

These minutes were approved at the July 13, 2005 meeting.

**DURHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 2005
TOWN COUNCIL, DURHAM TOWN HALL**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Richard Kelley, Steve Roberts, Kevin Webb, Nick Isaak, Arthur Grant; Susan Fuller, Councilor Diana Carroll and Councilor Jerry Needell

MEMBERS ABSENT: Lorne Parnell; Bill McGowan, Richard Ozenich

OTHERS PRESENT: Town Planner Jim Campbell; Victoria Parmele, Minute Taker

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Agenda

Arthur Grant MOVED to approve the Agenda as submitted. The motion was SECONDED by Kevin Webb.

Chair Kelley said there would be no Planner's report that evening.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

III. Report of Planner

(no report)

IV. UNH Campus Master Plan - University representatives will be presenting the Campus Master Plan. After the presentation there will be a question and answer period.

University Planner Doug Bencks spoke before the Board and first presented an overview. He said the University had a mandate to develop a comprehensive Master Plan covering a 20 year horizon. He said the Master Plan was a road map for incremental change, and provided confidence that individual projects that were planned would fit into a larger vision. He said the 1994 Master Plan was the basis for the current plan, and itself had been a great road map. He noted that Town involvement had been an essential element of the current process.

Mr. Bencks provided details on the professional consulting team of landscape architects, architects, transportation planners, etc. who had assisted in developing the Master Plan, describing them as a group of people who had great experience in campus master planning, and who were able to engage the community in the master planning process.

He said the process started in December of 2002 and ended in November of 2004, and

described the various kinds of committees and sessions that were held during that time. He and noted that there were Town representatives on both the steering committee and the Master Plan committee itself. Mr. Bencks said there were working groups involved with precinct studies, and said numerous interviews were conducted as part of the planning process.

Mr. Bencks next provided details on the evolution of the UNH campus over the past 100 years. He said there was steady, slow growth before World War II, with the University reached its first million square feet by 1945. He explained that after WWII, in large part because of the GI Bill, growth took off, but noted that since 1980, the University's population growth had flattened out, and said the University planned to stay at that even pace of development.

Mr. Bencks next provided details on issues and expectations that had been formulated as part of the Master Planning process, in response to the University's Academic Plan:

- Integration of academic and non-academic aspects of student life
- Strategically increasing University wide research
- Strengthen interdisciplinary teaching and research activities
- Become more competitive in attracting the most capable students, and the highest quality faculty and staff
- Focus on areas consistent with University's mission and areas where it can excel.

He said limited growth was anticipated over the time horizon of the Master Plan, with an expected increase in undergraduate enrollment from 10,850 to 12,000. He said graduate enrollment was expected to increase from 2,100 to 2,500. Mr. Bencks said there was currently an unmet demand for on campus housing, and also noted the need for accessible, affordable family housing. He said the new housing that would be provided would be a combination of suites and apartments. He also noted that there was a growing list of academic and residential buildings in need of major renovations, and said there was a great deal of work ahead on this.

Mr. Bencks spoke about the three distinct images of the University that had been defined by the consultants working on the Master Plan:

- A New England college
- The downtown, New England village as an important part of the University
- The New England landscape as a wonderful asset that the University could take advantage of in many different ways.

He said the University wished to maintain the current sense that it was a small college campus, and also wanted to continue to be a walking campus, where it was easy for students to move from class to class and from residence to class, and for visitors to move around the campus. He said these were fundamental building blocks as the University moved forward with its planning, and said that as part of this, it was important to alleviate conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles.

Mr. Bencks said the landscape of the University was a defining part of its identity, and said it was important for the University to be very conscious of this, and to nurture the landscape. He said that outlying fields and forests owned by the

University were needed as part of various University programs, and had been looked at in detail as part of the master planning process. He also said that roads, walkways, and common utility distribution systems were decades old, deteriorating, and needed to be dealt with.

Mr. Bencks said it was recognized there were impacts on the community as the University grew, and said that during the master planning process, there had been good discussion about Town/University issues and opportunities.

He described the University's current and future space needs for academic activities, and noted that the amount of growth in this area would be very limited. He said that most of this growth in terms of buildings would be tied up in research space, as well as in providing housing and dining functions. He said that the University's physical plant needs had to be accomplished within the limited funding sources that were available, and said the solutions arrived at had to provide the greatest long term value added.

He said all of the University properties were looked at together, and said there was a strong determination that these lands needed to be kept open, and had value for teaching and research. But he also noted the challenge of what to do with old farmhouses on some of these lands, many of which were historic, but were not needed as part of University programs. He said the question was raised during the master planning process as to whether other entities might be willing to be stewards of these properties. He noted that many of these houses were falling apart, and said it would be tragic if they were lost.

