

**Dover Parks and Recreation Commission
Meeting of January 6, 2010
Minutes**

P&R Commissioners In Attendance: John Budd, Peter Davies, Rich Oasis, Scott Seidman, Nancy Simms
P&R Employees In Attendance: Jessica Cooney
Others in Attendance: Jim Kinder and Andy Waugh (Warrant Committee); Bill Seymour (Gale Associates); Joan and Roger Panek (Oakley Road residents)

Meeting was called to order at 7:35am.

Prior Meeting Minutes

There were no prior meeting minutes available for review.

Presentation of Caryl Park Reconfiguration Proposals:

Bill Seymour from Gale Associates presented several options his firm prepared on our behalf. He underscored that these options were based only on our stated goals of having 2 rectangular fields, 2 or more baseball fields, and one softball field. In all options, the existing baseball field next to the tennis courts would be converted to a softball field. Mr. Seymour discussed each of his firm's seven renditions:

Option c-1: The existing two baseball fields are re-oriented so that the "working ends" of the fields are adjacent. One rectangular field is placed between the baseball fields and the proposed softball field and tot lot. The second rectangular field is placed in back of baseball fields and would be at a higher elevation. (Both rectangular fields would be 200 ft. X 360 ft. with 12 ft. run out on all sides.) A third baseball field or rectangular field could be constructed to the east of the back rectangular field and to the south of the tot lot. Current parking capacity at Caryl is 80 spaces; this option (as do all of them) eliminates parking along the western perimeter of the park. Ninety-four spaces are available in the front lot along Dedham Street with another 60 spaces in the rear parking lot at the far end of the back rectangular field. Access to this back parking lot is via an existing utility road that is to the east of the tennis court parking lot and will be extended and improved. Highlights of this option are: the softball field and one of the baseball fields are at a great orientation with regard to the angle of the sun; the working ends of the two main baseball fields are together; and the second rectangular field is back away from Dedham Street. The orientation of the second baseball field could be changed so that it is optimally aligned, but then the working ends of the ball fields would not be together. Space for buffer plantings is maintained around the Dedham Street parking lot and in front of and on the side of the back rectangular field.

Option c-1A: The only difference between this drawing and c-1 is the eastern curb cut of the Dedham Street parking lot is moved to the west of the existing berm, closer to the center of town and the Oakley/Park neighborhood.

Option c-2: One rectangular field (230 ft. X 284 ft. with 12 ft. run out) is placed where the current baseball fields are located. One baseball field is positioned between this rectangular field and the proposed softball field. Two other baseball fields are behind the rectangular field and are oriented outfield to outfield. The second rectangular field (200 ft. X 360 ft. with 12 ft. run out) is to the east of these baseball fields and to the south of the tot lot. Somewhat in the middle of the entire complex is a space for a concession/amenities building and a picnic area. This option allows for 110 parking spaces in the front lot and another 56 spaces in the rear lot at the far end of the southern-most baseball field.

Highlights of this option are: the minimal amount of clearing required; the ability to include one rectangular field with larger, more versatile, dimensions; and the possibility of a centrally located concession/amenities building and picnic area.

Option c-3: This option has two 230 ft. X 384 ft. (with 12 ft. run out) rectangular fields placed side by side in the front of the park where the current baseball fields are located. Two baseball fields are positioned behind the rectangular fields and are oriented so that the working ends are together. Tucked in between these two sets of fields is the possibility of a concession/amenities building and a small picnic area. A third baseball field is positioned to the east of these baseball fields and to the south of the tot lot. A one half mile jogging trail encircles most of the fields. This option allows for 120 parking spaces in the front lot along Dedham Street and another 49 spaces in the rear lot at the far end of the southern-most baseball field. Highlights of this option are: the cost efficiencies associated with the side by side positioning of the turf fields; the minimal amount of clearing necessary for the two rectangular fields; the space allocation for both rectangular fields to be of larger dimensions; the jogging trail; and the possibility of a concession/amenities building and picnic area.

Option c-4: This option places the three baseball fields at the heart of the park along with one rectangular field, measuring 230 ft. X 350 ft. (with 12 ft. run out) The second rectangular field, measuring 230 ft. X 384 ft. (with 12 ft. run out) is positioned behind the group of baseball fields. A one half mile jogging trail is included in this option. There is parking for 120 vehicles in the front lot along Dedham Street with an additional 60 spaces in the rear lot at the far end of the second rectangular field. This option includes a small playground and picnic area to the east of the first rectangular field. It also includes the possibility of adding a third field to the east of the group of baseball fields and to the south of the tot lot. Highlights of this option are: the central location of the three baseball fields and one of the rectangular fields; the space allocation for both rectangular fields to be of larger dimensions; the jogging trail; the small playground and picnic area; and the option for a third smaller rectangular field.

Option c-6: This option has two rectangular fields (each measuring 230 ft. X 384 ft. with 12 ft. run out) side by side to the west and south of the current tot lot. The two existing baseball fields are left untouched. There are no changes made to the parking spaces in the front smaller parking lot, but the larger rear parking lot would become the primary parking lot and would have capacity for an additional 96 vehicles. This plan allows for buffering trees and vegetation around the rectangular fields. Highlights of this plan are: the rectangular fields are all but hidden by heavy tree and vegetation buffers; the fields closest to Dedham Street will have very little, if any, game activity in the fall which reduces noise disturbance to the Oakley/Park neighborhood; as these same fields would not be required for regular fall soccer games, they could actually be rested which would help insure healthier grass in the outfields for the Spring baseball season.; the positioning of the primary parking lot is behind the rectangular fields and away from the Oakley/Park neighborhood; the access to said parking lot is away from the Oakley/Park neighborhood; and the extensive buffering trees and vegetation.

Option c-5: This plan is the same as c-6 except that it includes reconfiguring the baseball fields. The rear baseball field is reoriented slightly and moved away from the woods to allow more sunlight on the field (which would naturally reduce the current moss problem that is caused by the excessive tree shade along the first base line). It also includes a little league sized field in the northwest corner of the existing field area. In addition to those listed above in Option c-6, the highlights of this option include the

healthier positioning of the rear baseball field and the convenient positioning of the little league baseball field.

Comments:

Bill cited Dartmouth College as an example of turf baseball fields. The only clay is at the pitcher's mound. The infield material can be modified to allow for a more deadening bounce. There is no problem with sliding on this turf material.

Joan Panek expressed concern with the access road in Option c-6. She stated that there were sight line issues with the eastern curb cut for the front parking lot. It was her opinion that it would be better to have this access to/from the parking lot positioned to the east of the current earth mound.

Mrs. Panek asked what the town's ongoing expenses for these fields would be. Mr. Seymour's opinion was that they would actually go down because the baseball field spaces would not need to be shared with other sports and would not need to be relined every two weeks or so. They also would not be used as heavily and therefore would not need the intensive maintenance currently required to keep them safe. There is minimal maintenance required for artificial turf fields – no cutting, no lining, no watering, no aerating, no fertilizing.

Additional Meeting Required: It was determined that an additional meeting date was needed to address the remaining agenda items. The meeting was set for Wednesday, January 13, 2010 at 7:30am.

Fundraising for Fields

Recap of Caryl Park Project Abutters Meeting

Field Usage Fees

Final FY2011 Operating Budget

Middle School Football Program Letter

Memorial Day Rental

Misc.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:15am.

Respectfully Submitted,
Nancy Simms, P&R Commission