

These minutes were approved at the November 10, 2010 meeting.

**Durham Planning Board
Wednesday September 29, 2010
Durham Town Hall - Council Chambers
7:00 P.M.
MINUTES**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chair Susan Fuller; Secretary Stephen Roberts; Richard Kelley; Town Council representative Julian Smith; alternate Wayne Lewis; alternate Peter Wolfe

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chair Lorne Parnell; Richard Ozenich; Bill McGowan; alternate Town Council representative Bill Cote

I. Call to Order

Ms. Fuller replaced Mr. Parnell as Chair for the meeting in his absence, and called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm. She said Mr. Wolfe would vote in place of Mr. Ozenich, and Mr. Lewis would vote in place of Mr. McGowan.

II. Approval of Agenda

Councilor Smith MOVED to approve the Agenda. Wayne Lewis SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 5-0. (Mr. Kelley was at the meeting but had left the room briefly.)

III. CIP – Discussion with Todd Selig, Town Administrator, Gail Jablonski, Town Finance Manager, and Mike Lynch, Director of Public Works

Ms. Jablonski provided an overview of the CIP. She noted that DPW Director Mike Lynch had gone through the DPW projects at the previous Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Roberts noted the presentation by Paul Currier from NHDES to the Bellamy and Oyster River group, asking that regulations be put in place on septic tank inspections, which would take some heat off having to do wastewater treatment system upgrades for nitrogen removal. He said Mr. Currier was then very circumspect, and doubted that any septic tank would not eventually put nitrogen into the ground, and said DES would like towns to take an advocate position on sewer extensions as part of their planning. He asked what was in the CIP regarding sewer extensions.

Mr. Lynch said there were no sewer and water extensions in the CIP, but noted there were some plans out there such as the design for the Woodridge development. He noted that if there were a significant number of failed septic systems there, they would start to consider an extension of the sewer line out Mill Road. But he said this didn't warrant a capital expenditure yet. He said it was a tricky area because of the railroad tracks and other issues.

He said the immediate concern was taking care of the existing sewer infrastructure, and noted that the system was at the point where things were aging. He said there was still a lot of clay pipe, and said the focus now was on repair of the pipes in order to allow better flows at the West end and other areas. He noted that inflow and infiltration were still big issues.

Mr. Lynch also noted an issue with the water system that was uncovered when the Dover Road pump station was done. He said it was found that a lot of pumping velocity was being lost because of friction in the pipes, which meant that the pump had to work harder to get water to the treatment plant. He said DPW was working on correcting these kinds of deficiencies.

He explained that DPW worked with developers to see if as part of their projects, they could extend the sewer system. He noted the Sophie Lane conservation subdivision project as an example of this.

Mr. Campbell said the wastewater infrastructure was also extended as part of Perry Bryant's student housing project on Mast Road.

Mr. Roberts said at the workforce housing meeting the previous evening, there was discussion on areas of Town where the Planning Board would want to concentrate on in terms of being convenient for locating water and sewer lines.

Mr. Lynch said that was the answer in an ideal world, but he noted that this would mean there would be greater loading at the wastewater treatment plant. He said it was a balancing act.

Councilor Smith noted the approximately \$250,000 in the CIP for reconstruction of Wiswall Road. He said the road near the Wiswall Bridge was narrow, and asked if there was any plan to improve the road surface there but also stop it from being a raceway. He said right now, the state of the road resulted in calming traffic, and said he liked this although some other residents did not. He asked if any thought had been given as to how to prevent a new road surface from encouraging speeding there.

Mr. Lynch said yes. He noted that at the last Planning Board meeting, Administrator Selig had spoken about the idea of some alternative road programming, and as part of this, was interested in returning Wiswall Road to a gravel road in lieu of this project as an ultimate traffic calming method. He provided details on this. He said the good news on that road was that the houses were set back quite a ways. He said Wiswall Road was a candidate for this because it was not a major connector road like Mill Road.

Councilor Smith said that was until Packers Falls Road and Newmarket Road were flooded, when Wiswall Road suddenly became a major route.

