



CITY OF DOVER

**COCHECHO WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY
COMMITTEE - MINUTES**

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting
Meeting Location: McConnell Center Room 305, 61 Locust Street, Dover, NH
Meeting Date: **Tuesday, September 30, 2014**
Meeting Time: **5:30 pm**

PRESENT: Jack Mettee (Chair), Frank Torr, Kim Schuman, Sean Fitzgerald, Jim Schulte, Jack Buckley, Dana Lynch, Brian Gottlob

EXOFFICIO MEMBERS: Allan Krans, Mayor Karen Weston, Michael Joyal

STAFF: Steve Bird-City Planner, Dan Barufaldi-Economic Development, Gary Bannon – Recreation, Chris Parker – Planning Director

OTHERS: Councilor Tony McManus, Councilor Dorothea Hooper, Councilor Catherine Cheney, Councilor Jason Gagnon, Tom Fargo, Beth Fischer, Ray Bardwell, David Akridge, Art Guadano, Norm Fracassa, Brian Mehr, Chad Kageleiry, others.

1. Meeting was called to order at 5:35 pm.

2. Minutes of August 19, 2014 and September 8, 2014

Motion: Torr made the motion to approve the minutes of 8/19/14, Fitzgerald seconded. Vote: Unanimous.

Schuman noted that she was listed twice under members present. **Motion:** Lynch made the motion to approve the minutes of 9/8/14, Buckley seconded. Vote: Unanimous.

3. Citizens Forum

Mettee asked if any citizens would like to make any comments.

Ray Bardwell of Spur Road: I am glad to see the waterfront come back for discussion. It needs a master plan. The City needs to decide what infrastructure it wants to put in place. Dividing up the lot makes sense. We need to take our time, which will let the private development move forward. We can take a breather and wait for the economy to improve.

4. Changes to the Agenda

Mettee: I want to add an agenda item 7-C so we can discuss the RFQ for the marking analysis.

5. Correspondence

Mettee: I have received a letter from Councilor McManus that refers to a letter that he wrote on 11/7/06 that is very timely. The letter encourages more mixed development and says we should go back to the original design. The letter will be placed on file.

6. Old Business

None

7. New Business

A. Review and Discussion on Input Received at the Public Forum

Mettee: Staff has gone through the comments received at the public forum and developed a list of the common themes. Let's look over the list and see if it is accurate.

Lynch: Benefitting taxpayers has been the theme from day one. Items 2 and 3 go hand in hand and could be combined. The public park with access to the water has been there from the start.

Schulte: Is this a road map or is it simply a recap from the meeting?

Mettee: It will help to inform us throughout the process.

Gottlob: It is good to see support for the market feasibility study in there. The study should include a reference to the developer agreements.

Weston: The LDA doesn't control anymore.

Joyal: It is good to see that the public reinforced the 2005 charrette and the design guidelines.

B. Discussion on Development of Action Plan For Next Steps

Mettee: I have worked with staff to prepare an action plan or work plan that lays out the steps that need to be taken. The TIF document will be prepared by staff. The plan lays out the CWDAC meeting schedule, with the next meeting being 10/20/14.

Fitzgerald: Did Dickinson provide estimates of infrastructure and costs?

Mettee: There were costs developed for the park and seawall.

Schulte: There needs to be a master plan for what is going to happen. With more than one developer, there will be costs that we need to make sure the City Council will back the expenditures. We need to know the level of support from the City Council.

Mettee: That is a good point. The master plan is the end task. There will be costs associated with overseeing the development.

Schulte: Are we putting the cart before the horse? Will the City Council support the spending if we haven't finished a plan?

Joyal: While no formal votes have been taken, the City Council has supported the marking study RFP. The TIF has been discussed and the City Council urged that the work get started on the TIF.

Weston: I agree that there is support for the market study and TIF. Who's umbrella will this work be done under – DHA or DIBIDA? Maybe a blending of both. We need to have an open discussion. It should not affect CWDAC moving forward. Council wants to see the waterfront developed.

