

**DURHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 2002 – 7:00 P.M.
DURHAM TOWN HALL – TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dave Pease, Chair; Suzanne Loder; Annmarie Harris, Town Council Representative; Neil Wylie; David W. Watt; Rachel Rouillard, Vice Chair; Tracey Wood, Alternate; Julian Smith, Alternate (arrived at 7:10 PM)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Arthur Grant, Alternate Town Council Representative; Amanda Merrill and David Watt

OTHERS PRESENT: Jim Campbell, Town Planner; Interested Members of the Public

Chair Pease called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

I. Approval of Agenda

Jim Campbell noted that approval of the June 12, 2002 minutes were not listed on the agenda.

Neil Wylie MOVED to approve the agenda as amended to include review of the June 12, 2002 meeting minutes and to commence Item X “Approval of Minutes” no later than 9:30 PM. Suzanne Loder SECONDED the motion and it PASSED unanimously.

Chair Pease said Julian Smith would be voting until David Watt arrived.

II. Report of the Planner

Jim Campbell reported that:

- He would be on vacation from July 26 through August 5.
- An announcement was placed in the Planning Board packets from the EPA regarding a Smart Growth slide show. If the Board was interested in this presentation, arrangements would be made to place it on a future agenda.
- On September 24, 2002, the Planning Board will meet with other college towns at the State Planning Office.
- On Tuesday, July 30, 2002, at 7:00 PM in Council Chambers, the New Hampshire DOT will hold a public information meeting regarding the four-foot bike paths going in on Route 108, between Bagdad and Canney Roads.
- A draft status report of the Durham Land Protection Working Group and Funding Task Force was placed in the Planning Board packets.
- An application was received from Doucet Survey for the Gonet property. Part of the property would go to the Nature Conservancy. The house will remain in the Gonet’s

possession. The neighbor went before the ZBA for a variance because the lot is undersized. The granting of that boundary line adjustment would be part of the subdivision.

- On August 14, 2002, the Planning Board will conduct a Public Hearing on the new Oyster River High School maintenance facility. Also, on August 28, 2002, the Planning Board will conduct a Public Hearing on the ORHS renovation plans.
- A copy of the manual "Innovative Storm Water Treatment Technologies and Stress Management Practices" dated May 2002 is available for anyone interested in viewing it.
- A copy of the Open Space Report, prepared by Intern Todd Burns, was provided to the Planning Board. Comments and input would be appreciated.
- Tentative date for Mark Ireman to attend the Zoning Rewrite Committee meeting is August 7, 2002, with a secondary date of August 21, 2002.

III. Public Hearing to amend the Durham Zoning Ordinance Article IV, Sections 175-29(C)(20), 175-30(D)(9) and 175-31(C)(18) to remove the language "prohibiting the sale of alcoholic beverages within 200 feet of an establishment that sells alcoholic beverages or 250 feet of a place of worship."

Suzanne Loder MOVED to open the Public Hearing. Neil Wylie SECONDED the motion and it PASSED unanimously.

Neil Wylie noted for the record that there were no members of the public present to speak either in favor or against the motion. Chair Pease wondered if that was because the public was not interested, or because the public was not aware of the issue.

Annmarie Harris felt the lack of public presence might be because of the time of year, which is the height of vacation season. She said this was an issue the public might be inclined to comment on if it were a different time of year. She suggested keeping the public hearing open for one additional meeting.

Chair Pease said in accordance with Section 175-5 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Board was required to return a recommendation to the Town Council within sixty (60) days of an item being referred to the Board.

Julian Smith said the Citizens Exchange, in its e-mails, has mentioned that there is a move to make changes to the Zoning Ordinance on this issue. He said there are a number of people in the community who are aware of this proposed change. He asked what more the Board should do to inform the community.

Jim Campbell indicated that the proposed ordinance would go through a First Reading and Public Hearing process at the Town Council level, at which time the public would be notified and have an opportunity to speak on this matter.

Julian Smith said his desire would be that the proposed language in the Zoning Ordinance be removed in time. He did not believe anything could become worse in Durham by businesses selling alcohol next door to one another.

Neil Wylie MOVED to close the Public Hearing. Tracey Wood SECONDED the motion and it PASSED unanimously.

The Board continued its deliberation on this item.