Mr. Lynch noted that there were flooding mitigation projects in the CIP for

Longmarsh Road and Bennett Road, and said the State was also applying for mitigation money for the Hamel Brook, and was talking about doing a 70 ft bridge over the brook. He said hopefully the traffic detouring Councilor Smith had referred to would soon go away.

Mr. Lynch spoke about the concept of speed tables as a way to do traffic calming, and said there had been a meeting the previous Friday with neighbors in the area of Edgewood Road about testing a speed table there.

Chair Fuller asked whether if Wiswall Road was turned back into a gravel road, this would save money.

Mr. Lynch said yes, and said it would reduce the cost to about \$95,000. But he said maintenance work, grading, etc, would then need to be done on the road. He said the Town had sold its road grader several years ago and had contracted out those services. He said if another road like Wiswall Road was made into a gravel road, this would change things. But he said the DPW could make it work.

He explained that traffic calming measures like curbs wouldn't work on Wiswall Road, and also noted the stone walls there. He said this location would be a perfect candidate for a speed table, along with the bridge in order to get some traffic calming. He said the pavement could also be kept narrow.

Mr. Lynch said DPW was also involved in conversations about widening roads in order to allow bike lanes. He said they were trying to balance these things out.

Mr. Roberts asked about maintenance of gravel roads in the winter.

Mr. Lynch said the goal was to keep gravel roads frozen so plowing could be done. He said they were limited to using sand, because salt would thaw the road, and said this meant that Wiswall Road would have about a 4 month mud season, which would be a real challenge. He explained that there was a special truck that used a special mix of sand, with no salt, for gravel roads. He said unfortunately, the gravel roads in Town were somewhat spread out, but he said this was still doable.

Mr. Kelley asked Mr. Lynch to discuss how road projects were prioritized each year. He said higher priority projects sometimes appeared out of the blue, despite what had been planned in the CIP. He noted the Wiswall Road reconstruction, the work on Morgan Way, and the Crommets Creek bridge repair as examples of this.

Mr. Lynch provided details on why these projects had become higher priorities. In regard to the Crommets Creek bridge, he said it was a red listed bridge according to the State, and said because State bridge aid was starting to dwindle, it was therefore decided that it was important to make it a higher priority project. He provided details on this.

Mr. Kelley noted that the Main Street Railroad Bridge rehabilitation project was listed as 4th last year, but was now ranked 14th.

Mr. Lynch said the State's Bridge Division had stopped by and hadn't seen any problems with the bridge that were of immediate concern. He explained that this year's list had more items on it, and said it was felt that this project could drop down further on it. But he said if there was enough money, all the projects needed to be done.

He said the Street Lighting upgrades, which were ranked #3, were paid for by Federal Stimulus funds through a grant program. He said the Town was partnering with UNH to replace the existing metal halide lighting fixtures with more energy efficient and cost efficient lighting. He provided details on this, and said the new fixtures would have a 15-16 year life expectancy. He said there would be no impact on the tax base in doing these upgrades.

Mr. Kelley said he had spoken with Town Engineer Dave Cedarholm about the fact that this lighting technology was rather new. He noted that he had spoken with the Boston/Cambridge city electrician about this, who said they weren't sold on the technology yet. He also said while the lighting was advertised as lasting 15-16 years, it was only guaranteed for 3 years.

Mr. Lynch said lighting companies had jumped at the idea of this technology, and felt that it was the future. But he agreed that the long term viability of the technology was yet to be seen. He noted that the LID lighting was softer than the existing lighting in the Main Street corridor. He said this was the Town's attempt to try to be on the cutting edge of new technology, especially if there were cost savings involved. He provided details on what was planned.

Mr. Kelley said it seemed that when it came time to knock projects off the list, DPW might pull out something other than a project that was at the bottom of the list.

Mr. Lynch said to him, every project had value, and was on the list because it was needed. He said this was not a wish list, and said he struggled with the ranking system.

Administrator Selig explained that he had asked each department to prioritize the rankings, and said he found it useful to hear why departments valued one project over another. He said it would be determined which projects the Town could afford, and said to a certain degree, they would be re-prioritized. He noted that the reason a lot of projects got jammed together for 2011 and 2012 was that the Town in recent years had been putting some projects off.

