

D-R-A-F-T

**DURHAM PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2006
TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, DURHAM TOWN HALL
7:00 PM**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Richard Kelley; Arthur Grant; Stephen Roberts; Richard Ozenich; Councilor Needell; Bill McGowan; Lorne Parnell

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Susan Fuller; Annmarie Harris; Councilor Carroll

MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Agenda

Steve Roberts MOVED to approve the Agenda as presented. Councilor Needell SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.

III. Report of the Planner

- Mr. Campbell said he had met with University planner Doug Bencks, and said they had discussed the proposed gas pipeline from Rochester to the University's co-generation plant. He said he would provide Board members with a memo on this issue, and said he, Mr. Lynch and Administrator Selig would be meeting with University people on it. He explained that the Planning Board would need to have a hearing on this, also noting that because wetlands permits would be involved, the project would go before the Conservation as well.
- Mr. Campbell said he and Mr. Bencks had also discussed traffic modeling related to the transportation study the Town would be doing.
- He said he and Mr. Lynch would be meeting with the Main Street Enhancements Committee the following day, and he provided details on this project.
- He said the Housing taskforce would meeting the following day, and said Board members and members of the public were all invited to attend.
- Mr. Campbell said that Steve Lamb was now the owner of Highland House, and said there had been discussion on converting the property back to an inn, which was one of its historic uses. He said he would update the Board on this soon.

- Mr. Campbell said the next meeting of the Zoning Rewrite committee would be held the following Wednesday, at 7 pm.

Councilor Carroll passed out copies of a publication concerning “College Woods” to Board members, explaining that there were a number of people who were very concerned about the preservation of this area, which in many ways served as a classroom for the University as part of natural resources management courses. She said a conservation easement had recently been placed on 64 acres of this area, and said the goal was to extend this easement for the other 292 acres of College Woods. She noted that the University of New Hampshire owned a lot of open lands in Durham, and that this was the first conservation easement on that land.

- IV. Continued Public Hearing on a Site Plan Application** submitted by Joseph Caldarola, Portsmouth, New Hampshire for the building of 21 multi-family units of elderly housing. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 10, Lot 7-0, is located at the corner of Bagdad Road and Canney Road and is in the Residential B Zoning District. (The applicant has requested that this application be postponed until December 13, 2006.)

Mr. McGowan noted that the applicant had also has granted us 60 day extension

Arthur Grant MOVED to continue the public hearing on a Site Plan Application submitted by Joseph Caldarola, Portsmouth, New Hampshire for the building of 21 multi-family units of elderly housing to the Dec 13th 2006 meeting, at the request of the applicant. Bill McGowan SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.

- IV. Acceptance Consideration on a Site Plan Application and a Subdivision Application** submitted by Cuthartes Private Investments, Boston, Massachusetts, on behalf of Stonemark Management Co. Inc., Stratham, New Hampshire to build a 78-unit, age-restricted condominium development. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 1, Lot 6-8, is located at 97-99 Madbury Road and is in the Residential A Zoning District.

Jack Farrell provided an update to the Board concerning the proposed project. He said there had been additional meetings with the abutters, and said headway was being made in terms of finding ways to mitigate impacts on them from the development. He said there had also been meetings with Durham department heads, and said some good ideas had been obtained, some of which he expected would be incorporated into the plans for the project. He said these ideas pertained to drainage issues, and ways to limit stormwater runoff.

Mr. Farrell said he believed the Board had been provided with a complete application. He said the architectural and landscaping details would be provided the evening of the public hearing on the application in December.

Mr. Parnell noted that there would be 78 units, and he asked how many residents, and how many vehicles that would entail.

Mr. Farrell said it was expected there would be 1-2 people per unit, and said they might have 2 cars. He noted that the development would exceed the parking requirements.

Mr. Parnell asked how parking would be handled if there were more cars than the site could handle. There was discussion that one space per unit would be provided, and that there would not be enough parking if there were 2 cars for each unit.

Mr. Farrell explained that there would be about 30 more parking spaces available in the garage, which owners could be chosen by the owners. He said visitors could park beyond the development, and he said from past experience, there seemed to be adequate parking.

Mr. McGowan asked if there would be a summary of the meetings with the abutters.

Mr. Farrell said he expected to bring this information to the Board as they got into the details of each aspect of the plan. He said those working on the project had tried to go as far as possible to see what issues might be of concern for the particular homes in the area, and said this information would be presented during the landscaping portion of the site plan review process.

