

D-R-A-F-T

**DURHAM PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 13, 2003
TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, DURHAM TOWN HALL
7:00 P.M.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Amanda Merrill, Neil Wylie, Arthur Grant, Kevin Webb, Alternate; Nick Isaak, Stephen Roberts, Vice Chair; Annmarie Harris

MEMBERS ABSENT: David Watt, Chair; Rachel Rouillard, Richard Ozenich, Alternate

OTHERS PRESENT: Jim Campbell, Planner; John Harwood, Assistant Planner; Victoria Parmele, Minute Taker; and Interested Members of the Public

Chair Roberts called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. He said the public hearing on Monday, August 11, 2003, regarding proposed revisions to the Zoning Ordinance had been very productive, and thanked members of the public and Board members for their participation.

I. Approval of Agenda

Neil Wylie MOVED to approve the agenda. The motion was SECONDED by Arthur Grant and PASSED unanimously.

II. Report of the Planner

Town Planner Jim Campbell reported that there would be one new application for the next meeting. He said that T-Mobile was proposing to build a cellular antenna facility on the water tank behind the parking lot at New England Center. The property is owned by UNH.

Mr. Campbell said he attended a superior court hearing for Stonemark Management on August 5th, and heard arguments from the attorneys. He said they should hear back from the court within 2-4 weeks.

Mr. Campbell explained that John Harwood was present at the Board meeting to go over deliberations on the hotel project.

Mr. Campbell thanked everyone for his or her input at the public hearing held on August 11, 2003 and said he was hoping the next hearing, scheduled for August 25 at 7:00, would be equally productive. He reminded people that if they were not able to attend meetings in person, to please feel free to submit comments in writing, and these comments would be distributed to the Board.

III. **Deliberation on an Application for Conditional Use Permit** submitted by Michael J. Sievert, PE, Newmarket, New Hampshire on behalf of Fall Line Properties, Portsmouth, New Hampshire for the construction of a hotel in the Limited Business District. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 4, Lots 50-0, 51-0, 52-0 & 53-0, is located off of Dover Road/Main Street and is in the Limited Business Zoning District.

- IV. **Deliberation on an Application for Site Plan Review** submitted by Michael J. Sievert, PE, Newmarket, New Hampshire on behalf of Fall Line Properties, Portsmouth, New Hampshire for the construction of a hotel. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 4, Lots 50-0, 51-0, 52-0 & 53-0, is located off of Dover Road/Main Street and is in the Limited Business Zoning District

Chair Roberts asked John Harwood to summarize key points from reports in the packets from Carl Lindblade and Joe Durocher on the economic viability of the hotel project.

Amanda Merrill asked Mr. Harwood if Mr. Durocher had recommended Mr. Lindblade to him. Mr. Harwood replied in the affirmative, adding that Mr. Lindblade came highly recommended, and was very familiar with the hotel business in New Hampshire and New England.

Mr. Harwood explained that Mr. Durocher said he did not even need to look at additional market analysis, because he had previously done enough analysis of the region to determine that this was a viable project. Mr. Harwood then read/summarized Mr. Lindblade's analysis, which considered several universal factors relative to the proposed hotel. Mr. Harwood said that Mr. Lindblade believed, from reviewing the study completed by HRI Corporation and interviews with Mr. Berton, that Mr. Berton had a bonafide interest in developing an Inn in Durham, and that the hotel could only be a complement to the New England Center by adding another product into the marketing mix.

Mr. Harwood read through the written summary of his conversation with Mr. Durocher and noted one key point of the summary which stated there was need for this type of hotel for visiting parents, people attending various programs offered by UNH, overflow from New England Center, alumni weekends, and summer programs for people who don't want to stay in a dormitory.

Mr. Harwood noted that upon the Board's request, a drawing had been provided showing an elevation comparison of the proposed hotel to the historic courthouse, which Mr. Berton described for Board members.

Neil Wylie asked Michael Sievert, the engineer for this project, to review the Brownfields/contamination aspect of the project, and how it was being handled. Mr. Sievert said he had talked to GZA Environmental and was told they are actively monitoring the site on a quarterly basis. He said the monitoring wells have been reconstructed and are being retested, and will be there throughout the building project. He also indicated that there are wells downstream, on bank property, and that monitoring of these wells is also on going to predict movement of the plume downstream. Mr. Sievert said that the previous year, the consulting firm had talked about cleaning up the plume by natural attenuation, but he said he did not know the status of that process.