Mr. Kelley said it looked like the Town needed a dump truck. There was discussion about this.

Administrator Selig said he would some like feedback from the Planning Board on the priorities for resurfacing. He then spoke about Wiswall Road, and noted that there was a low amount of traffic on it. He said he had asked DPW to come up with a least cost alternative for surfacing that road.

He said another possible approach was to do nothing to the road, noting that its condition automatically slowed down the rate of travel. He said the road was already in a condition where it wouldn't save money to simply repave it, so a complete reclamation was needed.

Chair Fuller said she thought there was an issue under the roadway that needed to be addressed, and asked if there was danger that the roadway would cave in.

Mr. Lynch said it was a concern, and said if nothing was done in terms of the paving, something would still be done to address this. He said a culvert was needed there and he provided details on this. He explained that Wiswall Road had always been in the Roads program, but because of the work done to rebuild the Wiswall ridge, there had been further deterioration of the road.

Administrator Selig said the improvements to the bridge had highlighted the fact that the road was in bad condition.

Mr. Kelley asked if there had been feedback from residents about the inexpensive option for Wiswall Road, and Administrator Selig said this was the first venue where it was being discussed. Mr. Kelley said he didn't think it was a great idea, noting that Wiswall Road got a lot of use in summer months.

He said his concern, as a member of the Lamprey River Watershed Advisory Committee, was that additional sediment would wind up going into the river if the asphalt was stripped off. He also said he would be surprised if people would like to see a gravel road there.

Administrator Selig noted that Town Clerk lived in this area, and her response concerning this had not been positive.

He spoke about the proposed repairs to the Crommets Creek bridge, and said this would require a tremendous amount of focus by DPW. He said it would be great if the project could be pushed back farther in order to allow some time for DPW to address some other projects.

Chair Fuller noted the letter of deficiency the Town had received concerning the bridge.

Mr. Lynch said this was the Town's smallest bridge. He said it would remain more or less as it was as a result of this project, and said it was therefore not as demanding a project as other bridge projects in Durham had been.

Mr. Kelley asked if DPW had looked at the Crommets Creek bridge enough to satisfy itself that recent flooding and detouring of traffic hadn't deteriorated it. Mr. Lynch said DPW had in fact looked at this. He explained that this project didn't fit into the Federal Emergency Management Agency's box in terms of a project, and he provided details on this.

He said FEMA had noted the flooding conditions, and also said the bridge had deteriorated, but not to the point where it had to be closed. He said it was a low tonnage bridge, which was a challenge for fire trucks and garbage trucks, and said these were some of the challenges that DPW had to factor in.

Councilor Smith said he had received a call about stormwater runoff down Smith Park Lane, and that this was a challenge for seniors who walked that area. He asked what could be done to address the erosion and sedimentation there.

Mr. Lynch explained that the road was owned by the Community Church and was not a Town road, so the Church had to be a part of the conversation. He said they would give the Town permission to pave the road. He noted that a ditch line had been cut there recently, but said this wasn't a permanent fix.

Councilor Smith asked if there was a strategy for declaring a private road a public nuisance for roads like this where there was an issue.

Mr. Lynch said this was considered on a case by case basis.

Mr. Kelley noted the proposed culvert replacements in the CIP for Bennett Road and Longmarsh Road. He said the analysis indicated that as part of the current Route 108 project, there were plans for a new 70 ft long bridge Crossing at Hamel Brook. He asked what the plans were for further upstream, near the Rowing Club.

He said he also questioned the Longmarsh Road project, because the situation when there was flooding didn't strand anybody because people who lived there had another way to get out of there.

He said if the flooding issue wasn't addressed near the Rowing Club, the road would have to be shut down there, and people would be sent out to the Crommets Creek bridge.

There was discussion. Mr. Lynch said the 108 project included some upgrades to culverts, noting that there were six culvert crossings throughout that corridor. He explained that NHDOT believed that by resurfacing the vertical surface of the road, this would mean there would be less time when the road would have to be shut down during times of flooding. He noted that this project was planned for 2013.

