

DOVER PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING

HELD: Monday, Aug. 2, 1971
7:00 p.m.
Municipal Courtroom
Municipal Building
Dover, New Hampshire

ITEM NO. 1: ROLL CALL:

On Roll Call the following were present:
Chairman R. Normand Alie, Clerk Frank O. Estes, Mr. Donald E. Chick, Mr. Hugh C. Tuttle, Mrs. Lois Schofield.

Also attending were: Dick Lewis of WTSN, Tony Hartnett of Foster's, Norton Simes of McKenna Associates, Grant L. Davis.

ITEM NO. 2: APPROVAL OF JULY 12 MINUTES OF MEETING:

Moved by Tuttle, seconded by Mrs. Schofield, to approve as written. Unanimously adopted.

ITEM NO. 3: PUBLIC HEARING OF STANLEY A. PUFFER, SIXTH STREET, (Assessor's Lot 34-13):

After Chairman Alie opened the hearing, Mr. Norton Simes of McKenna Associates, who represented Mr. Stanwood Puffer, distributed the newest plans of the subdivision and explained these plans.

Mr. Simes stated that the land to be subdivided is 4.4 acres with Lot 1 being 17,000 sq. ft., Lot 2 being 22,000 sq. ft., Lot 3 being 33,000 sq. ft., Lot 4 being 22,500 sq. ft. (or 33,000 sq. ft. if the cul-de-sac is removed) and Lots 5 and 6 containing 22,200 and 21,350 sq. ft. respectively. All lots meet frontage requirements. On Lot 1, however, a portion of an existing foundation must be removed so that the street would set back 20 feet from the house.

The subdivision would require the construction of 700 feet of road and waterlines. The size of the roads meet Dover's requirements. The subdivision's plans also have shaded areas which indicate future right of ways. One right of way could arise from the cul-de-sac of the main road which could be removed in the future. Another right of way is proposed on the easterly side of the Puffer property.

Mr. Simes revealed the proposal of an on-site-disposal system of sewerage. He then noted that no percolation tests have been done since he wished to save money for the Puffers in case their subdivision plans are not accepted. Mr. Simes then pointed out that the Water Supply and Pollution Control Commission has given no final acceptance to him yet. He

realized the water supply's approval must come before the approval of the Planning Board.

Mr. Simes also mentioned that sufficient water hydrants would set on the land. He specified that one fire hydrant would be in the center of the subdivision.

Pointing to a topographic map, Mr. Simes spoke of a steep slope behind Lots 3 and 4. He said that Mr. Puffer intends to smooth this slope. Mr. Simes believes that this slope will stay as a natural buffer zone and that the slope will not injure the safety of homeowners on top of it.

Mr. Simes then commented in more detail about the roads, saying they will be 32 feet wide with bituminous asphalt pavement. No sidewalks will surround the roads since only five homes would need the sidewalks. However, a walkway may be necessary to reach the ball-park adjacent to the development.

Next, Mr. Simes discussed aspects of proposed drainage in the development. He noted 1) catch basins between Lots 2 and 6 to catch melted ice and rain, 2) an outlet pipe into the city land which abuts the back of the subdivision, 3) storm drainage off Sixth Street and 4) a drainage in the cul-de-sac. All the drainage will be adequate to take care of rain water. On Page 3 of the newest plans, Mr. Simes noted graphs of slopes. The graphs explained some uses of the proposed drainage.

On a special colored map, Mr. Simes emphasized the slope (as indicated on said map) of the first 400 feet of the road leading into the Puffer land.

Considering the proposed Utility Plan, Mr. Simes stressed that the present sewerage system near the Puffer land could not be utilized because a lift station would be required to service only five homes. This lift station is not economically feasible. However, Simes mentioned the possibility of a future (5 to 10 years) sewer interceptor line which may pass through the Puffer land and which could collect the sewerage.

