density. Mr. Maglaras suggested that the Federal guidelines which have been adopted by the City in the form of the Flood Hazard Ordinance, be used as a basis for the Board's decision. Mr. Sheldon noted that the Flood Hazard Ordinance is cross-referenced in the Subdivision Ordinance so as to aid in local enforcement of the guidelines. Mr. Sheldon

recommended that the Board include the floodway and not the floodplain in its list of items to be used in determining the net density. He noted that by not doing so, the Board may be requiring property owners to seek a variance for development of a single family home within the floodplain. Mr. Preston stated that the exact location of the floodplain may be difficult to determine and he suggested that it not be included in the calculations. **The Board agreed subtract the area of the floodway and not the area of the the floodplain, when determining net developable land for purposes of calculating density.**

DENSITY REDUCTION - RE: BEDROOM UNITS:

The Board discussed Mr. Sheldon's proposal to require each multi-family unit be supported by a minimum of 6,000 square feet of land area, plus an additional 1,000 square feet for every bedroom contained therein. Mr. Williams raised concerns that the Board is creating a zone which would be more attractive to MF development than it would be to SF development, and suggested that the Board require a minimum of 12,000 square feet, plus 1,000 square feet of net land area for each unit. Mr. Sheldon noted that the Board was dealing with two different styles of development (SF and MF), and as such was devising an appropriate method of determining density for each one. **The Board agreed with the proposal to permit density calculations based on a minimum of 6,000 square feet, with an additional of 1,000 square feet per bedroom, of net developable land area per unit.**

SINGLE FAMILY DEVELOPMENT:

The Board agreed to permit single family development in the same style as is currently permitted under the R-20 zoning designation. This would permit the development of Alternative Design Subdivisions (ADS) on lots supporting in excess of ten acres. It was suggested that the Subdivision Ordinance (specifically the section dealing with ADS) be revised so as to define steep slopes as those areas in excess of 20% slopes, rather than 15%.

DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS:

After a short discussion the Board agreed to revise the dimensional requirements of the RM-12 zone to reflect the following changes:

Lot Frontage	1-2 family: 125' 3-4 family: 150' 5-6 family: 175'
Setback Btwn. Buildings	2-4 family: setback shall be equal to the maximum height of the building group. 5-6 family: 75'
Minimum Frontyard Building Setback	2-6 family: 50'* * setback from a City street
Minimum Sideyard & Rearyard Building Setbacks	2-6 family: 10 feet per unit
Minimum Land Area	1 family dwelling - 20,000 S.F. 2 family dwelling - 20,000 S.F. 3 - 6 family dwelling - 6,000 S.F. per unit, plus 1,000 S.F. per bedroom

ITEM #2: Revisions to that section of the Site Review Ordinance relative to the design and construction of private driveways.

Mr. Sheldon clarified that the Board was considering those private drives which service more than one unit on a single lot.

After a short discussion and consideration of different methods of determining an acceptable road width for each project (ie: net density, gross density, number of units, etc.), the Board decided to use the specifications they have developed for incorporation into the Subdivision Ordinance as the two categories of construction standards. The Board also chose to use an arbitrary cutoff of 24 units to distinguish between types of development impacted by the two different categories of design standards.

DOVER PLANNING BOARD - WORKSHOP
April 18, 1985
Page 6 ...

ITEM #3: New Business

Mr. Maglaras raised concerns about the prohibition of development of single family homes off of a private drive. Mr. Sheldon noted that the City Attorney has ruled that subdivision is not permitted unless it has the proper frontage on a public ROW. He noted that this was originally adopted as a method of growth control and it has been effective in limiting untimely development. Mr. Sheldon suggested that the Board may wish to consider permitting a waiver of curbing in an R-40 zone, if proper drainage provisions are provided. Mr. Maglaras requested that the Board consider this suggestion.

The workshop session was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.