He said that although the student population would stay relatively steady, the University saw increasing undergraduate housing on campus to a minimum of 50%. He said the Master Plan had place-holders for as much as 70%, but said it was recognized that how much could be done toward this would be related to the funding available. He noted there was no requirement that students be housed on campus, so the University had to provide housing which students would find of value to them.

Mr. Bencks summarized the vision of the University, moving forward:

- renovating, replacing, expanding existing academic facilities
- maintaining large tracts of land for academic programs
- living and learning environment - how to engage students so they really feel the connection between living and learning - includes encouraging them to stay on campus longer, recognizing that as they mature, will be looking for more independence.
- need for housing of graduate students and family housing related to affordable housing issues - needs to be close to campus core; important for many reasons, including support of research growth of University
- opportunities for enhancing relationship with the larger community - clearly are opportunities related to gateways to campus that will also help with connection to the greater community.

Mr. Bencks said the University clearly heard the following in discussions with community members:

- 1) recognize are a number of issues related to traffic on neighborhood roads; see solutions to that as being part of a network of streets that will encourage traffic to move away from those neighborhoods, onto western part of campus.
- 2) commitment to maintaining open lands
- 3) providing more on campus housing

improving campus access and mobility - embedded in transportation aspects of plan; idea is to get people to go to parking space on edge of campus and walk, instead of traffic and congestion from looking for inner core parking spaces

- balancing needs of built and natural environment - are talking about manmade changes, but need to do this in a respectful way concerning the environment
- keep campus as compact as possible, not allowing development to move out beyond where has been occurring; limiting sprawl

Mr. Bencks said that University transportation planner Steve Pesci would next speak about transportation aspects of the Master Plan.

Mr. Pesci said that a lot of master plan discussions revolved around land use, and transportation as an important piece of this, both internally as well as in relation to the Town and the region. He said the University set up the transportation policy committee in 2001, and said it included representatives from the Town.

He said a key focus of transportation planning efforts was improvement of access to the campus and mobility within campus, considering all modes of transportation. He said safety concerns, and reduction of conflicts between transportation modes was an important component, especially because of the continued goal of having a walking campus.

Mr. Pesci said transportation demand management was one of the University's key goals, and focused on ways to reduce unnecessary demand. He provided details on this. He said another important goal of transportation planning was to reduce impacts on campus as well as in the Town, given the shared street system, and said a third key goal was stabilization of parking. He said the consultants looked at where UNH stood compared with its peers concerning parking, and found that it fell somewhere in the middle.

He said the University was very cognizant that in the long term, it wanted to preserve a ratio of parking to head count that was right for Durham and right for the University. He noted that the University had been recognized for the second year in a row as a learning institution that looked at transportation demand management and commuter choice.

He said a key way in which transportation planners had looked at traffic impacts was through development of an objective evaluating tool that looked at the street system, and incorporated data into a model to evaluate existing conditions as well as impacts from development that was planned. He said results of this analysis were in the process of being finalized, but said he would provide some of the findings of the study that evening. He said Mr. Campbell would receive a full copy of not just the

study results, but also all of the data, because the University believed it was mutually beneficial to share this information. He noted that he had met with the Town's Traffic Safety Committee as part of development of the model.

Mr. Pesci provided details on some of the information that was considered as part of the model: where commuters were coming from in the morning; what their travel routes were; locations of pedestrian/auto conflicts where infrastructure could be improved; infrastructure in general and where upgrades to this were needed. He said a concept they had moved toward was a network of streets that would allow movement of people and goods around campus and in Town.

He referred to the projects planned to develop the southern underpass, extend McDaniel Drive around Main Street avoiding College Woods, and connecting to Main Street directly opposite Loop Road. He said this was a new and important piece of a network that would allow vehicles, pedestrians, and the transit system to move around campus more efficiently, and would take some of the pressure off of the Main Street corridor.

He said the segment of road being constructed this summer continued Loop Road around to Gables Way; and also noted that long term, an underpass would connect to Strafford Ave, so there would be two new routes to distribute traffic across the network of streets, giving the UNH campus three legal, safe, multi-modal crossings of the traffic.

Mr. Pesci said after establishing this network design, the transportation planners had looked at the parking situation, and described the existing parking available on campus, spread across many lots. He said in terms of maintaining a walking campus, core campus real estate was very valuable, and said the decision had been made to move some parking to outer lots, as a way to better utilize land in the inner campus core. He said the proposed parking plan over a period of 20 included removal of many of the postage stamp parking lots on campus, and construction of two parking structures. He said A Lot would hold the largest structure, with a smaller structure to be located on B Lot. He said there would be approximately a 10% increase in parking, or about 600 spaces. He explained that these locations were ideal, because a 10-minute walk from them could get people to the vast majority of places on campus.