Councilor Needell asked if the sketches that were developed could be shared with the Planning Board, and Mr. Farrell said they could be.

Board members agreed they would also like to be able to see elevations, site lines etc.

Councilor Carroll noted that 12 acres of the parcel would be set aside as conservation land, and asked if the neighbors would have access to it.

Mr. Farrell said the land wouldn't be posted, but he said access wouldn't be encouraged either, noting the land would not be set up as a park, etc. He said what was proposed for this acreage was consistent with conservation goals.

There was detailed discussion on this issue.

Councilor Carroll asked if forestry or agriculture, such as vegetable gardens, would be permitted on the conservation land, and Mr. Farrell said the land would be left in a natural state.

Ms. Harris suggested that vegetable gardens should be allowed there.

Mr. Farrell agreed they probably should be allowed, noting there was some open land that certainly could be cultivated. He said they would look into that idea.

There was discussion on the handicap accessibility issue, if the land was improved and was used in part for gardens. It was agreed they would have to check with Code Administrator/Enforcer Tom Johnson on this.

There was discussion that the road for the development would be built to Town standards, but would be owned and maintained by the condominium association.

Mr. Ozenich said almost 50% of residents at Fitts Farm had 2 cars, and said it seemed that people at this development as well would want to have the option of having 2 cars, especially because this would be an upscale development, and residents would be in the 55 plus age category.

Mr. Farrell said he would take another look at this issue.

In answer to a question from Ms. Fuller concerning the 30 parking spaces in the garage, Mr. Farrell said they would be purchased by residents who wanted them. Ms. Fuller asked what the expected market value of the condominium units would be, and Mr. Farrell said it was expected that they would go for \$300,000 and up.

Ms. Fuller said she saw a possible problem between this development and the neighborhood, in terms of people from the neighborhood walking their dogs on the conservation land. She said she thought this would need to be addressed, so the neighbors would have some right to use the common land.

Mr. Farrell said this would be discussed with the developers.

There was additional discussion by the Board on this issue.

Mr. Campbell noted that if smaller parking spaces were designed, some additional spaces could be fit in on the site.

Councilor Needell asked if the proposed driveway would be wide enough to fit some parking spaces.

Mr. Farrell said it would be 22 ft. wide, so would marginally provide room for some spaces. He said this would probably work for overflow parking when there were parties.

Councilor Carroll spoke about the issue of the cost of housing in Durham, and the need for more moderately priced housing. She asked whether, with 78 units planned, there could at least be a few units that would be more moderately priced.

Mr. Farrell said he appreciate the interest in this, but said prices were what they were, and reflected the cost of construction, and the realities of the market. He said in order to have more affordable housing in Durham, the Zoning Ordinance needed to encourage it or require it, through incentives, etc. He said the market would then respond to that.

Councilor Carroll said it would be wonderful if developers like Mr. Farrell would talk about these things with Mr. Campbell. She noted a subdivision development in Exeter that included affordable housing units, and said one couldn't tell them from the rest of the housing units. She also noted that the Zoning Ordinance had changed, in terms of allowing more elderly housing, and that developers were able to put in more units on a given site, so there were incentives in place.

There was discussion about this.

Mr. Farrell said the Zoning Ordinance still needed to be more specific concerning affordable housing, in order for this kind of housing to be built. He noted that the value of the land reflected the

Zoning Ordinance. He said he would be happy to work with Board on affordable housing approaches in the Zoning Ordinance.

Councilor Needell asked whether once the public hearing closed and the Board began deliberations, the public would get another chance to comment, if changes were made to the site plan/subdivision plan.

Mr. Farrell suggested that the public hearing could be continued in order to accommodate this.

Councilor Carroll said she applauded the developers for including plans for recycling along with trash pickup, noting that currently on private ways in Durham, there was no Town pickup of recyclables. She asked that these plans for recycling be noted in the conditions of approval, and also said it would make it easier for the condominium association if this was clear up front. She said these things would help develop good feelings with the community.

Mr. Farrell agreed this should be done.

Chair Kelley noted that a sidewalk was proposed on the right side, looking up the driveway.

Mr. Farrell said this was one of the things that was discussed with the department heads, and said what came out of this was that the sidewalk should be put on the other side, for drainage reasons. There was discussion about this.