Neil Wylie said there were legal opinions that do not encourage the Board to maintain its stance. The Liquor Commission has asserted that it is willing to consider some changes to its procedures to allow Towns to have a greater voice. He said that would be best pursued by the Town Council. He felt the Planning Board should support the Council's recommendation to remove the language from the ordinance prohibiting establishments to sell liquor within 200 feet of a church or within 200 feet of another establishment selling liquor.

Annmarie Harris said she had misgivings about the proposed language change. She was undecided at this time about her concerns and was anxious to hear more from the public before making up her mind.

Rachel Rouillard felt if the Town was pre-empted by the State on this matter, then it did not have any authority. Therefore, she would support recommending to the Council removal of the proposed language from the Zoning Ordinance.

Suzanne Loder said she hoped the State would be more forthcoming with regard to what is reasonable in cases such as this and ask for more input from the Town regarding the choices or the decisions it makes. However, she said it did not make sense for the Town to have this language in its ordinance if the State is the body that makes that judgment.

Tracey Wood said she would prefer to see some other language constructed instead of completely removing the language from the Ordinance.

Julian Smith felt two things were wrong with the ordinance as currently written. First, the spacial limitations are arbitrary. Secondly, he pointed out that most church-goers attend church when bars are not in operation. However, he said if the Town needed language regulating the sale of alcohol, particularly on-premises, it should have it in the ordinance but it should be more reasonable and rational than what currently exists.

Jim Campbell spoke about what the Town might do if the language was removed. He said in place of the provisions in the ordinance, possibly an administrative application process would be established. This process would entail the different departments working with the Town Administrator and the Liquor Commission. Each application would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis using objective criteria. Therefore, the Town would have a voice on every application submitted to the Liquor Commission.

Rachel Rouillard questioned the type of administrative provision the Town could have versus the State in order to allow an applicant to apply for a liquor license. She asked if the State would have to change its regulations to allow town's to solicit information. Jim Campbell said the State already does that now. He said currently, the State does not issue a license without checking with the Town.

Rachel Rouillard said if the Town does not have jurisdiction to begin with, she wondered what right the Town had to demand information from an applicant for a liquor license. Jim

Campbell said the Town would not demand it from the applicant and that it is the Liquor Commission who is calling the Town, not the applicant.

Tracey Wood added that the Town also has a say on reissuance of liquor licenses. She asked how often reissuances occur. Jim Campbell explained that when stores change ownership, the liquor license goes with the owner. New owners have to reapply for a liquor license.

Neil Wylie referred to the draft regulation entitled "Ordinance Change for Regulating the Sale of Liquor in the Town of Durham" dated May 10, 1999. He asked if that was what Jim Campbell was referring to. Jim Campbell replied that what had been discussed between the Town Administrator and Department Heads was different from the draft regulation noted by Neil Wylie. He said former Town Planner, Duane Hyde, had crafted the regulation. He explained the process outlined in the regulation entailed that any application for an assembly permit through the Fire Department would trigger a Town Council Public Hearing on the liquor license application. The Council would then forward its comments to the Liquor Commission.

Chair Pease felt the Board should do something rather quickly regarding amendment of the Zoning Ordinance. He said the Town is currently in an awkward situation where it has a business with a new liquor license from the State, which is in violation of the Zoning Ordinance. He said the Town's enforcement staff needs to know whether or not to enforce the ordinance and are not certain about the outcome of any enforcement action taken. He felt guidance from the Planning Board and Town Council would help that uncertainty.

Neil Wylie MOVED that the Chair of the Planning Board submit a letter to the Town Council indicating that the proposed Zoning Ordinance language change the Council provided to the Planning Board appears to be satisfactory and that the Planning Board received no comments either for or against the proposed language change during its Public Hearing. The motion was SECONDED by Suzanne Loder and PASSED unanimously.

- IV. Continued Public Hearing on an Application for Subdivision** submitted by McEneaney Survey Associates, Inc., Dover, New Hampshire, on behalf of the Estate of Isabelle D. Sawyer, Durham, New Hampshire to subdivide a 39.37 lot into 3-acre "pork chop" lots in accordance with Article IV, Section 175-33 of the Durham Zoning Ordinance. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 11, Lot 34-1, is located on Durham Point Road, and is in the Residence C Zoning District.

Suzanne Loder MOVED to reopen the continued public hearing. Annmarie Harris SECONDED the motion and it PASSED unanimously.