Mr. Pesci next spoke about how the model that had been created was used to look at impacts in terms of how the various intersections were functioning, and noted that this analysis was based on data on am and pm peak traffic during the academic year. He said special event traffic was not included in the analysis, and said it was realized that this traffic issue was something that required continued, and sometimes better coordination between University and Town.

He said there were three basic components of the modeling on traffic impacts:

- Regional, background traffic - he said 1% a year compounded growth was used, based on historical NHDOT data.
- Total population of UNH, - which piece lives here and which commutes.
- University projects planned and their traffic impacts

He said the numbers from this were totaled, and from this was subtracted out those people living on campus, who were not commuting. He noted the total commuter population now and looking out 13 years was expected to be stable or even decreasing, especially because there would be an increase in the amount of on campus housing for students and families. He said this was key data for the traffic model.

He provide specifics on the model, and noted hot spots in town, under existing conditions, including Loop Road and Main Street, which had a service Level of F. He said the model as of 2013, with the McDaniel Drive extension, the Loop Road/Strafford Ave extension and the northern underpass would redistribute traffic, which should improve the situation at the intersection of Loop Road and Main Street.

He said under the no-build model, and reflecting the expected regional increase in traffic, they would end up with a little more delay at the intersection of McDaniel and Mill Roads. He said if University numbers were added in, they would see a bit of additional wait time, and he provided details on this. He noted that this demonstrated that the goal was not always to make intersections an A level of service, because by keeping the level of service lower in some locations, cars were discouraged from using these areas, and were more likely to travel back out to the west, where there was no delay.

Mr. Pesci said this traffic model could be useful in working with the Town, in order to look at challenges and solutions on an objective basis. He said the University would be happy to work with the Town to continue to develop the model.

Mr. Bencks noted Councilor Carroll had asked at a previous meeting about sustainability principles that were part of the Master Plan. He explained that the Master Plan itself was a comprehensive, holistic way of thinking and making decisions. He said that transportation demand management was clearly tied to broader issues of sustainable development, and provided people with alternatives to cars. He also said that keeping the walking campus environment as compact as possible provided a variety of benefits.

He said the University understood the importance of carefully managing the landscape, as well as incorporating sustainable building designs and guidelines that considered energy efficiency and the long term costs of building materials. He said the buildings that were planned need to endure for the long term, needed to be high performance, and also needed to be easy to maintain, and adaptable to change. He noted they also had to engage people, and speak to the community in a variety of ways.

Mr. Bencks provided additional details on the transportation network that had been designed, the buildings the University planned to renovate, new buildings planned, new housing for undergraduates, families, improvements to planned for the athletic fields, and plans to move administrative functions out to the edge of campus because it was not as crucial that they be within walking distance. He also noted the placeholders in the Master Plan for long term building development.

He provided examples of where the Master Plan envisioned transformational possibilities on campus. He noted the current dead end road of College Way, in an area that should be part of the walking campus. He described plans to transform this area, including expansion of the Paul Arts Center, so that it would be clearly defined as a pedestrian place.

He also noted a proposed area for the future Science Quadrangle, the location of the current University Fire Department, and said there was potential for major new academic building(s) in an area that was clearly part of the core campus. He also spoke about Forest Park area, which was currently not part of the campus fabric, and said that over time with changes to undergraduate housing, and academic buildings nearby, this area could be knit together and redefined as part of the campus.

Mr. Bencks asked if Planning Board members had any questions for him.

Councilor Needell said one of the key focuses of the Campus master plan was on housing growth, and asked if there were any plans for faculty or staff housing in it. He noted the serious problem concerning affordable housing in Durham.

Mr. Bencks acknowledged that junior faculty had been priced out of the local housing market. He said the University saw a need for transitional housing for graduate and family housing, but had not yet finalized where this housing would go.

Mr. Isaak said he had heard in the past that there were some ideas on moving the fraternities to a "Greek village".

Mr. Bencks said there had been a lot of discussion on this, including discussion of the Town's desire to transform the area where fraternities and sororities currently were on Strafford Ave. and Madbury Ave. He said discussion had included consideration of possible places where the fraternities and sororities might go, and noted that it was realized that the University couldn't unilaterally make this happen. He said negotiations with the Greek organizations would take some time, but said it could now be said that the University had some locations in mind where they could go. He provided details on this.

Chair Kelley asked why there was a relatively long period of time between the presentation of the completed Master Plan to the Trustees and their approval of the Plan.

Mr. Bencks explained that it was largely a timing issue, and provided details on this. He also said there were some financial questions the Master Plan Committee was asked to provide answers to.

