

**DOVER PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES OF MEETING**

Held: June 11, 1985  
Council Chambers  
Municipal Building  
Dover, NH

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

Alternate Members Present: Otis Perry, Robert Seaver.

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

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ITEM #1: Public Hearing on the minor subdivision of land owned by Nancy Phillips Berkowitz, Assessor's Map F, Lot 3, zoned R-40, on Tolend Road.

Nancy Berkowitz explained the minor subdivision.

Mr. Steele inquired if the only access to Lot #2 is the fifty foot strip entering onto Tolend Road. Ms. Berkowitz replied that this was the case.

Public Hearing Opened - No comment.

Public Hearing Closed.

Moved by Mr. Williams, seconded by Ms. Faria to approve the application for minor subdivision, contingent upon the following conditions:

- 1) Lot 3 shall be combined with the abutting property of Forbes and shall be so referenced on the mylar.
- 2) Receipt of Driveway Permits, when necessary, will be required.
- 3) Receipt of WSPCC & City septic approval will be required.

U.A.

ITEM #2: Public Hearing on the minor subdivision of land owned

DOVER PLANNING BOARD  
June 11, 1985  
Page 2 ...

by Alice Moscarillo, (applicant Richard P. & Theresa Conway),  
Assessor's Map B, Lot 10, zoned R-40, on County Farm Road.

Theresa Conway explained the minor subdivision.

Mr. Sheldon read the report of the SRSC and noted that the plan  
was actually a resubdivision of the parcel.

Public Hearing Opened - No comment.

Public Hearing Closed.

Moved by Mr. Elder, seconded by Mr. Williams to approve the  
application for minor subdivision as submitted.

U.A.

ITEM #3: Public Hearing on the site review of land owned by  
Lawrence R. Raiche, Douglas C. Gray, Gregory Koutrelakos and  
George Gauthier d/b/a/ Wellington Investments, Assessor's Map 29,  
Lot 22, zoned O, on Central Avenue.

At the request of the applicant (Gauthier), the Chair postponed  
this item until after item #5.

ITEM #4: Public Hearing on the site review of land owned by  
Thomas and Janet DuMont, Assessor's Map 24, Lot 115B, zoned CWD  
and RM-10, on Cocheco Street.

Mr. Maglaras removed himself from his seat on the Board for this  
item, as he suggested that he may have an indirect conflict of  
interest. Mr. Seaver sat in his place.

David Joy, architect for the project, offered a brief explanation  
of the project and addressed the concerns raised by the SRSC. He  
noted that while the system for drainage of the property has not  
yet been resolved, it is a priority upon which all other comments  
are dependent upon. The recreation area will be located north of  
the building and will include picnic sites, walkways, and a  
playground. The site will be fully landscaped. The site  
distance from the property, looking towards Rogers Street, was

DOVER PLANNING BOARD

June 11, 1985

Page 3 ...

measured by Mr. Joy to be approximately 350'; the site distance looking towards the downtown area was measured to be in excess of 400'. Mr. Joy explained that both of these distances were to be determined to be well within national standards. If blasting of the site is required, the developer will conduct an inspection of the surrounding properties prior to the blasting. A lighting plan will be submitted. While the developer is willing to consider the step down of the building, Mr. Joy noted that this would impact on the accessibility of the building by the handicapped and elderly. One or two screened dumpsters will be placed on the site to handle the solid waste generated. With regard to the entry grade, the developer is willing to lower the proposed 10% grade to approximately 6%, should the Planning Board so request.

In response to a question from Mr. Bouchard, Mr. Joy stated that he did not expect to have much snow in the parking garage as most of it would be covered.

In response to a request from Mr. Seaver, Mr. Joy pointed out the proposed locations for the dumpsters.

In response to further questioning by Mr. Seaver, Mr. Joy noted that floor drains would be placed in the garage area. Mr. Joy stated that the project will require considerable engineering and that the developer has chosen to delay beginning this work until he has received some direction from the Board.