Chair Pease indicated the reason the Planning Board continued the public hearing was to hear comments from the Conservation Commission.

Jim Campbell informed the Board it would hear from the Conservation Commission in the form of the correspondence received in the Planning Board packets.

Chair Pease asked for public comments. There were no comments from the public on this application.

Chair Pease read into the record an e-mail dated Monday, July 22, 2002 from Shawn Smith, estate representative to the Isabelle Sawyer Estate, in response to the e-mail from Lee Alexander dated July 17, 2002. The pertinent point of Lee Alexander's e-mail was to suggest the establishment of a "no cut zone" on Pine Point, which was also the consensus of the Durham Conservation Commission. (A copy of the July 22, 2002 e-mail is attached to this set of minutes). Chair Pease read into the record Lee Alexander's response dated July 23, 2002 to Shawn Smith's e-mail (a copy of which is attached to this set of minutes).

Annmarie Harris asked if the exclusion of Pine Point from such a large parcel of land would reduce its value. Shawn Smith responded that in concept it would not because it does not hinder the site where the house would go, which is really where the value exists. However, in reality, when a buyer hears there is one more encumbrance that would need to be dealt with, based on the terms that would go with the deed restriction, it would be difficult to predict what that may do to a potential buyer's interest. She agreed with Jack Herbert, executor of the Sawyer estate, that it does add risk to generating a State appraised value and it would not be in Mr. Herbert's best fiduciary interest to allow that.

Annmarie Harris asked if some number could be offered to the Conservation Commission to buy a conservation easement on that portion of the land. Shawn Smith replied that the potential for such an offer was feasible. However, she said the problem currently was that the preparation and execution of a conservation easement would be very lengthy and was not a process that the parties could enter into at this point.

Annmarie Harris asked if the selling agent would consider, when selling the property, an arrangement that would include consideration of a conservation easement. Shawn Smith replied that the potential to preserve the Sawyer Estate, Pine Point in particular, did exist. She said it was a matter of finding the right person to buy the property.

Jim Campbell asked when the state taxes were due. Shawn Smith responded the estate had filed an extension on the taxes in April.

Chair Pease asked Kevin McEneaney if there had been any changes in the plans. Mr. McEneaney said he walked the site that morning with Peter Hammen, NHDES inspector, who inspected the soils and reviewed everything regarding the process. Mr. Hammen did not have any problems and indicated to Mr. McEneaney that approval would be forthcoming within a week.

Chair Pease asked if there were members of the public who wished to speak on this matter. No members from the public spoke.

Neil Wylie MOVED to close the continued public hearing. Suzanne Loder SECONDED the motion and it PASSED unanimously.

Neil Wylie asked if the Board had ever adopted the draft Statement of Intent regarding the use of Section 4.04 in the Planning Board's Subdivision Regulations. Jim Campbell said it

had not been officially adopted. However, he said the Board should still take that section into consideration when reviewing applications.

Neil Wylie said his concern, in particular, related to the overcapacity situation in the school district and the inability to bond for a school that has already been approved because of opposition by some residents within the ORCSD. He said it caused him concern to be thinking of additional subdivisions unless there could be an assurance; in this case, that it would not cause an undue burden on the schools. He said that a Financial Impact Study could be conducted in accordance with Section 10 of the Board's Subdivision Regulations.

Annmarie Harris added that the implementation of impact fees was also in the process of being considered.

Tracey Wood asked if this parcel could be divided anymore, considering the amount of wetlands. Jim Campbell said because of the wetlands and shore land issues, and without having to put a new road on the parcel because there is no road frontage, it would take a feat to further subdivide.

Annmarie Harris said the Town has had the experience where adjacent parcels of land might be accessible to be combined, in which case there could be further road frontage and access. She felt the clean way to do it would be to build into the conditions of approval that the property could not be further subdivided.

Chair Pease said he would support such a condition as long as it specified no further subdivision that results in the creation of additional lots just because a boundary line adjustment is technically a subdivision. He said he would not want to prohibit a boundary line adjustment that might be needed.

Consensus of the Board was to include as a condition of approval that there be no further subdivision of the property that would result in the creation of additional lots, in consideration of Section 4.04 of the Planning Board's Subdivision Regulations.

