A brief project introduction was given by City Planner, Bruce Woodruff. Bruce also emphasized how important public involvement is to the success of this project.

Chris Luz of Lansing Melbourne Group introduced the team and gave a brief overview of the study. He went over the purpose of the RFP that was sent out in December of 2006, and how this study builds on the previous parking report done by Rizzo Associates in 2005.

After the brief overview Chris moved into the PowerPoint presentation, discussing draft policy and best practice recommendations. His first topic was residential parking, where he recommended formalizing a program that best fits the needs of the downtown community. He said that for any such program to succeed, it must be strictly enforced. He communicated that parking should not be a barrier to development, including residential development, and the importance of low cost permit parking. He suggested allowing residents to park in off-street lots free or at low cost from 6pm until 8:30am; and also when no off-street parking garage exists within a reasonable and secure distance, to allow parking in designated on-street spaces from 8:30am until 6pm.

Next, Chris discussed the winter parking and snow emergency ban. In his evaluation he gathered information from 12 or so cities. He found that many of the cities have even/odd side winter parking bans plus snow emergency restrictions; and others allowed unrestricted on-street parking subject to emergency declarations at any time. The City of Manchester uses white strobe lights mounted to traffic signal mast arms at targeted intersections to make motorists aware of emergency parking bans.

The next topic was on-street parking management. Chris discussed how his research shows a lack of clear direction on this; half of the cities grappling with this issue were removing meters, while the other half were adding meters. He also mentioned the need for greater enforcement and the success of “bundling” techniques, that is, using a number of techniques simultaneously for greater effect. Most of the cities he researched also implemented steps to improve signage and marketing. He also pointed out the benefits and drawbacks of metering spaces.
After the parking management discussion, Bob Duval of TFMoran spoke about the parking garage site evaluations. Twelve sites were discussed and evaluated against access, location, capacity, best use, ownership, complexity, and highest use. An important factor for the first site was that it be within reasonable walking distance (approximately 1,000 feet) of most or all of the downtown core. The attached matrix shows our analysis in determining which of the 12 sites would be the most appropriate location for the City’s first parking structure. At this stage, we have narrowed the sites down to three possibilities – Orchard Street Lot, School Street Lot, and the Steam Plant Lot.

Chris ended the presentation by discussing traditional and innovative options for financing parking structures. Many communities are encouraging PPP’s (Public-Private Partnerships) as a way of encouraging private developers to include structured parking in their development plans.

At the conclusion of the PowerPoint presentation, public comments and questions were encouraged.

**Comments & Questions:**

Joe Allis, property owner on Water Street and resident of Newmarket, wondered why the City has not put the Dover Transportation Center in the top three. Bob responded by mentioning that the location was too remote to satisfy parking demand for most downtown locations. Bob said that it was also a good location for mixed use – potentially offering residential uses along river with commercial and retail in front, and the site may not yet be ready for laying out a parking structure.

Rich Schreuer, property owner on Second Street, stated that he thought the points made in our presentation were great but was concerned about parking limits for leasing on-street spaces from 8:30am to 6pm and, wanted to know if it meant that residents would lose their spots during the day and have to move into lots. Chris said this was not the intent; rather it was to make the time limits uniform across the study area.

Janet Perry, Nicole’s Hallmark, 386 Central Avenue, spoke in regards to the Orchard Street Lot. She asked if it was a possibility the garage could be expanded into the residential or elderly housing areas. She said that one problem is the lack of buildings for businesses; she wanted to know if it was possible to put retail on lower garage levels. She feels that the Orchard Street site is a possibility for building space expansion for merchants to come into the City. Chris said that mixed use was a great point, and there aren’t a lot of other large sites that the City has control over. Bob mentioned that in almost every case property owners were interested in Public Private Partnerships (PPP), and that would be considered here also; however, the Orchard Street lot has limited visibility and is therefore less attractive from a retail point of view.

Linda Hagan, Jewelry Creations, 388 Central Avenue, suggested a possible PPP with the hardware store on Washington Street. She wanted to know, out of the three potential sites, which would alleviate the problem most. Chris mentioned there is no one solution that will best address all of the issues. Linda brought up Dover lacking an event hall, and mentioned redeveloping the TDBanknorth site so that the top level is an event facility with parking underneath. Chris said that was a great idea in terms of mixed use, but it cost much more to build that top level over parking. Linda suggested that we look at all of the downtown users’ needs and try to work them all together.
Karen Weston, Janetos, 77 Main Street, asked if there was a break-even number for lease rates supporting a parking garage. Chris said that it would take raising the existing lease rates by 250% to 300% so that market lease rates alone wouldn’t do it. Chris recommended a menu of options, including special assessments, TIF payments, or leasing all spaces to a single user (significant employers) at a higher rate that they could subsidize for their employees or tenants.

Wayne Chick, Foster’s Daily Democratic, 479 Central Avenue, suggested that retail space on ground levels would be a great way to generate revenue and deserves another look. Chris mentioned that the City needs to partner with the development community. Bob said that all of the land owners we met with are interested in exploring this further.

Kevin McEnaney, McEnaney Survey Associates, asked how many garage spaces are needed. Chris replied that approximately 400 spaces are needed at the present time.

Jack Buckley asked why TD Banknorth did not make the cut. Chris answered that it was difficult to provide commercial/retail space in front and still provide enough parking to address the City’s needs. It is a better site for continued commercial development. Bob added that it was a good site for a potential PPP with the landowner.

One City resident asked why the mill hasn’t built a garage themselves? Jessica Smith, representing Winsor Brook, 100 Main Street, responded that they have over 900 employees in the downtown area. This means the mill is a major downtown asset that supports many other downtown businesses, and it would be in the best interest of everyone to work together with the mills on solving these parking issues.

Bruce Woodruff, City Planner, wrapped up the discussion and reiterated that tonight’s meeting was not the end of the process, and public input will continue to be solicited on the potential garage sites. You can either call or email him or Kristine Silva. The website may not have all the documents on it, but it will be updated by the middle of next week.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm.
### Potential Garage Sites
#### Pros and Cons Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Highest Use</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Expandability</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Orchard Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Steam Plant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. School Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Dover Trans Center</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. First Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Foster's</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Library Lot</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Riverfront Parcel</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Robbins Auto Parts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. TDBanknorth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Third Street</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Water Street</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.** Good central location, well-suited for parking use.
**B.** Very good location, difficult access, irregular shape.
**C.** Good location, small site but excellent opportunity for PPP expansion with Janeto's site.
**D.** Too remote from lower square, potential for large mixed-use redevelopment with transportation hub.
**E.** Good location but small, irregular shape; best use would include residential and commercial development.
**F.** Small site with complex layout. Best use would include retail/commercial uses on two street levels.
**G.** Too remote from upper square, poor access for high traffic volumes.
**H.** Edge of downtown core. Dense development with no room for large parking structure. Single point of access.
**I.** Small, complex site, requiring assembly of adjacent streets and other parcels. Good potential for PPP.
**J.** Small, complex site. Very good location. Good potential for PPP.
**K.** Small irregular site, remote from lower square. Good potential for PPP.
**L.** Best use is multi-story mixed-use development. Needs assembly with Water Street itself. Excellent PPP site.