Malcolm McNeill, an attorney representing Mr. DuMont, addressed the drainage issue. He noted that the drainage problem in the area is one of long-standing and is not something caused by the developer. He stated that per a recent resolution passed by the City Council, Mr. DuMont is willing to enter into a public/private partnership with the City and is willing to prepare the necessary engineering and financial data required to do so. With regard to the project's impact on the Cocheco Street/Portland Street intersection, Mr. McNeill stated that while his client recognizes the fact that a problem may exist, the site under consideration is located in excess of .2 of a mile away. He noted that while it may be appropriate for the Planning Board to consider the site distance of the proposed driveway as one

travels along Cocheco Street, he considers it inappropriate for his client to address and/or resolve a long-standing problem not directly attributable to the project.

Mr. Sheldon read the report of the SRSC.

Public Hearing Opened.

Mr. Preston read a letter from Gail Mohrbacher, 12 Rogers Street, into the file.

Trudy McAtavey, Rogers Street, stated that she was concerned about the impact that the large scale of the building would have on the neighborhood. She also cited concerns regarding increased traffic, the lack of sidewalks in the area for safe pedestrian travel, and problems with the drainage.

In response to a question from George Maglaras, Cocheco Street, Mr. McNeill stated that the developer would be presenting a proposal to the City Council which is in keeping with the spirit of the resolution adopted on April 24, 1985 which outlined the potential for partnership between public and private development.

Mr. Maglaras stated that he was pleased to hear that the drainage problem in the area would be addressed. He noted that the existing pavement on Cocheco Street is narrow in many spots (18') and suggested that the applicant set a tone for the area by voluntarily moving his curbing back and widening the street in front of his property to 22'.

Estelle Maglaras, Cocheco Street, stated that the construction of a sewer in the area a few years prior had changed the natural flow of water in the area. To alleviate the problem of water settling on properties in the area, the City placed a temporary pipe across her property. She has requested that the City remove this pipe.

In response to a question from Mr. Elder, Mrs. Maglaras stated that the temporary drain was placed on her property approximately four years ago. She reiterated her previous statements regarding the history of the drainage problem.

DOVER PLANNING BOARD

June 11, 1985

Page 5 ...

Arthur Maglaras, Cocheco Street, stated that as a member of the City Council at the time, he was the one responsible for the placement of the temporary drain on Estelle Maglaras' property.

Public Hearing Closed.

Mr. Bouchard noted that the pipe was not placed on the Maglaras' property without permission from the owner. He stated that he is willing to repair the pipe on Cocheco Street and will remove the temporary pipe.

In response to a question from Mr. Steele, Mr. Bouchard stated that the water, prior to the installation of the temporary pipe ran to the ditch line at the side of the road.

Mr. Preston stated that water is standing in the ditch even now when the rainfall has not been great.

In response to a question from Mr. Elder, Mr. Bouchard stated that if the temporary pipe is removed from the Maglaras' property, the City will rehook-up an existing 8" pipe which had been damaged. He noted that water will probably sheet across the street and an ice problem may exist during the winter months. He further stated that the installation of drainage along Cocheco Street, from Rogers Street to Portland Street, is the only solution to the problem.

Mr. Elder stated that, in his opinion, the City has known of the problem for sometime and has not taken any action to correct it. For this reason he stated that he agreed with the statements made earlier by Mr. McNeill that the applicant should not be held responsible for these improvements.

In response to a question from Mr. Preston, Mr. Bouchard explained the location of the existing catch basin in the area.

Under unanimous consent from the Board, Tom Printy, Cocheco Street, was permitted to address the Board. Mr. Printy explained the path of water flow in the area and noted that a drain is located in the cellar of his building, and not outside, to help prevent the flooding of his property.

DOVER PLANNING BOARD

June 11, 1985

Page 6 ...