Chair Kelley noted Mr. Bencks had said that with limited funding, the University had to look at the greatest long-term value in assessing projects. He asked if the various Phase I projects were all seen as providing the greatest long term value, or if some categories, such as academic buildings, might take precedence.

Mr. Bencks said all Phase I projects were those the University was pursuing funding for, and he provided details on this. But he said deciding on which Phase I projects took precedence was a political decision.

Mr. Webb said Mr. Pesci's traffic analysis had not considered the significant traffic impacts of special events held at the University, and noted that a recent event had made it virtually impossible to move through Town.

Mr. Pesci acknowledged that the traffic model had not been used to look at special event traffic, and said it was understood that the most acute traffic impacts were related to special events. He said an important way to deal with this kind of traffic was by manual, proactive traffic control, and by getting people to use the shuttle system more, and he noted that an important element of this kind of traffic control was working on peoples' perceptions. He said the University had been working on this, and also said it was important to work closely with the Town on this. He said this issue was very high on the University's radar screen.

In answer to a question from Councilor Carroll, Mr. Pesci said that approximately 14% of daily traffic came in through Madbury Road off of Route 155, so the biggest question, if one was trying to reduce traffic on the internal portion of Madbury Road, was what could be done to divert that traffic to make a right turn on Route 4 and come into the main entrance to the University. He said the University was looking to work with the Town and NHDOT to make that happen.

Councilor Needell asked how the northern connector fit with the University's traffic plans.

Mr. Pesci said although the northern connector was not in the Master Plan, there was nothing in the planning process that precluded it, from an analysis perspective or a construction perspective. He said he believed that the western approach that had been designed served the same purpose as the northern connector. He said a related issue was the Madbury Road, Route 4 traffic signal, and said it had been his understanding when he worked for the Strafford Regional Planning Commission that the University had agreed all along that this signalized intersection was not desirable from a traffic perspective, and alternatives were needed.

Mr. Grant observed that immediate relief for traffic problems could come from better signage, noting there was minimal signage on the outskirts of the community that directed traffic to the University in the most efficient manner. He provided details on this. He said he had always commended University transit system, and noted the shuttle system worked well. But he said he had observed the previous graduation weekend that the Town had been clogged with vehicles. He said he had checked the West Edge parking lot, and several shuttles were in use, but he said many parking spaces were available there.

Mr. Grant said that unless parents received information at home about where parking was available, they wouldn't know about this. He also noted that when he had attended a football game at Dartmouth, people didn't get a choice as to where to park, and were directed by the police to where they were supposed to go.

Mr. Pesci said there had been a meeting that day on signage issues, and said it was understood the University needed to do a better job, especially with first time visitors. He said this was one of the highest priorities of the Transportation Policy Committee, and said the University would do a better job concerning this.

On another topic, Mr. Grant asked if was possible that the old reservoir could be converted for water needs.

Mr. Bencks said there was a general understanding that it was a shallow reservoir, so its actual capacity was questionable. He said it was not clear whether this would work or not, and noted there had not been an analysis on this in recent years.

Chair Kelley asked how 1994 Master Plan traffic projections fit with what had actually happened to the University by 2004.

Mr. Bencks said the analysis done in 1994 was not comparable to what had been done as part of the recent Master Plan process, which was much more far reaching.

Mr. Pesci said he agreed with Mr. Bencks that the recent master plan process concerning transportation issues was more involved that what was done in 1994, and said he felt confident that what had been done was about the best that could be done in terms of investment of resources. He also said it made sense to look 10 years out, quantitatively, but not 20 years.

Mr. Campbell noted that the synchro model indicated that the intersection at Mill Road was an A level of service, and said that didn't seem to make sense.

Mr. Pesci said that a weakness in the model had caused this situation where problems at an intersection weren't adequately reflected. He explained that the model wasn't good at looking at nonstandard intersections, such as the intersection of Mill Road and Main Street, and the intersections on Pettee Brook Road. But he said he felt comfortable that in general, the UNH effect/delta at 2013 was minimal.

Councilor Needell asked how much of the model depended on the northern underpass, and there was discussion about this.

Councilor Carroll said concerning the walking campus model, she wondered if other offices at the University, notably the Admissions Office, made students aware of this.

Mr. Bencks said he didn't know how much was portrayed as part of the admissions process, and said it was a good question.

Councilor Carroll said it was important that people came to the University with the expectation that there would be a walking campus. She also said she applauded the University for its policy of keeping cars out for freshman, and noted this wasn't easy when many of its competitors allowed freshman to have cars.

Mr. Pesci said the University was trying hard to get across the idea of accessibility and mobility, and said the message was that if people came to UNH, they didn't need a car. He said this message had to get out to parents as well. He said information was provided to students about trains available, and the shuttle on campus, and he noted that increasing train rider-ship showed that it was truly becoming a way to access the University and allow students to be mobile without their cars.