Rachel Rouillard asked what a "no cut zone" would provide beyond what the existing restrictions are for the shore land setback. Chair Pease said the Board's shore land protection language prohibits cutting of trees larger than 6" in diameter. The State's language prohibits cutting more than 50% of the basal area. He said "no cut" to him implies none, which would be more stringent. He said the Board's regulations do not require "no cut"; it was a request from the Conservation Commission for the owner to consider.

Rachel Rouillard felt the Conservation Commission should have an opportunity to provide input to the Planning Board prior to public hearings on proposals of significance. Jim Campbell said that Amanda Merrill, the Planning Board's representative to the Conservation Commission, should ensure the Commission receives any information that may be of interest to it.

Tracey Wood spoke about the applicant's request for waiver of underground utilities. She said although the financial impact was a consideration, she did not consider the other neighbors having above ground utilities as a viable argument for waiving the below ground requirement.

Neil Wyle said he was on the Planning Board when the regulation was written. He said this requirement was added for aesthetic reasons and for the assurance of safety and continuance of service. He felt it was the intention of the Board, when it amended the regulation, that all utilities be underground.

Kevin McEneaney said that Public Service's opinion regarding underground utilities is that it prefers overhead utilities because it has more problems with service underground rather than overhead.

Tracey Wood MOVED that the request to waive Section 9.05(B) of the Durham Subdivision Regulations, the requirement to locate all non municipal utilities underground, be DENIED. Suzanne Loder SECONDED the motion.

Kevin McEneaney said he would entertain a condition of approval to add a note on the plan that all utilities would be underground.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

Neil Wylie said he would be satisfied to authorize Chair Pease and Jim Campbell to approve the locations of all the municipal utility lines. He said they should be shown on the plans. The Board agreed with this suggestion.

The Board discussed and reviewed the Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval on this application.

Jim Campbell made a change to paragraph #3 of the Findings of Fact to add at the end of the paragraph: "...an updated version was received on July 10, 2002." Also, to change the word "grants" to "denies".

The Board added as condition #2: "there will be no further subdivision of the property which would result in the creation of additional lots, in consideration of Section 4.04 of the Planning Board's Subdivision Regulations, except for the purpose of permanent conservation use".

The Board added as condition #3: "all utilities will be placed underground, and that the location of the underground utilities be indicated on the plans".

Under "Conditions to be Met Subsequent to the Signature of Approval, etc." add the following to the end of paragraph #2: "...as required in Section 175-77(4)(6) of the Durham Zoning Ordinance". In paragraph #3, change the word "must" to "shall" and change the sentence to begin: "To ensure compliance with the Zoning regulations, the applicant..."

Tracey Wood MOVED to approve the draft Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval, as amended. The motion was SECONDED by Suzanne Loder and PASSED unanimously.

Chair Pease called a 5-minute recess.

The Board reconvened at 9:10 PM.

- V. **Continued Deliberation on an Application for Boundary Line Adjustment** submitted by Smithfield Construction, Portsmouth, New Hampshire. The properties involved are located on Edgewood Road, are shown on Tax Map 1, Lots 16-20, 16-21, 16-5 and 16-6 and are located in the Residence A Zoning District.

Rachel Rouillard recused herself from discussion on this application because she is an abutter.

Chair Pease noted that the Board received transcripts of the September 15, 1999 and June 2, 1999 minutes, which had been requested.

Jim Campbell outlined for the Board the outstanding items remaining to be discussed on this application.

The Board reviewed and discussed the four conditions outlined in Section 175-37 "conditional uses" of the Zoning Ordinance as they pertained to this application.

Condition #1: No alternative location outside the wetland, or which has less detrimental impact on a wetland, is feasible.

Neil Wylie asked if there were different conditions for encroachment on the buffer than there were for encroachment on the wetlands. He said he was sure that the conditions that have to be met which apply to the buffer would also apply to wetlands.

Chair Pease said his experience in the past with the Board has been if the encroachment is only within a buffer, the Board has been fairly open to small buffer encroachments. However, he said the current Board would need to decide on this particular application.

Tracey Wood said that in reading minutes from previous meetings when the original application was approved, it appeared that the issue of wetland crossings had been considered. She asked if the current Board could take what was considered historically and apply it to the present application. She explained that condition #1 of Section 175-37 of the Zoning Ordinance had been considered during the original application process and there were alternatives; however, the Board at the time chose not to consider the wetland crossing and wetland buffer issues in the larger picture in the plan.