In response to a question from Mr. Galt, Mr. Bouchard explained that the ditch which is located next to Mr. Printy's property flows to a 48" box culvert which empties into the river. He noted that the placement of a ditch across the front of Mr. Printy's property would not solve the problem, as the existing ditch is too shallow to handle additional flow. Mr. Bouchard stated that he would like the Board to consider the widening of Cocheco Street and the placement of sidewalks in the area.

Mr. Steele explained the mechanics of the Tax Increment District and then responded to a number of questions from Mr. Elder. He noted that the language of the resolution adopted by the City Council did not provide any formula which may be used to determine the overall impact of a project. He stated that the Council had instead chosen to use a limit of 50% and evaluate the merits of each project. He reiterated that fact that every proposal must be approved by the City Council.

Mr. Williams suggested that the Board provide the applicant with direction relative to the other items listed by the SRSC.

Mr. Galt suggested that he request a ninety-day extension from the City Council for consideration of this proposal.

Mr. McNeill stated that his client would agree to a reasonable extension for consideration of the proposal.

Mr. Williams stated that, in his opinion, the applicant should not be responsible for the study or redesign of the Portland Street/Cocheco Street intersection.

Mr. Elder agreed with Mr. Williams and noted that the City currently has budgeted monies for a study of that intersection.

Mr. Sheldon reminded the Board that if a project is assumed to impact on any service level of infrastructure, be it sewer, water, traffic, drainage, etc, the Board has usually requested a study of the problem and the impact of the project.

Mr. Elder stated that he was unsure of the project distance from a problem area that the Board should consider when determining

DOVER PLANNING BOARD

June 11, 1985

Page 7 ...

impact. Mr. Williams concurred.

Mr. Sheldon noted that, while there is no black or white formula to determine the distance one should survey from a target area, it would not be unreasonable to consider the impact of this project on the intersection.

Mr. Preston polled the Board relative to the necessity of a traffic study of the Cocheco Street/Portland Street intersection. While the Board unanimously agreed that a study of the area is necessary, it was divided on the issue of who should bear the costs.

In response to a question from Mr. Bouchard, Mr. Steele stated that the extent of the study to be funded by the City for the intersection has yet to be determined.

Mr. Sheldon explained the technical guidelines for undertaking a traffic study and stressed that a level of service for any intersection being considered must be calculated; a traffic count alone would not provide the Board with any information on which to base a decision. He stated that should the Board decide to request the applicant to undertake the study, it would not be requesting him to undertake any of the design work.

In response to questions from Mr. Elder, Mr. Sheldon explained that while a traffic study does not specifically determine the point of origin of the traffic, certain assumptions may be made regarding the traffic generation from any given project.

Mr. Preston stated that the Board should request the ninety-day extension from the City Council and allow the applicant the opportunity to present his proposal for drainage improvements.

Mr. Elder requested that the Board make a decision on whether or not to request a traffic analysis from the developer.

In response to a question from Mr. Bouchard, Mr. Sheldon stated that the intersection at Cocheco Street and Rogers Street, while slightly less dangerous than the Portland Street intersection, was cause for concern.

Mr. Bouchard suggested that the Board, if it should decide to request a traffic study, include the Rogers Street intersection in its request.

Mr. McNeill stated that, while he believed it to be reasonable for the Board to request a traffic study of the site's immediate impact on Cocheco Street, he did not believe that it was his client's responsibility to provide the City with a study of the intersections being discussed. He noted that Mr. Joy has determined that the project intersection on Cocheco Street is well within the nationally acceptable site distances.

Mr. Galt stated that, given the assumed flow of traffic from the proposed development, it would be appropriate to request a study of the two intersections being impacted (Rogers/Cocheco Streets and Portland/Cocheco Streets).

Mr. Sheldon stated that the Board should agree to request a study of the two intersections since the project was serviced by a corridor which may be accessed only those ways.

Mr. Galt noted that the Board requested traffic counts for all access points to the Weeks Traffic Circle when considering the impact of the proposed Demoulas shopping center. He suggested that the situation being discussed could be considered in a similar fashion.