Mr. Roberts said he would like to express deep concern about the transportation plan that had been developed by the University. He said he didn't think the effects on the community had been addressed, given the increase in pass-by traffic and the increase in growth in Seacoast area that was anticipated in the coming years. He said Madbury Road/Edgewood Road was a dangerous gateway, and said this was not addressed in the plan. He said this situation would only get worse for the Town.

Mr. Roberts said any transportation plan that had one way in, one way out didn't make any sense. He said he didn't think the design that had been developed would work, and said he would like to see some alternate study on this. He stressed that 30,000 additional people were expected in the immediate region in the next 20 years.

Mr. Roberts also said he had found accessibility to academic and research buildings for material handling purposes was poor, noting that the lifeblood of research required heavy lifting. He also said accessibility to the Paul Arts Center for people who were impaired was poor, and needed to be improved.

Councilor Carroll agreed, pointing out that attendance at the Celebrity Series was down even though people were moving to Town who had more time for these kinds of activities. She said the Paul Arts Center was a hard building to get into if one were disabled, and said this needed immediate attention.

Mr. Pesci said more short term access parking near buildings was planned, which would be different than day long parking. He said a drop off loop was planned for the Paul Arts Center and also said more accessible parking for the building would be provided.

Mr. Bencks said even though a goal was to continue to have a walking campus, this did not mean the University would be getting rid of accessible parking, for drop off of materials and other things. He said staging areas would exist, but would be part of a more controlled environment.

Mr. Roberts asked why limited growth in the number of graduate students was projected.

Mr. Bencks said this was based on resources, and said research was planned as a growth area compared to other functions of the University. He said it was up to the academic people to decide whether there should or should not be more graduate students.

Mr. Bencks said in response to Mr. Robert's comment on the traffic analysis, that the

University acknowledged that one way in and out was not enough, but was saying it wanted to encourage as much traffic as possible to use the western gateway. He said the University wanted to put together convenient ways for people to come in from the west through a network of streets. He said it was realized that people coming from the south and east wouldn't use this route.

Mr. Roberts spoke about the current back up of traffic at the Lee Traffic Circle, and there was discussion about current traffic patterns.

Mr. Pesci said it wasn't a question of one way in or one way out. He said the growth in the region was occurring increasingly north and west, and not to the east. He said while the University couldn't affect traffic at the Lee Traffic Circle, it knew cars would be coming in on Routes 4, 155 and 155A, and said this would be the primary gateway to UNH.

Chair Kelley asked whether, if that was the goal, everyone would be better served by not having McDaniel Drive attached to Mill Road, and not having a northern underpass under the railroad, noting this would physically force people to go the other way. He said this would result in a dramatic decrease in commuting traffic from UNH on Mill Road and at the intersection of Mill Road and Main Street. There was detailed discussion about this.

There was discussion about parking that was planned. Mr. Pesci noted again that only a 10% increase in parking was planned, so the traffic increase for the most part would not be coming from commuter traffic.

Mr. Pesci said the model was a tool that could be used to look at the impacts of various designs.

Chair Kelley asked if the University would share the model with the Planning Board.

Mr. Pesci said it was now a workable model, and said it behooved the University and the Town to work with it together. He also suggested that data for 155A and Route 4 should be the next thing added into the model.

Mr. Roberts said that another access to Route 125 besides the Lee Traffic Circle should be considered by the State.

Mr. Pesci said he understood this from a regional perspective, but said the University Master Plan had to work within certain limits.

Mr. Roberts said his concern was that the Master Plan limited the Town, by narrowing Main Street, and said that by pushing things to the outside to connecting roads, the University could well be making internal traffic worse.

Mr. Bencks said the University agreed this was the kind of thing that it and the Town needed to look at together.

Mr. Grant said he hoped the University would give serious thought to going far

beyond housing 60% of undergraduates in on campus housing. He said the impact of the student population in Durham far exceeds the traffic problems, and said the problems in neighborhoods, the shortage of housing, and inflated housing prices because of rental houses were bad for the fabric of the community. He said he had watched and read with some excitement the percentage of students in on campus housing at Boston colleges, and said many ran in the 80% range. He said what was planned for UNH was not enough, and said that unless there was a major increase in the percentage, Durham would be drastically change into a neighborhood ghetto for student housing.

Mr. Bencks said what had just been expressed was clearly articulated during the Master Plan process. He said the dilemma was finding the pathway for increasing student housing on campus, but said the University was moving forward aggressively with this. He noted the Plan spoke about 1700 new beds on campus, and said nothing like this had been done since the 1960s. But he said in the end it came down to money and demand.