Neil Wylie indicated that in looking at the surrounding property, there was no way to access that plot of land that did not involve a wetland crossing.

Condition #2: The proposed construction is essential to the productive use of other land which is not within the Wetland Conservation District.

Annmarie Harris said this condition was open to interpretation. She said that "productive use" was either maximum use or minimum use and that there was a history with the Board on the interpretation of this condition.

Chair Pease said to his knowledge, the last determination the Board made in no way binds the Board this evening. He explained that the last time the Board dealt with this matter, one of the interpretations offered was that there was some degree of synonymy between "permitted use" and "productive use" that if the zoning said a use was permitted in a zone, then by

definition that was a “productive use”. He said that was what had been suggested as to what “productive use” meant.

Neil Wylie said when the original application was considered, the Board received a letter from the Town’s attorney at the time, Donahue, Tucker and Ciandella, which said that “productive use” was any use permitted in the underlying district. He said if one were to accept this definition, then the answer to condition #2 would be in the affirmative.

Chair Pease said the argument has been made that “productive use” should include conservation and open space use, and since there is no need to access the land for use as open space or conservation land, then construction would not be essential to reach it for those purposes. He said he did not agree with this argument.

Chair Pease noted that the time had passed when the Board was to take up the matter of approving the minutes.

Annmarie Harris MOVED to amend the agenda to take up the item for approval of minutes at 10:00 PM. The motion was SECONDED by Suzanne Loder and PASSED 3-1-2 (Tracey Wood, Suzanne Loder and David Pease voted for the motion, Annmarie Harris voted against the motion, Julian Smith and Neil Wylie abstained).

Jim Campbell asked if the Board would be taking up the matter of Durham Crossing this evening. Chair Pease asked what the Board desired to do on this matter. Consensus of the Board was to not discuss at this evening’s meeting Items #VII and #VIII relating to Durham Crossing.

The applicant, Joseph Caldarola, spoke to the issue of “productive use”. He said the only common sense way to look at this matter would be that the clause is referring to the use in which a road would be necessary because the whole section is talking about the construction road. Further, he said if one included all of the uses for which roads are not necessary, then the entire section becomes ridiculous.

Mr. Caldarola clarified the current status of the property. He said it was originally proposed as three lots and was approved as two lots with a 30-foot access easement which crosses one lot to access the other lot. He said that what is being proposed is a roadway within the access easement which gets to the back lot. He said regardless of what the Board did, there would be a roadway there because it had already been approved for a roadway. Mr. Caldarola said there was no additional buffer impact above what was already approved. He said the issue is how many units will be built on that parcel.

Chair Pease asked each Board member for their comments.

Neil Wylie said it appeared that this application was essential to the productive use of other land. Therefore, he would be in favor of accepting condition #2.

Tracey Wood was in favor of accepting condition #2.

Annmarie Harris was in favor of accepting condition #2.

Suzanne Loder was in favor of accepting condition #2.

Chair Pease was in favor of accepting condition #2.

Julian Smith abstained.

Condition #3: Design, construction and maintenance methods will be such as to minimize detrimental impact upon the wetland and will include restoration of the site as nearly as possible to its original grade and condition.

Annmarie asked if the driveway clearing had already happened. Mr. Caldarola said the area had been cleared and that the silt fence was installed. He said he had also started construction of a temporary gravel driveway within the access easement to gain access to the back building lot.

Board members had no other objections with this condition.

Condition #4: Economic advantage is not the sole reason for the proposed location of the construction.

Chair Pease noted that this condition has also been a matter of significant controversy on the Board as to whether it means that the only reason to build the road is to achieve some kind of economic benefit, or whether it means the only reason to locate the road as proposed is to avoid a higher cost of placing the road in some other way that would have less impact.

Board members had no other objections with this condition.

It was the consensus of the Board that it did not have a problem with the approval to cross the wetland buffer.

At the request of Mr. Caldarola, the Board discussed the age restriction question and the merging of the association.

Neil Wylie asked why he kept seeing properties advertised saying that both occupants must be 55 years of age. Jim Campbell said that State law allows Towns to be more restrictive. He said since Durham does not have stricter guidelines, and the State allows for 55 years of age, that is what the applicant has applied for. He said that Human Rights would allow a community to make the restriction for everyone for 55 or over.