Mr. Sheldon reminded the Board that the developer need not have to pay for any improvements, but it is he who should determine the level of service. He suggested that the Board may not wish to approve the proposal if the intersection serving the site is operating at level of service F. He stated that the Board should identify improvements to the infrastructure of the Cocheco Waterfront District as a priority.

In response to a question from Mr. Perry, Mr. Sheldon stated that the developer should obtain traffic counts for the a.m. peak, the noon peak and the p.m. peak for two weekdays. Then a level of service analysis should be performed and presented.

Mr. Williams suggested that the Board postpone discussion on this

DOVER PLANNING BOARD

June 11, 1985

Page 9 ...

item until the next meeting.

Mr. Steele stated that because the proposal is for only 24 units, in his opinion the request for additional studies is not necessary.

Mr. Sheldon reiterated that fact that it is not possible to make a decision based on a traffic count alone, and that a level of service analysis would be required.

Mr. Preston stated that 48 cars (assuming two cars per unit) may not have a large impact on the area.

Mr. Bouchard stated that the City will undertake a study of the Portland Street/Cocheco Street intersection and it is the City's responsibility to make any necessary improvements. He stated concerns regarding the grade on Rogers Street.

Mr. Galt reiterated his point about the necessity of a study for the Cocheco Street/Rogers Street intersection.

Mr. Williams stated that he did not believe that a study of the intersections should be the responsibility of the developer. He noted, however, that he had concerns regarding the proposed design of the driveway for the project and suggested that it be revised.

Mr. Sheldon suggested that the Board request a study which will determine the level of service at the point that the proposed driveway enters onto Cocheco Street and at the intersection of Cocheco Street and Rogers Street. So moved by Mr. Bouchard and seconded by Ms. Faria.

Moved by Mr. Elder, seconded by Mr. Bouchard to move the question. U.A.

Vote on motion: 7-1 (Williams).

Upon the unanimous consent of the Board, Trudy McAtavey, Rogers Street, was permitted to address the Board. She suggested that traffic counts in the afternoon be undertaken as early as 3:30

DOVER PLANNING BOARD  
June 11, 1985  
Page 10 ...

p.m. because of the shift changes at the downtown businesses. Mr. Sheldon stated that the peak hours will be considered to be approximately 3:15 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Sheldon inquired if the Board wished to address this item with the developer at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Mr. Joy stated that, because his client believes the drainage situation to be paramount to all others, he would request that the remaining issues be addressed after a satisfactory solution regarding this problem is agreed upon.

Mr. Preston stated that the applicant will present the information to the City Council regarding drainage improvements and then return to the Planning Board for further review.

Mr. Sheldon requested that the applicant provide the Planning Office/Planning Board with all correspondence directed to the City Council.

Mr. Preston declared a two minute recess.

Mr. Magalaras reconvened the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

ITEM #5: Public Hearing on the site review of land owned by Dan Philbrick, Assessor's Map 25, Lot 43H, zoned B-3, on Portland Avenue.

Dan Philbrick explained the proposal.

Mr. Sheldon read the report of the SRSC.

Mr. Galt inquired as to whether or not the gravel fill for the required shoulder was permitted within the 50 foot "grace area" between the commercial and residential zones. Mr. Sheldon replied that because the fill placement was intended to promote better drainage of the area, it was permissible.

Mr. Williams suggested that although the rear area was zoned for residential uses, because of the surrounding commercial activities it is unlikely that the 10-15,000 square feet which

DOVER PLANNING BOARD

June 11, 1985

Page 11 ...

could be developed would be. Mr. Sheldon noted that although this assumption may be correct, the Planning Board may not waive the zoning requirements.

Public Hearing Opened.

George Gauthier, Hill Street, requested the location of the site. Mr. Maglaras responded.

Public Hearing Closed.