Mr. Sievert. said the hotel project proposes to provide impervious material directly over where the original contamination was, and not continue to allow groundwater infiltration over it. He also said there will not be excavation down into that area, as part of the construction, and that they will be working at grade level instead.

Amanda Merrill asked if a recommendation had been made that on the area of concern, only impervious area would be provided. Mr. Sievert said no best use was recommended, but noted impervious cover was one of the better uses that could be conducted because it is compatible with the hotel and will allow access for continued monitoring.

Chair Roberts asked if the hotel design was convenient and functional with regard to parking and traffic. Mr. Sievert replied that fencing would prevent lights from vehicles from being a problem, and in some areas the building would block lights from vehicles. He said a retaining wall would be built to deal with erosion, additional snow, etc., and that fencing would go on top of that.

Chair Roberts said another area raised was that there should be no neighborhood negative impact from the development. He noted there had been some fairly aggressive businesses in that location in the past. Mr. Sievert replied that traffic reports predicted less impact from the hotel.

Chair Roberts asked if a person coming into Durham on 108 into downtown would see an increase in their daily commute from what they are seeing now. Mr. Sievert replied that the commute would not be lengthened by the existence of the hotel. He said that peak traffic is lower for the hotel than other uses, and that people will still see a backup at the intersection during the commuting period, but the hotel would not cause it.

Amanda Merrill said Nick Isaak had mentioned the possibility of changing the pitch of dormers to be more in line with dormers over the hotel entrance, which might raise the total height of the building. It was explained by several attendees that if the pitch was increased, this would increase the total median height of the building, but it would not look any higher.

Nick Isaak said the pitch of all of the dormers should be increased, or none of them should be increased, depending upon consensus of the Board. He said he thought it should be increased.

Jim Campbell asked Mr. Sievert if he would be able to attain the maximum building height of 35 feet allowed by the Zoning Ordinance if the Planning Board were to request such an increase. Mr. Sievert said he was not certain and would have to figure the average height from several measurements. He said that at the moment, the building height was 29 feet.

Mr. Berton commented that the Board was also considering the economic feasibility of the project. He said the existing ridgeline, with the existing dormers, is the most economically feasible one for the success of hotel, because it would keep his costs lower.

Consensus of the Board was to table a decision on the dormer issue for now and move on.

The Board decided to review and discuss the conditional use checklist first, then have Mr. Harwood guide it through the Findings of Fact.

Amanda Merrill clarified the checklist is based on which sections of the conditional use language in zoning ordinance, since revisions to that section of the zoning ordinance are proposed. Mr. Harwood said Jim Campbell set up the checklist under the old ordinance. (He noted that the revisions to the ordinance have some great language which makes some

of the items clearer, but also makes things more confusing because it talks about the Planning Board doing economic analysis, while the current ordinance puts that responsibility on the Town Council.)

Mr. Harwood noted that the first five items on the checklist were bookkeeping items and went over them briefly. He then referred to Item #6 – Site Suitability, and noted that three areas were covered under this item. He read the response to this item and then asked for the Board's thoughts.

Kevin Webb asked whether there were existing circuits for trippers for the traffic light, and was informed by Mr. Berton that they were in place. Mr. Webb also asked if New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT) had approved the exit. Mr. Berton said it had been approved and that this was driven by the first proposal that had been developed concerning the hotel.

Annmarie Harris addressed the issue of adequate usable space, suggesting it was desirable to reduce the number of parking spaces for student apartments at Nick's Bricks. She said she preferred to see fewer parking spaces and more landscaping, and felt it would be given favorable consideration for a waiver. Mr. Harwood said a variance would be required for this item.

Arthur Grant said he was concerned about the number of parking spaces. He asked if that number was required in order to meet the hotel and apartment requirements. Mr. Harwood said it was required, based on the current zoning.

Mr. Berton recalled earlier discussions on this subject, and said that parking was crucial to the success of the hotel. He said student parking is stickered now and would continue to be stickered. He said it will be monitored well, but the reality is that those spaces are all crucial. He said he wanted to guarantee that every hotel guest would be able to park at his hotel.

Chair Roberts asked about student parking at Nick's Bricks and duplexes. Mr. Berton said student parking was being slightly reduced for these places. Chair Roberts noted how important it was that there be adequate parking at a hotel. He asked for other views on the parking. Nick Isaak said that from a design perspective additional spaces are not usually created because of cost issues, but he did not think the applicant could provide less than the minimum.

Neil Wyman said he appreciated the aesthetic aspect of this, but felt it was important that there be adequate parking for the business.