He said even if today the University said it wanted to go to 80%, it was restricted financially from accomplishing this. He also said it didn't want to do this in a way that trapped it, noting that if the University increased housing dramatically and then there wasn't the demand for it, this would be difficult. He said these things had to be weighed, but said the desire of the community to get as many of the students as possible on campus was well understood. He noted there were many benefits to the students, including academically, from staying on campus.

Councilor Needell noted that one of the key growth areas for the University was research, and said this meant increasing staff would be needed for this kind of work. He said this connected to the housing issue, and noted the plans for the Zoning Ordinance to allow multifamily housing in the same area of Town the University was proposing for this kind of housing.

Mr. Grant said providing more housing on campus for faculty, staff and students created the best potential for reducing traffic in the community. He also said he knew from experience that the faculty development area had been a tremendous benefit in its day, and said he hoped the University would find ways to do more of this.

Mr. Campbell said creation of a University trail system was a fantastic idea, and recommended coordinating this effort with the work the Town's Parks and Recreation Committee was currently doing updating information on trails.

Mr. Campbell noted that the Campus Master Plan said that as part of the Gables housing complex, amenities such as convenience stores, etc. might be provided there if there was demand. He said as someone who was concerned about downtown business, that if this kind of development did occur, he would like to see it worked into the leases that those businesses, in fairness, should pay taxes to the Town. He said a number of downtown businesses were very concerned about this issue, and said this equity issue was something that needed to be talked about.

He also said the off campus housing/neighborhood development issue was a fantastic idea to explore. He said he was not sure Madbury Road would be ideal spot for this, from the Town's perspective, but he said the concept was something they all needed to move forward on.

Mr. Campbell said that in the discussion on large tracts of University land, and blending the living and learning environment, he didn't hear anything about conservation easements to make sure these properties stayed open, and would continue to be used for those purposes.

Mr. Bencks said this kind of discussion was taking place on campus about long term commitment to keeping the open lands open, within the time horizon of the Master Plan. He said the University had begun to look at this idea seriously in relation to the College Woods natural area, and he said there was agreement that a conservation easement should be in place there over the long term. He said they were looking at ways with the State to find a way to do this, in a way that didn't require them to get fair market value for the property. He also said there were other ways to protect the parcel and other University properties, and said he expected there would be continuing discussions on this.

Mr. Bencks said he would be happy to bring Mr. Campbell's message to the University concerning taxes on potential commercial functions at the Gables, but said he personally was not in a position to respond to this idea.

Chair Kelley noted that it was expressed at the meeting that there was a great deal of desire to work with the Town on important transportation issues, and he suggested, if this was not already happening, that the University and the Town begin to address these issues in specific work sessions.

Mr. Pesci described noted the University's current connections with the Town's Traffic Safety Committee as a way to build this effort. Mr. Bencks agreed that was a good starting place.

Mr. Roberts said the Town's only alternative, if this couldn't happen, was to fund its own traffic studies and super-impose them on the University's Master Plan.

Mr. Bencks said he saw this meeting as a first step in making the kinds of things Chair Kelley was talking about happen.

Chair Kelley said that the Campus Master Plan stated early on that the University must address critical impacts within the community. He noted that traffic and housing issues had been brought up, but also noted that the fiscal relationship between the University and the Town, was a key area that needed to be considered. He asked if other Board members had other issues they wished to bring up.

Councilor Carroll asked if there would be adults living in the new on-campus dorms with students. She noted that during the student riots, there were responsible landlords who cautioned students, and really helped them process what was going on.

Mr. Bencks said a residence director would live in the dorm to ensure there was oversight, and he provided details on this. He said he had heard this arrangement had been successful in the dorms during the period of the student riots.

In answer to a comment from Councilor Carroll, Mr. Bencks said as an aspect of the living and learning environment, the University was looking at the approach taken in some other universities, where faculty members lived in the residence halls. He noted that the logistics of moving to this would be significant, and said the University was looking to see if this could be done on a building by building basis.

Councilor Carroll spoke about the University's outdoor pool in regard to the Campus Master Plan.

Mr. Bencks said the University was looking at options on what would be done when the day came that the State made it difficult to continue to operate the pool. He said a key consideration was how to make use of it for students as well as the broader community. He provided some detail on what was planned, but noted these plans were for a time beyond the current planning horizon.

Councilor Carroll noted that the Town had a pool committee. She said the pool was an historic structure, and said that if it were an historic building, more people might rally around to protect it. She acknowledged there were some operational problems, but said the pool was a focus of community life, and had a lot to do with the quality of life in Durham. She said it was very important to have a discussion on this. She noted that University administrators who lived in Durham were sensitive to this issue, and realized the pool meant a lot to the people who went there. She also commented that before the pool had been built by the WPA, there had been a pond on the site.