Chair Kelley asked if the existing house on the site, where the detention pond was proposed, had a basement, and was told it did.

Mr. Farrell noted that the drainage plan had been changed significantly since his meeting with department heads. He provided some detail on this.

Chair Kelley said his concern had been possible infiltration into the detention pond, if it was dug in that area.

Mr. Farrell said Mr. Cedarholm had suggested that pervious pavement be used, which would eliminate most of the drainage issues by allowing groundwater recharge. He said groundwater absorption areas could also be developed under the parking area and some of the landscaped areas, and he provided additional details on this. He said these things would eliminate the need for offsite treatment or retention on the site.

There was discussion about the University's test site concerning pervious pavement.

There was discussion that technical review of the site plans would be postponed until the December Board meeting.

Mr. Grant asked if the application was complete.

Mr. Campbell said it was complete enough so that it was appropriate for the Board to accept it, keeping in mind that there would be some things that would be added to the plan that would not affect that acceptance.

Arthur Grant MOVED to accept the Site Plan Application and a Subdivision Application submitted by Cuthartes Private Investments, Boston, Massachusetts, on behalf of Stonemark Management Co. Inc., Stratham, New Hampshire to build a 78-unit, age-restricted condominium development on Tax Map 1, Lot 6-8, is located at 97-99 Madbury Road, in the Residential A Zoning District, and to schedule a public hearing on Dec 13th, 2006 at which time the Planning Board would hear from the applicant regarding engineering, landscaping and architecture. Richard Ozenich SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.

Councilor Needell noted that one of the things the applicant was asking for was a higher building that was spelled out in the regulations. He asked if there was some way this height could be demonstrated during the site walk.

There was discussion about this, and Mr. Farrell said he would try to provide something on this.

It was agreed there would be a site walk on Dec 9th, at 10 am, and that additional site walks could be scheduled if needed.

VI. Public Hearing on amendments to the Historic Overlay District, Article XVII, Sections 175-90 through 175-98 of the Durham Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Campbell explained that Councilor Peter Smith had suggested some changes needed to be made to the Ordinance before it was approved. Mr. Campbell said most of these changes had been made, and said some editorial changes suggested by Councilor Julian Smith had also been made. He said the Ordinance had gone back to the Historic District Commission (HDC), and noted that the HDC didn't want to make one of the changes suggested by Councilor Peter Smith. He said the Planning Board had agreed with the HDC on this.

Chair Kelley explained that a change recommended by Councilor Peter Smith that the Board did not endorse was the proposed location for the language on the powers and duties of the Heritage Commission. It was also noted that Councilor Peter Smith had suggested taking out the wording “..from a public way..”, under B 4, but it was decided to keep it in.

Bill McGowan MOVED to open the public hearing on the amendments to the Historic Overlay District, Article XVII, Sections 175-90 through 175-98 of the Durham Zoning Ordinance. Richard Ozenich SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.

Arthur Grant MOVED to close the public hearing. Bill McGowan SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.

Arthur Grant MOVED that the Planning Board forward to the Town Council the proposed Amendments to the Historic Overlay District, Article XVII, Sections 175-90 through 175-98 of the

Durham Zoning Ordinance, as revised on Oct 3, 2006. Steve Roberts SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.

VII. Public Hearing on amendments to the following Sections of the Durham Zoning Ordinance regarding Forestry/Timber Harvesting: Article II, Section 175-7, Definitions; Article XIII, Sections 175-60, 175-61, 175-65, Wetland Conservation Overlay District; Article XIV, Sections 175-69, 175-71, 175-72, 175-75.1(A&C), Shoreland Protection Overlay District; Article XX, Sections 175-109(L), Performance Standards; and Article XII, Section 175-54, Zone Requirements.

Mr. Campbell provided some background on the reason for the proposed amendments, explaining that at the time the Town Council had approved the revised Zoning Ordinance, including the overlay districts, some landowners had expressed concern about some of the provisions related to forestry and timber harvesting. He said that since that time, there had been several discussions with foresters, wetlands experts and others who had discussed how perhaps the Ordinance could be improved concerning these issues.

He said one recommendation was to use the broader term of “forestry”, instead of “timber harvesting”, and said this change had been made to the following sections of the Ordinance.

- Article II Definitions section
- 175-65 Performance Standards in the WCO District;
- 175-75.1 Performance Standards in the SPO District;
- Article XX Performance Standards; and
- Table of Uses.