Kevin Webb questioned whether handicapped parking would be part of the total mix of 68 parking spaces. Mr. Berton replied that it was. Mr. Webb said he recognized that aesthetics are important, but parking is also important. He said if the concern is that the facility might fail and then turn into something the Town does not want it to be, it would be in the Town's interest to not hamper the success of this facility. He also said that if he were to stay at the hotel, he would expect adequate parking.

Amanda Merrill noted some of the aesthetic concerns could be addressed when the Board discussed landscaping and buffering.

Nick Isaak noted that some vertical landscaping would be worthwhile.

Arthur Grant restated his position that the three duplexes were not essential to the success of the hotel, and said removal of them would free up quite a few parking spaces. He said he thought that too much was being crammed onto one lot.

Mr. Berton said removal of the duplexes was not an option, and that the duplexes are crucial to the viability of the hotel. He said the development met all the requirements. He said he envisioned the duplexes being an integral part of the operation of the hotel, and noted that when he first proposed the hotel, Planning Board member David Pease suggested that the duplexes could evolve into an extended stay residential component.

Chair Roberts noted that other buildings would shield the parking in front of the duplexes.

Mr. Harwood referred to Item #7 on the checklist. –Appropriateness of design. He explained his reasoning for eliminating the wording on brick piers, noting that the Historic District Commission (HDC) will make the final determination on fencing.

Amanda Merrill said she assumed this meant the HDC had jurisdiction over all of the fencing. She said the Board had an opinion from Town attorney Walter Mitchell about the applicability of the ordinance to the property. She asked if the HDC would have some jurisdiction over landscaping as well as fencing, and said that the issue of screening was an issue for the Planning Board. Chair Roberts said HDC was the arbitrator on it. Jim Campbell said the HDC could not require screening, but if it was required, they could require it to be appropriate.

Annmarie Harris suggested deletion of the word “likely” in the sentence “the property line will *likely* have an open fence...”

Amanda Merrill asked whether the HDC looked at signage. Mr. Harwood replied in the affirmative. He also noted that signage would need to be approved by the Zoning and Code Enforcement Officer, and that the Board could make it a condition of approval for the development.

Mr. Harwood referred to Item #8 on the checklist - Immediate Neighborhood Impact.

Annmarie Harris noted it should say “businesses” instead of “garages” in the sentence “the proposed use will generate less traffic than the *garages* that it replaces”.

Mr. Harwood referred to Item #9 – Immediate Neighborhood Integrity. There was no discussion on this item.

Mr. Harwood noted that he had not written a draft for Item #10- regarding whether services and facilities are available and adequate to serve the needs of the use as designed and proposed to serve the use as designed and proposed.

Jim Campbell said that historically, the Board had not looked at Item #10 in terms of fiscal impact, but rather in terms of physical adequacy of facilities to handle a proposed development. Mr. Campbell noted that in the past the Planning Board had gone through each of those items, and answered them “yes” or “no”. He also said there were/should be letters from the Public Works and Fire Departments regarding adequacy of services and facilities.

Arthur Grant said he thought the sentence should read: “Town staff have found/reported that the services under Item 10 are adequate”. He said the Board had not evaluated each of these things and found them to be available and adequate. Mr. Grant said he accepted the word of town staff that something was adequate, but did not necessarily know this himself.

It was agreed that Item 10 should read: “The following services and facilities have been found available and adequate by the town staff to serve the needs of the use as designed and proposed”.

Chair Roberts said it was part of the Planning Board’s mandate to evaluate the proposal to determine adequate sewer, water, stormwater drainage and fire protection. He said this responsibility was assigned to the Technical Review Committee who responded that these services are capable. He said what the Board had questioned was the business plan, which Mr. Harwood had addressed in a report to the Board members.

Mr. Harwood noted that Fire Chief Ronald O’Keefe had indicated that the fire lane and parking in front of Nick’s Bricks is not a problem and that the fire lane can be the roadway.

Neil Wylie noted that the development was likely to have no impact on the Town’s parks and schools.

As an aside, John Harwood noted that if Mr. Berton planned on using duplexes for extended use, he would have to come back to the Board for a change of use.

Item #11 regarding whether the proposed use will not cause or contribute to a decline in property values of adjacent properties Chair Roberts asked if Mr. Berton had provided comments that had been accepted by the Board, or comments from town citizens on this item. He said his sense was that this would be a more hospitable use than the prior use, which was an auto garage, and that cleanliness and maintenance are key aspects of having an effective hotel property.