Annmarie Harris said it was her understanding that the request was put forward that the previously approved subdivision for elderly housing preferred the requirement of 55 years of age or older because there was concern expressed that an individual 55 years old could have a younger partner with children.

Attorney John Ryan, representing Smithfield Construction, responded that the condominium association had addressed the question of who is it that will be in the under 55 age group that will be permitted in these dwellings. He said there was a fairly lengthy set of provisions within the condominium document which binds everyone dealing with this issue.

Chair Pease said if someone complies with the other requirements, the federal statute gives someone the license to discriminate against people under the age of 55. He said he saw as a

potential limited license the license to discriminate against people under the age of 55 up to the point at which there is 80% occupancy by people 55 years old. However, he said it does not give someone a 100% license which one would get if they go to age 62. Attorney Ryan said he agreed that structurally and internally, the legislation is not a model of clarity.

Chair Pease said his concern was if the Town has a requirement on the property for 100% occupancy, which is subsequently found to be illegal under federal law because it discriminates too much, then the whole elderly housing requirement might fail legally and become void because it is not consistent with federal law.

Attorney Ryan said assuming some federal agency (i.e. the Labor Department or whoever enforces the federal law) were to preempt the State, then over a period of time the Town would have to bring its ordinance into compliance with whatever the federal agency's edict was.

The consensus of the Board was to continue discussion on this matter and to postpone approval of minutes to the beginning of the August 14, 2002 agenda.

Joseph Caldarola explained the changes to the landscaping design for the Board. He said the previous design had the transplanting trees connecting the existing big trees on the lot line.

Regarding the revised site plan and drainage report, project engineer Keith Weston explained that in order to minimize impact to the wetland, catch basins were added and curbing up to station two. He said there is a treatment swale that has special grasses in it to slow the water down to less than 1%. He said this will give the water the ability to dump any sediment in it into the ditch and divert it from the wetland area. Mr. Weston also explained that a level spreader was installed on Jane Miller's property because the Miller's were concerned about the water from the back yard going into the wetland which would eventually go into the pond located on their land.

The Board discussed whether further transcriptions of the September 15 and June 2, 1999 meeting should be done with regard to the original application submitted by Mr. Caldarola. Consensus of the Board was to defer this matter until all Board members have had an opportunity to review the September 15 and June 2, 1999 meeting transcripts and to provide further direction at that time if further transcription is required.

- VI. Continued Deliberation on an Application for Site Review** submitted by Smithfield Construction, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, for the purpose of constructing twelve elderly housing units. The properties involved are located on Edgewood Road, are shown on Tax Map 1, Lots 16-20 and 16-21 and are located in the Residence A Zoning District.

This item was continued to the August 14, 2002 meeting.

- VII. Continued Deliberation on an Amended Application for a Conditional Use Permit** submitted by MJS Engineering, PC, Newmarket, NH, on behalf of EPB Properties, Inc., and Fall Line Properties, Inc., Portsmouth, NH, for the purpose of constructing a Planned Unit Development in the Limited Business District. The property is located on Main Street/Dover Road, is shown as Tax Map 4, Lots 50-0, 51-0, 52-0 and 53-0 and is in the Limited Business Zoning District.

This item was continued to the August 14, 2002 meeting.

- VIII. Continued Deliberation on an Amended Application for Site Plan Review** submitted by MJS Engineering, PC, Newmarket, NH, on behalf of EPB Properties, Inc., and Fall Line Properties, Inc., Portsmouth, NH, for the purpose of constructing a Planned Unit Development. The proposed area has been designed to support commercial units and multi-family housing units. The property is located on Main Street/Dover Road, is shown as Tax Map 4, Lots 50-0, 51-0, 52-0 and-53-0 and is in the Limited Business Zoning District.

This item was continued to the August 14, 2002 meeting.

IX. Other Business

There was no other business to come before the Board.

X. Approval of Minutes - June 12 and 26, 2002

Postponed until the August 14, 2002 meeting.

XI. Adjournment

Suzanne Loder MOVED to Adjourn. Neil Wylie SECONDED the motion and it PASSED unanimously. The meeting ADJOURNED at 10:25 PM.

Dave Watt, Secretary
Durham Planning Board