Moved by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Galt, to approve the application for site review, contingent upon the following conditions:

- 1) A waiver of the seven foot sideyard setback requirement is granted.
- 2) The shade trees as depicted on the plan shall have a minimum caliper of 2-1/2 inches.
- 3) The proposal to extend the City sewer shall be sized pursuant to the regulations outlined by the City Engineer.
- 4) The dumpster and the southernmost parking space shall not encroach into the residential zone.
- 5) A waiver of the ten foot frontyard setback requirement is granted.
- 6) All curbing depicted on the plan shall be granite.
- 7) A three foot gravel shoulder shall be placed along the southerly rear parking/loading area.
- 9) Approval of the placement of the landscape island within the City ROW is granted.
- 10) A five foot landscaped buffer shall be established along the westerly boundary line.
- 11) The easternmost entryway shall be redesigned so as to decrease the sideyard landscaped buffer to five feet and increase the entry area.

U.A.

Mr. Galt sought some assurance from the applicant that the landscaped islands will be built. Mr. Philbrick stated that he will develop the site plan as submitted.

DOVER PLANNING BOARD  
June 11, 1985  
Page 12 ...

ITEM #3 (as published on the agenda): Public Hearing on the site review of land owned by Lawrence R. Raiche, Douglas C. Gray, Gregory Koutrelakos and George Gauthier d/b/a Wellington Investments, Assessor's Map 29, Lot 22, zoned O, on Central Avenue.

Douglas Gray presented a revised plan to the Board and offered an explanation of the proposal.

In response to a question from Mr. Bouchard, Mr. Gray stated that no island was planned for the ingress/egress.

In response to a question from Mr. Galt, Mr. Joy stated that the planned entranceway is 22 feet wide.

In response to a question from Mr. Galt, Mr. Sheldon stated that all shade trees depicted on the plan will be required to be of 2-1/2 inches minimum caliper.

Public Hearing Opened.

Lovell Hindle, 4 Abbott Street, raised concerns regarding traffic in the area. He questioned the Board about sewer capacity for the project.

Father Athens, 10 Abbott Street, requested that the public be permitted to view the plans. He raised concerns about the lack of a fence between his property and the abutting developed properties.

Helen Cowburn, 766 Central Avenue, stated that she was concerned about the proposed building being located only ten feet from her lot line. She inquired if a fence would be erected between the two properties.

Mr. Gray responded to Mrs. Cowburn by noting that the side of the building will facing toward the Cowburn property. In reply to a further question from Mr. Maglaras, Mr. Gray stated that the building will be finished with a vinyl siding, probably one which gives the appearance of clapboards.

DOVER PLANNING BOARD  
June 11, 1985  
Page 13 ...

Mr. Maglaras noted that in the Office zone the required sideyard setback is ten feet.

In response to a question from Mr. Preston, Mr. Joy stated that the plan depicted an existing concrete wall running along the lot line, on the Cowburn side.

John Cowburn, Central Avenue, stated that the concrete wall is approximately 20 feet in length.

Father Athens, Abbott Street, directed a question to the Board regarding snow removal from the site. Mr. Gray responded by stating that the plan is to push the snow to the southerly edge of the property.

Public Hearing Closed.

In response to questions from Mr. Galt, Mr. Gray stated that a screened dumpster will be placed at the westernmost edge of the property for on-site solid waste disposal.

In response to further questioning by Mr. Galt, Mr. Gray stated that only one catch basin is planned for the proposed parking area. Mr. Galt stated that he was concerned that the plans for snow removal may necessitate the installation of another catch basin. Mr. Gray stated that he would be willing to install a second catch basin.

Mr. Sheldon read the report of the SRSC.

The Board decided to hold an on-site review of the property on Thursday, June 13, 1985, at 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Maglaras suggested that the Board consider the issue of requesting a traffic study for the site. Mr. Galt noted that the applicant did provide the site distances for the property in his presentation.

In response to a question from Mr. Williams, Mr. Joy stated that he had determined the site distances.

Mr. Maglaras requested that the applicant present the information regarding site distances after it has been verified by a professional engineer.