Answering a request of Mr. Chick, Mr. Simes agreed to make a listing of the various ways in which Puffer's subdivision plans deviate from the required specifications of the City and State.

Ms. Ruth Sullivan then posed the question of the economical feasibility, etc. of this subdivision for the City. She said the City "might" place an interceptor sewer line through Puffer's land but she questioned if the sewerage would in actuality be taken care of by the City. She seemed displeased with the idea that 4 lots behind her home would have septic tank sewerage.

Mr. Stanwood Puffer requested that Mr. Simes explain modern septic tanks. Mr. Simes stated that newer septic tanks are usually tanks as large as 1,000 gallons. The tanks have baffels, other screening devices and even bacteria controls of disposal. The sewerage passes through a series of treatments (through certain gravels, etc.) and the final sewerage passes as a leach fuel which recharges the water in the soil. So, in summary, the only discharge which leaves the tank is an effluent which has a clean C-D water classification rating.

Mr. Frank Cassily stated that the road of the subdivision, which ends with the cul-de-sac, does not pass through the railroad bed which once existed on Puffer's land. Mr. Cassily had a r.o.w. through this railroad bed and he is against the actions of the developer who plowed land over this r.o.w. Mr. Cassily also felt that Puffer's plan should indicate where the existing railroad bed is. Mr. Simes pointed out that the developer's newest plans do show the existing railroad bed.

Continuing his argument, Mr. Cassily said the road of the subdivision should be redesigned to follow the railroad bed and then if the City wished to build a road along this railroad bed, the lots of the Puffer subdivision would not obstruct the course of the road.

Furthermore, Mr. Cassily felt that all the septic tanks of the subdivision (or just one large septic tank) should occupy one lot toward the back of the subdivision. Then, Dover's future north end trunk-line sewer could pass through this lot and carry the subdivision's sewerage into the new system.

Mr. Simes reasoned that Mr. Cassily's group sewerage disposal plan would fail, because single families might not buy a home knowing they must pay a company to service a large expensive septic tank.

Next, for the Planning Board's records, Mr. Simes identified the deed to the Puffer land which was sold to Forest Remick by Boston and Maine Railroad. The deed, dated May 29, 1947, is located in Book 548, Page 461 at the Strafford County Courthouse.

To clarify some of Mr. Cassily's thinking, Mr. Chick simply reiterated that it might be a feasible idea for Dover to build a road along the railroad bed which crosses Lots 5 and 6 of Puffer's land.

Mr. Richard Hayes then asked the Planning Board what the requirements were for the distance between a house and a city street. Mr. Hayes declared that his house on

Sixth Street is approximately 9 feet from the existing and proposed street leading into Puffer's land. The distance requirement being 20 feet, the Planning Board felt that Mr. Puffer should go to the Zoning Board of Adjustment to ask for a variance to build a dedicated street within 9 feet of Haye's home. The Board is asking for an opinion from the City Attorney on this matter.

Mr. Ronald Fabian, who lives on Sixth Street and abuts Mr. Puffer's land, does not see where the water of the subdivision will flow. Mr. Fabian also was not sure how he could reach his land off Sixth Street which abuts Mr. Puffer's land. (Mr. Fabian and Mr. Harold Prey own land on Sixth St. which formerly belonged to the Lord and Keenan Company). Mr. Simes told Mr. Fabian that, if he has a legal entrance to his land abutting Puffer, the developer will build a curb cut in the road and pave a slope down to Mr. Fabian's property. Mr. Fabian then feared that water would drain onto his land since the road of the Puffer subdivision will set approximately three feet above Fabian's property.

Mr. Hayes then asked which side of Mr. Puffer's roadway would contain a waterline. Mr. Simes answered that the right side of the road will contain the line.

Mrs. Lugg questioned the sewerage requirements in the Sixth Street area near her home. Mr. Chick felt the Planning Board Office could assist Mrs. Lugg in finding State sewerage requirements.

