

DOVER PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

HELD: Monday, Feb. 6, 1967
8:00 p.m.
Horne Street School

The Public Hearing concerning the rezoning of a parcel of land identified as Lot D-2 to a B-3 District.

There were approximately 160 members of the public present.

The Public Hearing was called to order at 8:00 p.m. at the Horne Street School. Mr. Ouellette, Vice-Chairman of the Board, was appointed Acting Chairman in the absence of Chairman Sheldon.

The letter from Mr. Tamposi requesting that said parcel be rezoned was read to those present and a map describing said parcel was displayed and described.

The Planning Director stated that the letter was sent to the City Council, who referred it to the Planning Board for consideration and recommendation. He pointed out that the public meeting holds no legality but is held simply to obtain the public's comments and feelings on the proposal.

The Planning Director then read a copy of the letter sent to the residents in the area of the proposal, advising them of such.

Mayor Tuttle then introduced Mr. Tamposi, Mr. Nash and Mr. LeHoullier.

The floor was then opened to those wishing to speak on the proposal.

Mr. Charles Lewis, Whittier Street, stated that he wanted to hear more on the proposal.

Mr. Freeman J. Tucker, 10 Barry Street, asked why the proposal called for commercial zoning all the way down to the dwellings. He stated that he felt it should be further back.

Mr. Tamposi stated that they are willing to put a restrictive covenant on the property if desired.

Mr. LeHoullier explained that his firm has had previous experience in changing property from residential to commercial and displayed photos of the "before and after" of property similarly affected. He stated that they would be prepared to make certain deed restrictions.

Mr. Albert B. Midgley, Corner of Whittier and Glenwood, asked how wide the road was. It was replied that the proposal called for a 40 foot wide road.

Mr. Henry Roberge, 46 Glenwood Avenue, asked if a 40 foot wide road would allow two trailer trucks to pass each other. Mr. Chandler answered that with proper construction it would.

Mr. LeHoullier pointed out that most of the streets are paved to around 32 feet wide.

Mr. Richard E. Clark, 8 Barry Street, asked Mr. LeHoullier if it were not true that if they don't get access on Spur Road they are not interested. Mr. LeHoullier answered that without access from the Turnpike, they cannot develop.

It was brought to mind that in the picture of the proposed development, there were trees and buildings shown. It was asked if the developers intended to supply the trees. Mr. LeHoullier answered that they intended to plant trees.

Mr. LeHoullier continued that progress will be watched by the Planning Board and the public will be informed of progress. He stated that when the street is completed, under the regulations of streets, then the City will accept it and will maintain it.

Ms. Helen Donnelly, asked where other projects such as this were built. Mr. LeHoullier explained that in Nashua, similar building was performed which proved to be of great benefit to the City.

Ms. Donnelly asked what the population of Nashua was. It was answered that the population was 44,000. Mrs. Donnelly stated that Dover being 23,000 it could hardly be called similar.

Mr. Charles Walker, 12 Barry Street, stated that he wished to be recorded as against the extension of Barry Street. He stated that soon the entire area will be zoned for commercial use.

Mr. LeHoullier explained that none of this was being rezoned to B-3 and that the intention was to use it for multi-family residence. He continued that they were willing to put any covenants or deed restrictions that were desired.

It was asked if it was possible or feasible to just rezone part of the area. Mr. Tamposi stated that he had no objections.

Mr. Chandler stated that he would like to read a letter from Mrs. Griffin of Whittier Street, stating his opposition to the rezoning.

Mrs. Gardner of Barry Street questioned the type of dwelling being discussed. She asked if there was a particular reason that the housing is being stressed so much. She asked if housing was the most important and what type of housing is recommended.

Mr. LeHoullier stated that one wouldn't build \$35,000 homes in that pit.

Mr. Tamposi stated that he wished to add that in his experience he has found that homes that are abutting either a shopping area or industrial park are the first houses that sell. He gave an example.

The Planning Director stated that they would probably range from single family residences to multi-family residences.

Mr. Perron, Glenwood Avenue, asked if it had been definitely established that they will use the entrance off Glenwood Avenue as a road. He was answered in the negative.

The Planning Director stated that the primary access to the development would be the road connecting the Turnpike with Route 16.

Mr. Perron stated that as he interpreted it, in other words, Smith Well Road and Barry Street would be thoroughfare business. The Planning Director stated that this was not the request of the developers.

Mr. LeHoullier stated that he wished to reiterate that he wished to make it clear that the connecting of Barry Street Extension as proposed through the existing Barry Street is not the thing that interests Tamposi. It was only a suggestion.

Mrs. Butterfield of Barry Street stated that she and most of her neighbors had bought their property because it was a dead end and of the entire proposal, this was the only complaint — not to extend Barry Street.

Mr. Jerry Daley, Barry Street, stated his opposition to an extension of Barry Street.

It was asked if such a development would depreciate the value of existing homes and property. Mr. Tamposi showed photographs of similar developments where the value of homes was appreciated and not depreciated by such development.

Mr. Thomas McDonald, 57 Glenwood Avenue, wished to go on record as being in opposition to any access from Glenwood Avenue to Central Avenue. He made it clear that he wasn't against the proposed development if access were gained from Spur Road or Connector Road.

It was asked if there was any third alternative to get onto this area. The Planning Director replied that there was none readily apparent.

Mr. Paul M. Phipps, Glenwood Avenue, stated that he was definitely opposed to any increased traffic on Glenwood Avenue.

The possibility of another access to the development was discussed. The possibility of protective covenants was discussed. Mr. LeHoullier answered that they would be pleased to discuss the possibility with property owners in the area.

Mr. John Gintautas, 70 Glenwood Avenue, stated that he felt such proposed rezoning would develop into spot zoning.

Mrs. Gardner expressed the wish to hear a little more on the proposed apartments.

Mr. Tamposi answered that these would be garden type apartments -- a minimum of 12 apartments. Mr. LeHoullier added that it would be in the vicinity of 50 units.

Mr. Raymond Chase, Glenwood Avenue, stated his concern for the increasing amount of traffic in the area.

After discussions on traffic in the area, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wallace I. Akerman
Secretary

WIA:c