Administrator Selig said the main impetus for that project had come from Durham,

as a result of the fact that significant concerns had been expressed by residents of the Cold Spring Road area and Bennett Road about flooding issues.

Mr. Kelley said he was only questioning the Longmarsh Road segment.

Administrator Selig agreed that doing the Longmarsh segment was much less significant, and said the issue was clearing Bennett Road into Route 108, and Route 108 into Durham. He also said that doing work at the Newmarket end of Route 108 had regional watershed implications, and said the concern was that it could create additional problems for Newmarket.

Mr. Kelley said right now, Newmarket was considering whether to keep the Macallen dam. He said if they got rid of it, the culverts proposed for Durham might not be needed anymore, and he therefore questioned spending money on them.

Councilor Smith said that regarding the Longmarsh Road flooding, this was caused by the Lamprey River flooding north across Longmarsh Road, and into Hamel Brook, where it undermined Route 108 and came rushing down the Oyster River and over the old dam.

He said several of these proposed projects, including the Bennett Road culvert project, would result in putting much more water faster into the Oyster River. He said he agreed with Mr. Kelley that if the Macallen dam was taken out, or if the State put in a huge gate there so the Lamprey River could be lowered in anticipation of storms, some of this road work wouldn't be as necessary.

Mr. Kelley said his understanding was that NHDES had new culvert requirements, and asked if the numbers in the CIP reflected that.

Mr. Lynch said the project hadn't been designed yet. He said it was a FEMA project, and he provided details on this. He said the LaRoche project was expensive, and said there were two culverts involved. He said if the State moved forward with the bridge at Hamel Brook, water would be able to travel through the corridor much easier.

He said one concern was that at the Longmarsh Road piece, if more water was being taken through that area, there would be even more erosion than there was now. He said there was some additional engineering and hydraulics that needed to be looked at, and said they were not there yet.

He said Mr. Kelley was right, and said if Administrator Selig said there could be one or the other, Bennett Road would be the choice. He said this would get people away from walking the railroad tracks when there was flooding.

There was discussion about the need for culverts in the LaRoche field. Councilor Smith explained that the water was coming from the north across Bennett Road and

going down across LaRoche field and to LaRoche brook down to the Lamprey.

Mr. Kelley said he would be interested to see what the State decided to do on Route 108. He noted that the work done there would be in the floodplain, and said they would have to mitigate what was put in. He said he would be surprised if the water level didn't creep up.

Mr. Roberts asked how the work planned would keep people off the railroad tracks, and Mr. Lynch explained that during times of flooding, people walked to Town on the railroad tracks, and also parked their cars at Sullivan Falls as part of an escape plan.

Councilor Smith noted the Spruce Hole Well development project outlined on page 83 of the CIP, which said that it included utilizing the Lamprey River water main, which would require converting the portion of the Lamprey River Hard Pipe that ran alongside Mill Road from a raw water main to a treated water main, and diverting all the water from the Lamprey River into artificial recharge basins.

Mr. Lynch said this was the next step in the development of the Spruce Hole well. He explained that right now, there were 5 possible options to make this happen, and said page 83 talked about one of the 5 options. He said this should be looked at as a placeholder, and said that realistically, the next step would be moved out a year or more.

Administrator Selig said he was not convinced that this was the time to do this project, and said the urgency had been getting the well installed.

Mr. Kelley said what the Town should be striving to do was to divert some of the Lamprey River water to the treatment plant, stating that this was the cheapest way to get water. He said he didn't see the Spruce Hole well project happening soon, but said it was a wise move to get the well permitted. He said Durham would be best served by getting water from the Lamprey River, and said that hopefully with Durham and the University well represented on the Lamprey River management committee, their water needs would be well represented.

Administrator Selig asked what Planning Board members thought about the idea of speed tables.

Mr. Kelley said he didn't know the specific locations where they were being considered, but said if the Town got an immediate favorable response from people, that would be good. He said they could work.