Next, Mr. Fabian returned to the issue of drainage which would flow from Puffer's land to Fabian's driveway. Mr. Simes stated that no large construction problem would arise if the Planning Board stipulated that the developer should place a catch basin or some other drainage mechanism in front of Fabian's driveway.

Mr. Fabian then reiterated a previous comment that future city sewer and other proposals have been talked about but talk will not help this subdivision if these proposals are never realized.

Mr. Simes then made another comment on the road leading into the subdivision. He said that the first 200 feet of the road could not have the 3% grade as required by the City so the developer is requesting a variance for this road.

Discussion then centered on the steep slopes which hide Mr. Puffer's land from Sixth Street. Mr. Chick asked if the developer intended to remove vegetation from these cliffs. Mr. Simes, who is recommending ways for Mr. Puffer to shape these slopes, said that some trees will practically be necessary to protect homes at the base of the hills.

Mr. Chick then asked Mr. Simes if he would present a contour map to the Board showing what he intends to do with the slopes. Mr. Simes explained that he hopes to design these cliffs so they have a 4 to 1 slope. He wants the slopes to meet requirements as a 30 or 40 foot wide buffer zone. Mr. Simes also felt that natural grass could possibly grow on the slopes rather than trees which would have uncovered roots. However, Mr. Simes asked that the Planning Board direct him in any decisions of what to do with this buffer zone - particularly behind the land of Miss Alicia Sullivan.

Miss Sullivan stated that to protect her land a law requires Mr. Puffer to place lateral support on the cliff of the buffer zone.

In relation to the discussion of the steep cliff, Mr. Puffer added that Mr. Peters requested him to remove a knoll from his (Peters') land at the top of the hill.

Miss Sullivan and Mr. John McCarthy then asked that the Planning Board Office notify them when McKenna Associates submit grading maps of the slope in the Puffer subdivision.

Mr. Simes asked the Planning Board Office to notify him of what the Board wishes him to do next about this subdivision.

Mr. Chick said he would like to see a map showing the railroad bed which set 90 feet \pm from Puffer's back property line.

Mr. Richard Hayes requested that the Planning Board Office notify him of the meeting at which the Planning Board will vote on the Puffer subdivision.

Stating their pros and cons for the subdivision, Mr. Puffer and Mr. Simes said they were for it. Mr. McCarthy said he was not against the subdivision, but Mr. Hayes claimed he was against it.

Mr. Alie then declared the public hearing closed.

ITEM NO. 4: LIMITED SUBDIVISION OF ROBERT DUVAL (Assessor's Lot I-82):

Mr. Duvall did not come to explain the subdivision so Mr. Weeks pointed out the basics of the plans and said he was in favor of the proposal.

Moved by Chick, seconded by Estes, to approve the plan. Unanimously adopted.

ITEM NO. 5: SUBDIVISION OF HUGH C. TUTTLE (Tuttle Lane):

Mr. Tuttle abstained as a board member in order to discuss this subdivision of a piece of his land which contains 70 acres. He first explained that Downes will buy the lot in the subdivision. The street of the subdivision meets City specifications. Providing that septic tank specifications meet approval, Mr. Tuttle feels that the subdivision will develop with a U-shaped street. Therefore, he may not build the temporary turn-around as proposed in the plans. Mr. Tuttle said that this winter he would plow the snow from the street but next year, if he develops the subdivision, the City could take over the street. Mr. Tuttle wished to know how the Board felt about this subdivision so that Mr. Downes, who will build as soon as possible, could proceed with preparations to build.

Next, Mr. Tuttle stated that John Sowerby had approved the proposals of the subdivision. Mr. Tuttle also mentioned that he has turned on water at the site of the subdivision. He further stated that water drains down from the center of the Downes lot. Also, he mentioned that he wanted bituminous curbs on the street. Finally, he added that he would put up a bond on the subdivision.

Mr. Chick then said that the Board must wait for contour maps and wait for comments from the Water Supply and Pollution Control Commission and also wait for a quorum (5 members not counting Mr. Tuttle) before they could act on this subdivision.