Mr. Campbell said another change was to make forestry a permitted use in the Wetlands Conservation Ordinance district and the Shoreland Protection Overlay district, noting it had previously been listed as a conditional use in these districts.

He also said the performance standards for the WCO and SPO Districts, as well as in Article XX, had been revised to reflect the fact that forestry must be done using best management practices set forth in the most recent best management practices manuals. He noted that it was only in the SPO district where the language had been kept that forestry must be done by a licensed forester, and that this requirement was not included for the WCO district and other districts.

Mr. Campbell also said the language in 175-69, Purpose (of the SPO District), had been changed, to read “The Shoreland Protection Overlay District is an overlay district intended to protect the quality of the Town’s surface waters, in order to promote public health and safety, maintain wildlife habitat, and conserve and protect shoreline and upland resources. This is accomplished by maintaining and enhancing natural forests and shoreland habitat and buffers. (Underlined portion was new wording)

Mr. Campbell outlined some additional changes to the Ordinance concerning forestry/timber harvesting.

Arthur Grant MOVED to open the public hearing on amendments to the following Sections of the Durham Zoning Ordinance regarding Forestry/Timber Harvesting: Article II, Section 175-7, Definitions; Article XIII, Sections 175-60, 175-61, 175-65, Wetland Conservation Overlay

District; Article XIV, Sections 175-69, 175-71, 175-72, 175-75.1(A&C), Shoreland Protection Overlay District; Article XX, Sections 175-109(L), Performance Standards; and Article XII, Section 175-54, Zone Requirements. Councilor Needell SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.

Edward McNitt, Durham Point Road, said that overall, he thought that including the procedures from the forestry experts was a big step forward. He said he had one remaining question. He noted that initially, there was a provision that forestry could not be done within a certain distance of property lines.

Mr. Campbell said all references in the Zoning Ordinance to forestry not being allowed within 100 ft of any property line had been removed.

Bill Hall said he hoped properties could be managed to deal with dead trees along the riverbanks, before they fell into the water.

There was discussion that this was covered under 175-60 A. 5.

Rob Keefe, 59 Piscataqua Road, thanked the Planning Board and others for the time that had been spent developing these amendments, stating that it was important that the Ordinance be clarified concerning forestry. He said there were in fact people in Durham who practiced forestry, and noted that forest management was pretty common on conservation easement properties.

Chair Kelley said this process of reviewing the Ordinance concerning forestry had been very positive, and said he had learned a lot from it.

There was discussion that it would be a good idea if the Board visited Doe Farm with a forester, to get a better idea of what good forest management was all about.

Mr. Keefe noted that UNH Cooperative Extension had an excellent web site that provided various kinds of information on forest management.

Councilor Carroll suggested that the Board could hear back from the forestry community in the future regarding how the Ordinance changes concerning forestry were working.

The Board thanked Mr. O'Keefe for his input on this issue.

Don Quiggly, Professor of Forestry, Thompson School of Applied Science, commended the Planning Board and the Town for its commitment to work on this issue, on behalf of licensed foresters, the NH Timberland Owners Association, and others. He said he thought the Ordinance, as revised, would work well.

Chair Kelley said he was interested in expanding forest management in Durham, noting that there was a lot of conservation land in Durham. He noted that Mr. Quiggly had offered to meet with some of the owners of this land, and said he hoped that offer still stood.

Mr. Hall said he would also like the Town to take a leadership role concerning forestry, noting that there was timber at Doe Farm that should be cut. He also said there were 136 acres of forestland behind the solid waste facility that could be cut, and said this could make the Town some money. He said there was also an area across from Jackson's Landing, and 40 acres north of Wagon Hill, where timber could be harvested.

Councilor Carroll asked what the next step would be, if the Planning Board wanted to move forward with something like this, and there was discussion that a recommendation from the Board would go to the Town Council. Councilor Carroll said this sounded like a good project.

Chair Kelley said perhaps the Board could do something concerning this within the next few months.

Arthur Grant MOVED to close the public hearing. Richard Ozenich SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.