Mr. Campbell asked for some details concerning water, sewer and stormwater planning issues. He also asked if the various Town and University entities involved with utilities were talking with each other enough. He said he knew there had been some disconnects on this, and said it was important that all these connections were in place.

Mr. Bencks said the details on water, sewer and stormwater planning had to come from the utilities master plan. He also said there were some things the University could do to correct the deficiencies in communication.

Mr. Grant said this had been a productive and useful discussion, and suggested it was time to draw it to a close.

Chair Kelley noted some members of the public were present who should be allowed the opportunity to speak. He thanked Mr. Bencks and Mr. Pesci, said the discussion had been informative, and said the Board looked forward to working with the University in the future.

Mr. Bencks thanked the Board for the opportunity to make the presentation.

Richard Lord, Bennett Road said he had been pleased to hear the University include the concept of stewardship of some of its natural areas, and said an area of special interest to him was Thompson's Farm. Concerning the idea of a private stewardship arrangement for some of the buildings on University properties, he asked what guarantee there was that someone who took this on would maintain the building. He said this was especially an issue with Highland House because the property had a great view of the river, and might be converted if someone saw a bigger payoff in doing so.

Mr. Lord also said that as a member of the Lamprey River Advisory Committee, he was particularly interested in a possible conservation easement for Woodman's Brook, which was an especially valuable area. He also asked Mr. Bencks about the possibility that federal funding for land grant colleges might be removed.

Mr. Bencks said he was the person to come to first concerning possible conservation easements. He also said Mr. Lord's comment on private stewardship arrangements was exactly what the University was struggling with. He said the only reason the University would sell any of these properties with farmhouses would be if someone were found who would take care of the house. He said one possible approach would be that if the owner later said the house couldn't be maintained and had to be torn down, the person would be required to sell the property back to the University. He said in this way, there would be no incentive to tear the house down.

Mr. Bencks said that the issue of possible removal of federal funding for land grant colleges, would have an enormous impact on the University, and said they would have to wait and see what happened.

Bill Hall, Smith Park Lane, said had been through this before, with the 1993 traffic plan. He said the University had only given lip-service to what was in it. He noted a key issue in the plan had been signage, and said he never saw anything on this implemented. He also said that based on the 1993 plan, the University was supposed to put parking lots on Route 108 north and south of Town, and bus people in. But he said this didn't happen, the northern connector didn't happen, and now they didn't want to talk about it. Mr. Hall also said the quoted A Levels of service at intersections in Town were a fantasy, and provided details on this.

He said he was glad that Mr. Roberts was carrying the ball on this. He said he realized the Board had part time members, but he said they were there to protect the Town, and its plans, not the plans of the University. He said the questions weren't being asked, briefings were not forthcoming at Council meetings, and the issues weren't being handled. He said it was time the Board engaged and dealt with the problems - the fire station, water, parking, traffic, access, etc. He provided details about how traffic management had been handled at recent events. He also provided some history on the Town's past dealings with the University. He said the present system wasn't working, and said he hoped the Board engaged and keyed off of what Mr. Roberts had brought up, because it was a serious issue.

5 Minute recess

Board members agreed to hear the Request for Site Plan review listed as **B. New Business** under **VI. Other Business** before having the discussion on Design Guidelines/Regulations.

Councilor Needell MOVED to amend the Agenda to hear the Request for Site Plan review listed as B. New Business under VI. Other Business before having the discussion on Design Guidelines/Regulations. The motion was SECONDED by Kevin Webb, and PASSED unanimously.

VI. Other Business

A. Old Business

B. New Business: Request for Site Plan Review before the Technical Review Committee by Ray Donner, 13 Jenkins court, Map 2, Lot 14-3.

Mr. Donner, the applicant said he wished to divide the current space that Benjamin's Restaurant occupied into three separate spaces. He provided details on the proposed layout of the spaces, their utilities, and how the utilities would be paid each month.

Mr. Roberts noted that the Planning Board was in the process or considering architectural design standards for the Town, and said there was something to be gained by having a cohesive downtown environment that had architectural class. He said Dover was a good example of this, and said this didn't necessarily require spending a lot of money.

Mr. Donner said he felt he had improved his building dramatically already, and provided details on this. He said it was a great building, and noted it had been a theatre at one time. He said he would be happy to work with the Board on architectural design ideas, but noted that the change he was proposing would not impact the outside of the building, so wouldn't be something the Technical Review Committee would be looking at.

Mr. Roberts said he was sure that the technical details concerning the application would be fine, but said his question was regarding the aesthetics. He said he saw other communities around the country paying more attention than Durham to these details.

Councilor Needell asked about access to Section C of the building, and there was discussion about this.