In response to a question from Mr. Galt, Mr. Sheldon stated that a wider entryway would be desirable, however by requesting this the Board would force the applicant to seek a waiver of the landscaping setback requirement.

Mr. Galt suggested that traffic attempting left-hand turns may have some difficulty. Mr. Bouchard agreed, particularly if a traffic light is installed in the area.

ITEM #6: Old Business

- 1) Review of the application for site review of the land owned by Llewellyn Bridges (applicant Kenneth E. Morin d/b/a Eagle Realty), on Charles Street.
- 2) Review of the application for a waiver of the Driveway Ordinance for the land owned by Llewellyn Bridges (applicant Kenneth e. Morin d/b/a Eage Realty), on Charles Street.

Mr. Preston removed himself from his seat on the Board, as she suggested that he may have a conflict-of-interest.

Mr. Maglaras noted that the Board held an on-site review of the property.

Mr. Sheldon read the report of the SRSC.

In response to a question from Mr. Maglaras, Mr. Bouchard stated that the remaining sewer capacity could be used on a first-come/first-served basis. He noted that should the Board decide to not grant the request for a waiver of the Driveway Ordinance, the question of sewer capacity may be moot.

Mr. Maglaras stated that he had concerns regarding the fact that this area was zoned UMUD.

Mr. Bouchard, in response to a question from Mr. Williams again noted that determination of sewer capacity for the project may

DOVER PLANNING BOARD

June 11, 1985

Page 15 ...

not be necessary, depending upon the actions of the Board.

Mr. Morin stated that his interpretation of the ordinance allows for development within the UMUD district without provisions for parking on-site.

Mr. Williams suggested that the project's density be reduced.

Mr. Sheldon explained that the 1979 recodification of the Zoning Ordinance provided that parking did not need to be provided for development within the UMUD zone for projects which did not involve new construction. He stated that the ordinance clearly was founded on the intent that new construction within the district would kick in the parking requirements. He cited a number of examples of such projects which have previously come before the Board.

Mr. Williams suggested that the residential area now being considered and which is designated UMUD may be incorrectly zoned and requested that the Board take action to assess the designation. He suggested that the Board put off action on this particular application until it has time to do so.

Mr. Galt noted that the applicant has submitted his proposal in good faith under the current zoning.

Mr. Bouchard suggested that the Board deny the request for the waiver of the Driveway Ordinance. Mr. Maglaras noted that this would require the developer to return to the Board with a revised plan.

Moved by Mr. Bouchard, seconded by Mr. Elder to deny the request for a waiver of the Driveway Ordinance.

Mr. Galt stated that he he did not wish to see a "downtown-type development" in a primarily residential area.

Vote on motion: U.A.

Mr. Sheldon suggested that the Board follow through on their action and vote to deny the application for site review in its

entirety. After this is done, he noted that the Board may then discuss the zoning if they so wish.

Mr. Williams and Mr. Bocuhard both expressed their belief that the zoning for the area is inappropriate.

Mr. Morin requested that the Board continue with the processing of the application and grant approval of the proposal contingent upon his revising the plan to meet the requirements of the current zoning.

Mr. Williams moved to deny the application for site review.

Mr. Maglaras stated that since the applicant has requested that the Board continue to process the application, they should do so.

Mr. Galt suggested that the Board may need a ninety-day extension from the City Council for consideration of this proposal.

Mr. Morin restated his request that the Board grant approval contingent upon his compliance with all ordinances. He noted that he did not wish to lose the rights he has acquired by virtue of submission of this application, given the Board's intention to rezone the area.

Mr. Maglaras stated that the Board may vote on the application at this meeting or may request the applicant to revise the plan and resubmit it to the Board.

Mr. Maglaras, in response to a question from Mr. Morin, noted that Mr. Galt will request a ninety-day extension for consideration of this proposal.

In response to a question from Mr. Williams, Mr. Maglaras stated that the Board need not take any action on the plan this evening if the developer is willing to come back with a plan for which a waiver of the Driveway Ordinance is not required. Mr. Maglaras recommended that Mr. Morin not request that the Board vote on this issue at this meeting.

