

Springdale Study Committee Minutes  
September 24, 2015  
Town House Lower Level Meeting Room

**Attendees:** Eric Aborjaily, Juris Alksnitis, Nancy Kostakos, Doug Novitch, Anne Reitmayer, Matt Schmid, Doug Straus, Catherine White

**Guests:** Julie Bonenfant, Kate Cannie (WC), Joanne Connolly (COA), Giles Dilg, Maureen Dilg, Eleanor Herd, Cara Groman, Carol Lisbon, Mary McGaw, David Powers, Barbara Roth-Schechter, John Sullivan (ConCom), Tricia Terrell, Philip Trotter, Jack Walsh

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:38 PM by Catherine White.
2. **Minutes** from the September 10 meeting were approved.
3. **Final survey results** were discussed. Ms. Kostakos had assembled all data and comments into a final presentation, which included manual tabulation of combined use preferences. Many respondents did not appear to understand the question regarding combined uses. Of those respondents who did appear to understand the question (i.e. selected multiple uses in each column), the vast majority preferred combinations that included open space. The most popular combinations with open space were active recreation, followed by farming and community gardens. Guests and liaisons at the meeting concurred that the question was unclear, and suggested that even the apparently good data might be unfairly biased towards a younger population in town, and should probably not be counted as valid.
4. **Possibility of conservation-friendly development:** At the September 10 meeting, the Committee agreed that we should invest more time in further exploration of conservation-friendly development at 46 Springdale. In advance of the meeting, Mr. Aborjaily had circulated three rough site plans (attached) showing 22 units of cluster housing at the perimeter of the site, with a large portion of the site maintained as open space. Ms. White contacted the Audubon Society to see if they would be willing to do a feasibility study on the site for a conservation-friendly development similar to those discussed in their May 28 presentation. Unfortunately, they do not have the resources to assist with this at the moment. However, their response to our request did say that based on the reports and information we provided (all available at [doverma.org](http://doverma.org)), they were concerned about development causing significant degradation to the habitat quality. Mr. Alksnitis and Ms. Reitmayer pointed out that given this opinion was not based on a true feasibility study, we should not take it as gospel. Ms. White noted that there are at least five species of concern that have been observed on the site. Mr. Alksnitis noted that the property is not a sanctuary, and that he believes habitat concerns could be addressed with careful planning.
5. **Dover Housing Partnership:** Ms. White reported that she had contacted Mr. Dawley to get more detail on the Dover Housing Partnership (<http://www.doverma.org/town-government/boards-committees/housing-partnership/>), which was charged with addressing the affordable housing situation in Dover, but seems to have disbanded five plus years ago. Mr. Sullivan shared that the Partnership was interested in pursuing a particular opportunity to develop affordable housing, and stopped meeting once that opportunity was no longer viable. The Committee agreed that the 46 Springdale situation has again highlighted the need for a Dover Housing Partnership, and that we would recommend that the Partnership be resuscitated.

There was further discussion of how much of an impression the meeting our Development Subcommittee had with the Town of Lincoln had made on us. Their dedication to residential planning and conservation for 20 plus years has resulted in very positive outcomes for that community. There was strong sentiment among Committee members and guests that we need to educate our community and become equally dedicated to planning and preservation if we want to maintain the rural character of Dover that so many of us value. This would also mean resuscitating past efforts to pass cluster-housing zoning changes. Several people mentioned that developers would prefer less-impactful cluster developments if zoning bylaws were already in place.

6. **Definition of Affordable Housing:** Ms. Lisbon pointed out that we need to be more specific in our definition of affordable housing, and not leave it to individuals to try to interpret what we mean by this term. Are we referring to a particular price-point? Are we referring to owned or rental housing, or both? Is there a legal definition that we should be referencing? Also, what do we mean by senior housing? We will be sure these terms are clearly defined in our report to the Board of Selectmen.
7. **Current Status of Site:** Questions were raised as to the current status of the site. 1) Has the vernal pool been certified? Answer: yes. 2) Can townspeople access the site now that the Snyders have moved out? Answer: to be determined by the Board of Selectmen at its upcoming October meeting.
8. **Sale of House + Approximately 3 Acres:** Ms. White asked the Committee for their feelings on previous discussions around possible sale of the house and approximately three acres, with the rest of the site maintained by the town for further consideration. Mr. Novitch stated that he had concerns that the uncertainty of what might happen with the balance of the site could have an adverse impact on the sale price for the house and three acres. Mr. Alksnitis stated that those who had an interest in possible combined use need more time to develop their proposal and are not ready to vote at this time. Ms. Kostakos stated that her general feeling is that while she understands and advocates for the need to address affordable housing, she feels recommending an affordable housing development for this particular site at this moment is putting the cart before the horse. She feels that we need to educate the community more before recommending another housing development close to the center of town. Ms. Lisbon stated that she feels it is the mandate of this committee to recommend a specific use for the entire site, and that we should take as much time as is needed to come up with a thorough proposal for the site. Mr. Aborjaily and Mr. Schmid agreed that we should take more time to explore conservation-development options. The possibility of renting the property while a more thorough plan is developed was also discussed.
9. **Next Meeting:** We agreed that another meeting in the next week or two is needed. Ms. White will poll the Committee via email for availability.
10. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Kostakos