Mr. Donner noted he might want to put a window in Section C, and said he had hired an architect to consider design ideas to bring more light into the building.

In answer to a question from Mr. Isaak about egress for the units on the building, Mr. Donner said Section C had front and back egress. He said Section B had three

doors, and said Section A had a front door plus another door that went out to the alleyway. He said the building more than met the egress requirements.

There was detailed discussion on this. There was also discussion on access to the building for deliveries.

Mr. Campbell noted Mr. Johnson had gone through all of this carefully.

There was discussion on the dumpsters for the building.

Councilor Carroll asked if the new tenants knew about recycling in Town, and there was discussion about this. Mr. Donner said he would ultimately be responsible for making sure this happened.

Councilor Carroll said there were many responsible landlords in Durham that kept up with recycling, and said it was good to hear a business owner say he would also do this.

***Kevin Webb MOVED to pass the Application for site plan review by Ray Donner, 13 Jenkins Court, Map 2, Lot 14-3 up to the Technical Review Committee for review and approval at the _____
COULDN'T HEAR. Nick Isaak SECONDED the motion.***

Councilor Needell asked what the Board's options were if this motion was denied.

Mr. Campbell said it would have to go to the full Planning Board, with full site plan review, public hearings, etc.

Councilor Needell asked whether, if Mr. Donner were unable to come to agreement with the Technical Review Committee, he could come back to the full Planning Board.

Mr. Campbell said he could.

Mr. Webb confirmed that all the proposed uses were permitted uses in that District..

Mr. Roberts said this was something the Planning Board should pay more attention to, and said an expedited site plan review process could be held in order to have some influence in terms of design consistency and downtown improvements.

Councilor Needell said he didn't disagree with Mr. Roberts concerns, but said except for the window, there would be no exterior effect of this application.

Mr. Roberts said he didn't know that, and said that when the Planning Board used to do site inspections, sometimes things popped out that needed to be considered.

He said he thought the Board had done a better job that way in coordinating retail development in Town.

Councilor Needell asked what criteria the Technical Review Committee used in reviewing applications.

Mr. Campbell said it used the same regulations the Planning Board used., and the same process, although it was expedited somewhat.

Chair Kelley said the applicant would like to get going with the improvements to his buildings, and asked if him whether, when it came time to make the improvements to the outside of the building, including the window, he would consider coming before the Board regarding those matters.

Mr. Donner said that going through the entire Planning Board would mean he would lose a lot of money. He said the building where the window was planned wouldn't be occupied until August 1st, so there would be no exterior changes until then.

Mr. Campbell said he wouldn't want to put Mr. Donner through full site plan review for that, but said perhaps the Board could do a conceptual or design review phase, and agree on something for exterior improvements.

Mr. Donner said he wanted to match the other windows, and could present what he had in mind to the Board. He said he didn't think this would delay prospective tenants from moving in.

Chair Kelley asked Mr. Campbell if there was a way to address both Mr. Roberts concerns and Mr. Donner's concerns.

Mr. Campbell said this could be handled at the Technical Review Committee level, or Mr. Donner could come before the Planning Board or design review concerning the window.

Mr. Grant said the Board didn't have the design guidelines in place yet, and said as Mr. Roberts had noted, some conversation and persuasion might have an impact. But he said he didn't see, if there were not major changes, that the Board had much of a role. He said that in fairness to the property owner, the Board should pass this application on to the Technical Review Committee. He said he got the impression that if there were some design changes, the applicant would come in and talk about this with the Board.

Councilor Needell asked if with the new Zoning Ordinance, there were design standards for this district.

Mr. Campbell said there were, but said most of them would apply to new buildings. He read through these design standards.

Councilor Needell said since the Zoning Ordinance had been posted, the provisions in it would apply, and the Board would be using it for guidance.

Mr. Isaak said signage was the most critical part, and he encouraged a smaller, hung sign for the building, similar to what Youngs Restaurant had. He noted that if there were a face sign, it would be hard to see from Main Street.

Mr. Donner spoke about sign issues and design ideas concerning his building, and there was discussion about this.

The motion PASSED, with Steve Roberts voting against it.

- VI. **Design Guidelines/Regulations** - The Planning Board will be discussing the possibility of creating Design Guidelines/Regulations.

Mr. Campbell said there would be a continuation of the public hearing concerning the Irving applications at the June 8th meeting. He also said there would be discussion with Judith Spang at that meeting concerning the issue of Oyster River dredging. It was agreed that the discussion on the Design Guidelines/Regulations would be discussed that evening.

Arthur Grant MOVED to adjourn the meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Kevin Webb and PASSED unanimously.

Adjournment at 9:55 pm

W. Arthur Grant, Secretary