John Harwood said he did not ask Mr. Berton to produce information on what the financial impact of the development would be to the town in terms of tax revenue. He said he had spoken to the Assessor, and his initial thoughts were that it would be significantly greater than that which would come from two gas stations at that location, or a bank.

Chair Roberts noted this item dealt with whether the proposed development would cause or contribute to a decline in property values of adjacent properties. Mr. Berton said it was hard to imagine the hotel would cause or contribute to a decline in property values.

Neil Wylie said coming down Main Street, the hotel would obscure the Cumberland Farms, which would be a net benefit by making the historic district look more attractive. Kevin

Webb agreed that the hotel would effectively extend the character of the historic district. Nick Isaak said the hotel was a good use for making the transition from the gas station to the historic district.

Item #12 – that the conditional use has been determined by the Planning Board to be a benefit to the Town. Chair Roberts asked Board members if there were any additional comments with regard to Item #12.

Neil Wylie said the hotel is a recommended permitted use in the new Master Plan, which recommends upgrading hotels from a conditional use to a permitted use. He said the development will surely increase the nonresidential tax base and will require relatively few services.

Annmarie Harris said she agreed, but said she would like to maximize the architectural features of the property if the Board was going to approve it. She said the property should be as historically representative and attractive a gateway to the community as possible.

Amanda Merrill agreed with Annmarie Harris, and expressed some concerns about aesthetics. She said she hoped that landscaping and buffering would be adequate.

Nick Isaak said he thought the project satisfied an essential component of the Master Plan, which was to add further identity to the urban part of Durham. He described the site as a missing tooth along the corridor coming into town, and said the project would go a long way to improve the feel of Main Street and define the limit of the historic district. He said his only concerns were aesthetic, but said he could address these as a member of the HDC. He said that what the HDC agreed on in terms of fencing could most likely be extended for the whole project.

Chair Roberts asked Mr. Harwood to guide the Board through the draft Findings of Fact before any motions were proposed on the Conditional Use Permit.

John Harwood read through the draft Findings of Fact and asked for comments.

Arthur Grant said there should be a 4th condition, which reads: “the board and applicant have agreed to a maximum stay of 10 day”. It was noted by the Board that this wording was in the Site Plan and it was agreed the wording should be in both.

Kevin Webb said the draft was a good first cut, but would like to see it a bit stronger, because this is a message for future Planning Boards. He said the Board needed to be clearer on what the concerns are in this community, and suggested revised wording for the introduction to the document. As part of this, he suggested possible insertion of a sentence to read: “The community and present Planning Board are very concerned that this property not be turned into any form of alternate housing for the university”.

Arthur Grant said that the Findings of Fact lists what the applicant has done, but not what the Board has done (i.e., dates of public hearings held on the proposed development, site walks, etc.). He said it needs to be made very clear what the Board did, and how it came to its conclusions. He also said it would be helpful to indicate that some members of the public spoke in opposition or in favor of the project. He said he was noting this because in the

Stonemark case the Board was accused of not having granted the applicant enough time to rebut the criticism, although the record shows that the Board did indeed allow enough time. Mr. Grant said he was trying to set a format for the future. Mr. Grant also said the Findings of Fact should say the Board engaged the services of Mr. Lindblade.

Kevin Webb said Mr. Grant was trying to establish a way to show the Board had followed the correct procedure, and satisfied the requirements of the Conditional Use Permit. He said it was good to always assume we are preparing for trial in situations such as this.

Mr. Harwood asked how to merge the checklist with the Findings of Fact and conditions of approval. He asked if he should take detailed substantiation from the checklist and add it to the Conditional Use Permit draft.

Chair Roberts said that according to the ordinance the Board had to go through the ordinance and answer the questions requested, and the checklist would dictate the answers. He noted that a large section of the conditional use section of the ordinance is given to the Town Council for consideration, and is exempted.

John Harwood said the confusion was that items in the Findings of Fact were generic, not detailed, and he wanted to know if the Board wanted him to elaborate, with the information put together in the checklist, to substantiate the findings, rather than just attach the checklist.

Kevin Webb suggested he attach the checklist to the Conditional Use Permit, and reference it. Neil Wylie noted that what was filed was the condition of approval, so the checklist needed to be incorporated.

Jim Campbell said the Board could also add, under Section 2 of Findings of Fact the statement: "The Planning Board has reviewed the attached checklist and has determined...". Chair Roberts summarized that Mr. Harwood should go through the numerical sequence of the ordinance and provide documentation that answers it, and attach the checklist as a finding.