Lynch: Looking at the RFQ list of existing information can be combined with the work in task 3 for base plan. We need to get the market analysis done early on so we can use it to develop the concept plan to show infrastructure, public land and the shoreland.

Mettee: The City Council will have to approve funding for the study. We can work on the developer RFP while the market analysis is completed.

Schulte: We need to shift task 12 down the list.

Parker: If CWDAC is okay with the RFQ tonight, it could be sent out tomorrow.

Buckley: Would the Chair entertain a question from the audience?

Mettee: I am okay with that.

Chad Kageleiry: The market analysis needs to be done to inform changes to the plan. There is no way to determine feasibility of the site until the master plan is complete. You need to have an idea of what can be built before you go out for a market analysis. You should take more time to understand the plan.

Mettee: The 20005 charrette plan is not the controlling plan. We are not going to create a plan that the market won't support.

Bardwell: Put out a market analysis with very little restrictions on it and let the study tell you what will work.

Mettee: This is a flexible work plan that can change as needed.

C. Market Feasibility Study RFQ

Mettee reviewed the RFQ tasks in the document.

Torr: I don't want to use the latest Dickinson plan in the RFQ.

Joyal: I think we use the charrette plan and the first Dickinson concept plan.

Lynch: We should add review of site constraint map as a task under #1.

Torr: How do you integrate the idea of removing the bluff?

Mettee: I think you include that idea.

The consensus was to not include the first Dickinson plan in the RFQ but indicate that it is available.

Schulte: Would high tech businesses be allowed on the site?

Mettee: Yes they would.

Joyal: Would the committee agree that industry is not desired?

The consensus was that industry would not be allowed except for high tech uses.

Schulte: The TIF should include adjacent land and parcels across the river.

Mettee: Should the document be more specific about development incentives?

Parker: We wanted to be more general.

Barufaldi: There are a number of incentives such as ERZ and TIF and various state programs.

Mettee: Do we need to add various scenarios about how big the park will be?

Parker: We wanted to let the study tell use what will work and have the community say what will work in terms of public land.

Kageleiry: When you get the RFP back, is that what will be sent out to find a developer?

Mettee: We can make some adjustments to make it realistic. That is why we need to add some direction in terms of the amount of park.

Gottlob: There will be an expectation that the public will have a park to enjoy, especially if the City is participating financially.

Weston: We should add that the trail connection is required but don't specify the percent of park.

Lynch: A placekeeper for public access is found in the charrette. The scope can be framed by the findings of the study. There is a balance. We never specified a width of the green space.

Mettee: This is a very important issue. There needs to be a signal that public green space is expected.

Beth Fischer: The topic of public access to the river is important. You need to include public access to the river for boats. You should leave some forest areas on the site.

Councilor Cheney: There needs to be a complete feasibility study to look at the long term. It should not include any plans from before.

Art Guadano: You should set very few restrictions in the study. There needs to be lots of types of public space.

Mettee: Minutes should reflect the addition of the constraints map.

Parker: We can add examples of improvements in the task.

Schulte: In the common themes document, should we add in access to the water in bullet 6?

Lynch: I am fine with adding it or just noting it somewhere.

Mettee: We can amend the list to add public access to water.

Schulte: It is a timing issue. We have been at it for 30 years. We need action from the City Council.

Joyal: Three things are happening. The RFQ for the market analysis will require the City Council to award the bid and find funding. The TIF District is in the works. The City Council is discussing who will oversee the CWDAC.

Mettee: Are we just blowing smoke if the City Council decides to do away with CWDAC?

Joyal: The discussion is not about CWDAC being disbanded. The debate is about where it should be attached to put the development in the best position to succeed.

8. Adjournment

Torr made a motion to adjourn at 7:18 PM, Lynch seconded the motion. Vote: Unanimous.

DRAFT