Arthur Grant MOVED to forward to the Town Council the Amendments, updated on Oct 5 2006, to the following Sections of the Durham Zoning Ordinance regarding Forestry/Timber Harvesting: Article II, Section 175-7, Definitions; Article XIII, Sections 175-60, 175-61, 175-65, Wetland Conservation Overlay District; Article XIV, Sections 175-69, 175-71, 175-72, 175-75.1(A&C), Shoreland Protection Overlay District; Article XX, Sections 175-109(L), Performance Standards; and Article XII, Section 175-54, Zone Requirements. Bill McGowan SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.

VIII. Other Business

A. Old Business:

Mr. Campbell noted that the Town Council had approved Lorne Parnell as a regular Planning Board member, so he would be moving up from his previous alternate position.

Mr. Ozenich said that regarding the 99 Madbury Road property, he saw that there were two discrete pieces of land involved.

Mr. Campbell said the Town Attorney had determined that for Zoning purposes, the property could be considered as one piece of land.

There was detailed discussion about this.

Richard Ozenich said he didn't see this as following the Town's conservation subdivision regulations.

Chair Kelley suggested that Mr. Ozenich ask the applicant about this.

Councilor Carroll said the way the Zoning Ordinance used to be, one unit of housing could be built on a half acre in the RA district, and on about an acre in the RB district. She said perhaps that house would cost 400,000. She said with the new Zoning Ordinance, a developer could build 3 one

bedroom units of elderly housing on the half acre in the RA district, or on the acre in the RB district, and charge \$300,000 per unit. She said the developer now had the opportunity to make \$900,000 on a unit of land vs. \$400,000.

Ms. Fuller described some of the costs involved in doing multi-unit development, for example having to build 3 kitchens vs. 1 kitchen, etc. She said it did cost more to build all of these units in one building. She also said there were land associated costs, such as blasting, and other costs associated with doing multi-unit development.

Mr. Roberts said he had seen a development like what Stonemark was proposing in Colorado, and said the Town wanted this to encourage downtown density. He said the question was whether Durham wanted a walkable community, wanted density in the core of Town, and how could this be done if the Town did want it. He said he had observed that throughout the country, towns were trying to get density that was acceptable to residents, and achieved more than just providing cash flow to the builders.

Councilor Carroll said her point had been that the cost differential was still sufficient so that there was an incentive to build multi-unit elderly housing.

There was further discussion about the costs and benefits of building multi-unit housing, as compared to single-family housing.

There was discussion as to whether there should be an initiative to address affordable housing. Chair Kelley said if the Planning Board had the will to address this, then this issue should be added to the Zoning rewrite hit list.

Ms. Harris said part of the problem in Durham was that affordable housing could turn into student housing. She said with the density bonus for 55 plus housing, it should be possible to request that the developer provide a portion of the 55 plus housing that was more affordable.

Mr. Campbell provided details on his discussions with developers concerning affordable housing issues. He said the Board needed to stand up and say the Town needed affordable housing, and to move forward concerning this.

Ms. Harris said age restricted affordable housing might be an easier fix for the problem and said there perhaps could be a range of prices for this kind of housing.

Mr. Roberts noted an email he had received from someone in Bedford about frustration that town was having in trying to address the affordable housing issue.

Ms. Fuller said the Board could perhaps come up with guidelines or a formula for developers to look at.

There was a detailed discussion about the fact that affordability was a relative thing, and that while \$250,000 for a house might seem affordable for Durham, it was still not a price for true workforce housing.

Mr. Grant said a reality for Durham was that land was assessed at \$75,000 an acre. He said with a house that was then \$250,000, someone had to pay \$500 a week for taxes. He said affordability for Durham wasn't workforce housing, it was a somewhat cheaper affordable housing for perhaps an elderly person in Town.

Chair Kelley said in order to truly do affordable housing, the Town needed to either increase the tax base or lower the budget, in order to bring taxes down.

Mr. Grant said his suggestion was that the Town should get the University to build dorms for its students. He said this would decrease the price pressures on housing, and said there would then be a crop of buildings in the community that could be used for affordable housing.

Chair Kelley said he would like to see private development of this housing, because the Town could then get tax benefits from it. He noted areas of Town, - the OR District and the Technology drive area, where this could have happened, but had not happened.

Councilor Needell said for a multi-unit age restricted development, if within 10-15 years there was a demographics change and there was not the same kind of demand for age restricted housing, there would be tremendous pressure to change this restriction. He said the question was whether the Planning Board was comfortable with this, and whether this was good policy. He noted that some people had asked him this question.

Ms. Harris said she thought the deed would prevent this from happening.