At this time, the Board began review of the Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval for the site plan.

Arthur Grant said the site plan needed to say something about the lighting plan approval. He also said that the Findings of Fact needed to say that the applicant secured a variance from the ZBA to consolidate the lots, and that the Board received an independent marketing analysis.

It was clarified that everything should be stated in both the Conditional Use Permit and the site plan review.

Jim Campbell suggested that the time period allowed for the Conditional Use Permit should be extended beyond six (6) months, because for the last Conditional Use Permit issued, the applicant needed more than six months, since the Town Council was unable to act on it in time.

The Board decided to leave the wording as it was, and if the Town Council does not approve the permit within six months, then the Planning Board would give Mr. Berton an extension.

Arthur Grant MOVED to continue deliberations until the next meeting of the Planning Board, August 27, when we will review a draft of the Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval, Conditional Use Permit, from Mr. Harwood. The motion was SECONDED by Neil Wylie and PASSED unanimously.

V. **Other Business**

A. New Business: **Discussion on TE Grants**

Jim Campbell noted the memorandum in the packets, which provided an update on grants he had recently applied for, and others he was looking into possibly applying for in the future.

Arthur Grant asked if the Town really need another study of the northern/southern connector. He said the town already had a number of similar studies on its shelves. Jim Campbell said he personally had not seen a feasibility study on the northern/southern connector.

Mr. Grant also asked what the Mill Plaza Access Study was about. Mr. Campbell said the Master Plan specifically called for reviewing alternative accesses to the Plaza. Mr. Campbell said Chesley Dr. in the Master Plan was specifically not an option, and said there were two options, but would require buying property, which would be expensive. He said he wanted to include in the proposed study the present access and how we could better accommodate the present access, which would be the most inexpensive way to do something there.

Arthur Grant recommended that Mr. Campbell move that application down to 2005. He said the northern/southern connector issue was an important to address, but the Mill Plaza access issue could wait, considering expenses the Town is facing.

Chair Roberts said he went through the original planning on the Mill Plaza expansion, and noted it was a complex and expensive issue.

Jim Campbell said the Main Street application had been submitted for extending the shoulders for bike lanes and adding a sidewalk, and explained that 80% of funding is federal money, with the remaining 20% coming from the Town, UNH and the State (because part of the road is a state highway). He noted the improvements were taken right from the Master Plan, and would be a wonderful addition to the town, making the road safer, and encouraging people to get out of their cars.

Arthur Grant MOVED to indicate endorsement of TE applications and request that the Town Administrator communicate that endorsement to the appropriate authorities. Amanda Merrill SECONDED the motion and it PASSED unanimously.

B. Old Business: **Discussion on Rules of Procedure**

Jim Campbell said he had updated the rules of procedure, and received an email from both Councilor Neil Niman and Amanda Merrill on this item. He said the portion in red was from the August draft, and the rest was from the July draft. He said he incorporated suggestions and put it on the agenda in case Board members wanted to discuss it. Arthur Grant said he was not clear on the part regarding email discussion lists. Group members said this referred to citizens' exchange of information by email, a variety of forms throughout the town.

Amanda Merrill asked Neil Wylie if his comments concerning email included comments made by Planning Board members about Board matters. Jim Campbell said he had put wording pertaining into the draft. Ms. Merrill asked if the new language made it clear that Board members are not supposed to comment on Board matters on these email lists.

Kevin Webb said the language should be more generic, and refer to email discussion groups, or any public forum.

It was agreed that the wording should say, "This includes the use of email and other electronic discussions".

Arthur Grant asked for clarification on Section IV – Applications/Decisions– and said he thought it was decided there should be one meeting per month for reviewing applications, and the other meeting should be for business purposes. He felt it was important to designate that the Board designate one meeting a month to receive applications.

Chair Robert said it was important not to be tied down in the way Mr. Grant had described, and that if there were a number of applications in a given month, they might need the two meetings to consider them all.

Neil Wylie said the Board could do public hearings and deliberations first at a meeting, and then spend time on applications after this if there was time. He suggested the following change to the rules of procedure for this: III.D.4 becomes Public Hearings/Deliberations and II.D.5. becomes Acceptances, and the rest stays the same.

Neil Wylie said that the Board needed to do a better job of getting minutes reviewed and accepted sooner.

Kevin Webb noted, concerning disqualification, that the rules should be more restrictive than the present language. The Board agreed upon language for this.

Arthur Grant asked that time be allowed for re-drafting and re-consideration of the rules of procedure at the next meeting.