The public made no comments about the subdivision.

Mr. Chick then added that the Board can waive some of the subdivision steps since Mr. Tuttle is a member of the Board. Mr. Tuttle asked to be waived of a contour map.

The Board decided to individually visit the site of the Tuttle subdivision on their own time. They requested that the Planning Office find out from John Sowerby what the bond for this subdivision will be. Once the Board knows the price of the bond, they will schedule a special meeting to work on the Tuttle Subdivision.

Mr. Alie then declared the public hearing closed.

ITEM NO. 6:

Moved by Tuttle, seconded by Mrs. Schofield, to meet with Environmental Services, Inc. on Aug. 16, 1971 at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers. Unanimously adopted.

The Planning Board Office will notify Mr. William Malcolm, City Council, Planning Board members, the Housing Authority and other interested parties of the time and place of the meeting.

ITEMS 7 and 8:

Since the Planning Board has one more meeting in its contract with Metcalf & Eddy, the Board decided to discuss Phase II of the Comprehensive Plan with Metcalf & Eddy at its October Meeting. (To avoid confusion with the present discussions of Urban Renewal in Dover, the Board felt that discussion of Phase II should wait until October). For the meeting with Metcalf & Eddy, the City Council, general public, etc. will be notified.

ITEM 9:

Discussion of Sweeney Subdivision:

First, the Board wished the Planning Office to contact Mr. Ireland again and ask him to reply on the matter of pipes for the Sweeney Tract.

Mr. Chick then said that water drainage in the development will apparently go to the same places that it does now except on Hamnett's property where a sand bank presently diverts water. Mr. Chick mentioned that John Sowerby had contacted the State Water Supply and Pollution Control about the proposal of two catch basins near Hamnett's house which might run directly into the Henry Law sewer. The Planning Office and Mr. Chick are to seek an opinion from the State on this matter.

The Board Members felt that larger sewer pipes in the development, particularly from Nola Street to Court Street would improve sewerage. The Board considered asking the City Council to accept to pay the difference between 8" and 10" sewer pipes.

Mr. Tuttle suspects that Mt. Pleasant and the Russo farm could develop housing. The Board should consider where sewerage from this housing would go. Mr. Tuttle added that 10" sewer pipes around the Sweeney land could nearly double capacity for transporting sewerage.

Mr. Chick said he will contact the Planning Office and Engineering Office and have them find the contours of land around Sweeney and have them find how sewerage would flow in the area. Mr. Chick felt that at least the difference in cost of 8" and 10" sewer pipes in the development could be found.

Mr. Chick reiterated that deeds to lots in the Sweeney development should specify which duties the City has and which duties the owners have on the lots. Mr. Chick also restated the Chief of Police's requirements that shrubs and trees must not obstruct the entrance ways to the development.

After the Board generally discussed drainage problems on the Sweeney land, Mr. Chick said he and someone from the Planning Office would personally speak to the McLeods', Taylors and Hamnetts about the drainage complaints.

Mr. Tuttle said there must be provisions for additional water flows in the development. Mr. Chick said that extra water will not add much to the water which is already there. However, Mr. Tuttle said that when vegetation is removed during construction of the development, the silt of the land will drain with the water flow. Mr. Tuttle felt that a pond should be built on the development during construction in order to catch run-off topsoil.

ITEM 10: OLD BUSINESS:

The Board discussed applicants for Planning Director. Mr. Chick felt that all applicants should be considered on equal standards by the Recruitment Committee.

ITEM 11: NEW BUSINESS:

After the City Attorney has read Phase II of the Comprehensive Plan and also the proposed Zoning Ordinance, he will speak with the Planning Board about his letter on planning improvements in Dover.

ITEM 12: ADJOURNMENT:

Moved by Chick, seconded by Estes, to adjourn at 10 p.m. Unanimously adopted.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank O. Estes
Clerk