Mr. Morin requested that the Board provide him with an acceptable

density for the development of this property. Mr. Maglaras noted that this would not be possible at this time.

Mr. Morin raised concerns regarding the suggestion that zoning in the area be revised.

Mr. Maglaras noted that the applicant should revise the plans to meet with the requirements of the Driveway Ordinance.

Mr. Sheldon noted that should the Board decide to change the zoning, the applicant will not be permitted to obtain a Building Permit once notice of the public hearing is posted.

Mr. Morin stated that he had not acquired any rights by virtue of this application. Mr. Sheldon noted that this was the case.

Mr. Morin again requested approval contingent upon a plan which meets the code. Mr. Maglaras stated that the Board is not able to do this.

Mr. Morin again stated that his interpretation of the code does not require parking to be provided in the UMUD zone. Mr. Sheldon reiterated the fact that this was not the case.

Mr. Bouchard noted that because the waiver of the Driveway Ordinance has been denied, there exists no plan before the Board which may be voted upon.

Mr. Sheldon stated that should the new plan be "substantially changed," a new public hearing may be required.

Mr. Maglaras suggested that the Board may deny the existing application or the applicant may choose to withdraw it.

Mr. Sheldon noted that the applicant may bring a revised plan back to the Board. If it involves significant change, a new public hearing will be scheduled.

Mr. Williams requested a workshop session to discuss the revision of the zoning in that area. The Board decided to hold a meeting on Tuesday, June 18, 1985, at 7:00 p.m.

Moved by Mr. Galt, seconded by Mr. Williams to deny the request for a waiver of the Driveway Ordinance. (This motion was proposed at this point so as to comply with parliamentary procedure.) U.A.

- 3) Review of the application for major subdivision of the land owned by George and Nancy Parsons, on Varney Road.

Mr. Sheldon stated that the applicant has not yet met with the City Engineer to review the drainage proposal.

- 4) Review of the proposed revisions to the Site Review Ordinance.

Mr. Sheldon reviewed the changes proposed to the Site Review Ordinance and noted that the revisions had been highlighted for easier review.

Mr. Bouchard stated that he has determined that charges for engineering/technical services rendered by the City should be the hourly rate of the individual involved plus 25%. The fee would only apply after the first three hours of service has been devoted to the application by City employees.

Mr. Steele suggested that the City charge 1.5 times the City's out of pocket cost, minus the original filing fee.

Moved by Mr. Elder, seconded by Ms. Faria, to move this item to the workshop session scheduled for June 18, 1985.

U.A.

ITEM #7: New Business

- 1) Single Family Development - Garrison Road

Roger Knowls, representing DCM Development, stated that a project to develop 30-40 house lots off of the Garrison Road was being planned. He noted that, although the land under consideration is zoned RM-12, the SF house lots would be approximately 20-30,000 S.F. He also noted that the developer will bear the costs of

DOVER PLANNING BOARD

June 11, 1985

Page 19 ...

constructing a City street along the fifty foot ROW which runs near the Garrison School.

2) Nash/Tamposi Project - Plaza Drive

Mike Gilfoy, from Richard P. Millette and Associates, stated that his client would be appearing before the Zoning Board of Adjustment on June 20, 1985 and requesting a special exception to make improvements within the Conservation District. He requested comments from the Board regarding the proposal.

The Board decided to hold an on-site review of the proposal on Thursday, June 13, at 5:30 p.m.

3) Approval of the minutes of the regularly scheduled meeting held on May 21, 1985.

Moved by Mr. Steele, seconded by Ms. Faria to approve the minutes as submitted.

U.A.

4) Approval of the minutes of the regularly scheduled meeting held on May 28, 1985.

Moved by Mr. Galt, seconded by Mr. Elder to approve the minutes as submitted.

U.A.

Moved by Mr. Bouchard, seconded by Mr. Elder to adjourn the meeting at 10:20 p.m.

U.A.