Amanda Merrill asked about authority on actions where the Board's rules were silent. She referred to a situation that had occurred having to do with reconsideration, where there were no means for doing a reconsideration because there was no procedure for it in the rules. Jim Campbell said he had that question in to Walter, and had not heard anything back on it yet.

VI. Approval of Minutes – July 9, 2003

- Page 2, 4th paragraph – strike “no one from public to speak”
- Page 4, top of page, should read, “to be some work up front to determine what that is”.
- Page 4, 2nd paragraph – should read, “She stated that she hopes this would be a special building”
- Page 4, 3rd paragraph –should read, “at the application hearing many months ago, he proposed an independent”
- Page 4, 3rd paragraph- strike last paragraph “He also stated...”
- Page 4, 4th paragraph – should read “hotel will occupy is 3,900 sq. ft more”
- Page 4, 5th paragraph – should read “He further suggested that the added green area”
- Page 4, last paragraph –should read “planner, zoning administrator and code officer”.
- Page 5, 2nd paragraph –should read, “He also suggested a condition that the removal of snow and road sand and salt must be trucked from the property and disposed of elsewhere whenever the snow piles in the designated storage areas....”
- Page 6, 4th paragraph – should read “but he understands it might not be financially feasible without 3 floors”
- Page 6, 8th paragraph and 13th paragraph – capitalize Simplex
- Page 6, 13th paragraph – should read “letter that states whether or not the conclusions are reasonable”
- Page 7, 4th paragraph – should read, “the applicant does not believe this issue affects any aspects of the subdivision.”
- Page 7, 7th paragraph –end of paragraph, should have sentence – “There were no additional members of the public to speak”.
- Page 8, 4th paragraph – Megan Walley should be replaced with Ann Lawing.

***Arthur Grant MOVED to approve the Minutes of July 9, 2003 as amended.
The motion was SECONDED by Neil Wyman and PASSED unanimously.***

Approval of Minutes – July 23, 2003

- Page 1, 1st paragraph change to read “.... did not believe there was enough time to review the goals of the Planning Board retreat”
- Page 2, and on need header or footer giving title and date of Minutes.
- Page 2, 1st paragraph – change to read “he would be sending proposals to the Board regarding grant applications for transportation enhancement, and congestion mitigation and air quality”
- Page 2, 2nd paragraph – Remove “John – fall line update attached to packet” Also, last sentence of paragraph, use complement instead of compliment.
- Page 2, 5th paragraph – Should be Duane Hyde and Ed Galena.
- Page 2, 6th paragraph – middle of paragraph, should read “ who should be in the “Working Group” and how it should be formed. In addition they will discuss the process required to bring conservation projects to the Council”. Also change last sentence of paragraph to read “...they would also be talking about the process evaluation criteria as presented in the report to the Council”

- Page 3, 5th paragraph- strike “In response to a concern from Steve Roberts”. Also insert at end of paragraph “Steve Roberts expressed a concern that the Conservation Commission has the statutory responsibility to keep the Town’s inventory of protected land. (36-A:2)”
- Page 3, 7th paragraph – under III Economic Development – strike 8:23 pm
- Page 3, 8th paragraph – should read “There are 3 members from the community awaiting approval by the Council”.
- Page 4, 1st paragraph – should be Stephen Roberts
- Page 4, 4th paragraph – add “Tax incurrent financing” in parentheses to TIF
- Page 4, 7th paragraph – should read “Councilor Niman stated that for any development the committee proposes that the number one priority.”
- Page 4, last paragraph – should read “Arthur Grant stated that Jim Morrison, the former Director of Research”
- Page 5, 1st paragraph – should read “gives them part time jobs and internships, and sometimes offers them full time jobs after graduations..”
- Page 5, 3rd paragraph – should be Stephen Roberts
- Page 5, 4th paragraph – should read “Tony Federer passed out copies of the book “Better not Bigger” and said he would donate..”
- Page 5, 8th paragraph – eliminate extra “and” before 5). Also, under 6), should say “enforce the maximum allowed number of occupants per dwelling unit”.
- Page 5, 9th paragraph – strike “Building codes and”. Also, take capitals off of “Police Action”.

Neil Wylie MOVED to approve the minutes of July 23, 2000 as amended. The motion was seconded by Arthur Grant and PASSED unanimously.

VII. Adjournment

Neil Wylie MOVED to adjourn. The motion was SECONDED by Annmarie Harris and PASSED unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10: __p.m.

Amanda Merrill, Secretary