Councilor Needell said there could be a way out of this, with the approval of the condominium association and the Town Council.

Ms. Fuller said she didn't think the demographics made this a likely problem, for quite some time to come.

Mr. Roberts said that out west, elderly residents deliberately avoided elderly housing, and preferred living with a mix of age groups.

Mr. Campbell said the Zoning Ordinance could make the amount of elderly housing the Town allowed to a percentage of the housing stock. He noted he had done some research on this, and had found percentages of 10-20%.

Councilor Needell said one of the side effects of the Zoning change concerning elderly housing was that there was now an incentive to convert single family home to elderly housing, because one could put 2-3 houses on one property, which was essentially converting the RB District to the RA District, in terms of density.

Ms. Fuller asked what the percentage of elderly housing in Town would be if the currently proposed projects were approved, and Mr. Campbell said it would be 7-8%.

Councilor Carroll said the only applications coming before the Board were elderly housing developments. She said if the Board was really interested in moderately priced housing, they needed

to look at how moderately priced elderly housing could be put together. She saw this as an opportunity to look at some options. She also asked that in looking at workforce, moderately priced housing, they needed to think about whether they wanted this kind of housing in various parts of Town, not just in one area.

Mr. Grant said the best approach was for Councilor Carroll and Councilor Needell to convince the University that it should proceed with its faculty/staff housing community, and on its land, pay taxes. He said the community would absorb the cost of having children in the schools. He said that the Town didn't really have much land available for this kind of development.

B. New Business: Brief Discussion on Density and Professional Property Management

Mr. Campbell provided background on this issue, and the committee that had been meeting to discuss it. He said one of the things that had come out of this was that perhaps greater densities could be allowed for properties where there was professional management. He said a goal was also to provide incentives to get professional property management on properties that were not currently professionally managed.

He described some of the criteria and performance standards the landlords might have to meet concerning this.

Ms. Harris suggested they speak about the density issue before discussing the details of the initiative.

There was discussion that one of the purposes of this initiative was to encourage re-development downtown, by providing density incentives to developers.

Mr. Campbell noted that one of the things the Committee was trying to get at were single-family homes with student rentals in them that were not currently professionally managed.

There was detailed discussion that any changes concerning this would mean there would be a significant change to the three unrelated issue. It was suggested that perhaps the Committee should speak to the Board concerning these possible changes.

Chair Kelley said he endorsed this approach in that it encouraged redevelopment downtown. Ms. Harris asked how this initiative would contribute to the character of the downtown area, especially for building that were next to existing neighborhoods. She said even though these properties were professionally managed, there was still an impact from them because of the number of visitors, and nighttime activity.

Ms. Fuller said the Committees' thought was that there were curfews and other rules that accompanied these kinds of units.

Ms. Harris asked how this kind of thing would be enforced.

Mr. Campbell said landlords like Paul Berton did inspections, and when they saw problems, took care of them.

Ms. Fuller said the Committee discussions had indicated that the problem properties were the mom and pop buildings that were not managed properly. There was discussion about this.

Ms. Harris said she was not sure there was a significant need for increasing density, and density relative to the neighborhoods. She also spoke about the recent softer market for student housing, and there was discussion about this.

Mr. Grant said he supported an increase in density for the commercial downtown core, but he noted that the wording the Committee had provided referred to single family housing dwellings in that area. He questioned whether there were any such dwellings in this area of Town.

There was detailed discussion about this, and about which districts the performance standards should be directed to and written for. There was additional discussion about other recommendations in the document provided by the Committee.

Mr. Campbell noted that it would take a while to refine these recommendations.

Chair Kelley suggested that the Committee could meet with the Planning Board concerning these recommendations if it wanted to.

C. Next meeting of the Board: December 13, 2006 (Only meeting in December)

IX. Approval of Minutes – October 11, 2006

Page 1 – It should be noted that Ms. Harris and Ms. Fuller were not present at the meeting, and that Mr. Roberts was present.

Page 2 should say that Mr. Ozenich recused himself from the discussion on the Caldarola application.

Richard Ozenich MOVED to approve the October 11, 2006 Minutes as amended. Bill McGowan SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.

X. Adjournment

Arthur Grant MOVED to adjourn the meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Richard Ozenich, and PASSED unanimously 7-0.

Adjournment at _____

W. Arthur Grant, Planning Board Secretary