Administrator Selig asked the Board for feedback on the proposed Pettee Brook Lane corridor sidewalk and lighting improvements planned for 2012. He noted that this had been delayed for 10 years. He also spoke about the pilot traffic control program underway on Pettee Brook Road since the summer, and said the Traffic

Safety Committee believed that it had been successful.

He said the Town was therefore moving forward to evaluate how 32 parking spaces in that area could be managed, and how these spaces could be integrated into a larger parking plan for the downtown. He noted that the bump-outs would be hardened in place of the current painting of them on Pettee Brook Road.

Administrator Selig also spoke about the possible approach of providing more expensive parking in front of businesses on Main Street, and less expensive parking further way, which could encourage wider use of the entire downtown core.

Mr. Roberts said a family member worked at UNH, and said parking was difficult without a permit. He said metered parking was more expensive because it was the only place one could park for two hours. He asked if the intention was to change that.

Administrator Selig said transportation planner Rick Chellman had been engaged to work with the Town on traffic planning issues. He said among other ideas, there had been discussion on the idea of automated meters to replace coin operated meters, and creation of a tiered pricing system from the downtown core outward. He provided details on this.

Mr. Roberts asked if the Town would still allow long term parking such as the parking on Strafford Ave.

Administrator Selig noted that the parking spaces on Strafford Ave were leased to UNH so that the Town could lease spaces at the Store 24 property, which was owned by UNH.

There was discussion on how the planned lighting and sidewalk upgrades in the Pettee Brook Lane corridor would be coordinated with projects in that area that had already been approved. Mr. Lynch noted that DPW had put previously this project out 5 years, and said with the new parking scheme there now, it was time to do it.

Mr. Campbell said there was a section of sidewalk missing on Pettee Brook Road between Rosemary Lane and the UNH Police station. He said part of the approval of the Kostis project was that the applicants would pay for the sidewalk, or would build it themselves.

Mr. Lynch said this area needed to be reconstructed. He provided details on this, and said it would be a challenge but could be dealt with.

Chair Fuller said doing this project would tie the downtown to Pettee Brook Lane, and would make it seem more convenient to park in this area.

Mr. Lynch said it would help complete the vision for the downtown.

Mr. Wolfe said if the Town started charging more to park in the downtown core, this would impact shopping there.

Administrator Selig said Mr. Chellman had said this would not happen. He said right now, there was the impression that parking wasn't available downtown, but said there was parking available beyond Main Street.

Chair Fuller said a fundamental problem was the amount of time people were allowed to park.

There was discussion, with Administrator Selig stating that right now, the strategy for parking on Main Street was based on supporting businesses that wanted free parking and quick turnover. He said for the Pettee Brook parking lot, the premise was that students would not park there all day. But he said a more comprehensive plan was needed, and said Mr. Chellman said tiered parking would mean that more people would park downtown.

Mr. Wolfe said the Town could eliminate paid parking downtown.

Administrator Selig said if all the parking was free, people would still want to park on Main Street. He said this created congestion, and said if it cost less to park along Pettee Brook Road or in the Pettee Brook parking lot, perhaps someone would park there. He said this was all being evaluated.

Mr. Wolfe said his recommendation would be to eliminate all paid parking,

In answer to a question from Mr. Roberts, Administrator Selig said Mr. Chellman would recommend how many spaces would be needed for a parking structure at C lot. He said there was preliminary engineering on this, and noted that such a project was not in the CIP yet.

Mr. Roberts asked if the consultant from B Dennis was working with the Town on this, and Administrator Selig said Mr. Chellman and Lavallee Bresinger Architects were assisting with this. There was discussion about showing the plans to the Durham Business Association.

Chair Fuller said it was time to do the work on Pettee Brook Lane, especially in order to be able to tie that area in as part of the downtown.

Administrator Selig said the parking issue wasn't only about pricing, and was about providing a cityscape feel as one walked from a parking area to where he wanted to go.

Chair Fuller acknowledged that right now, the Pettee Brook area felt totally disconnected from Main Street.

Administrator Selig said a benefit of the C lot site for a parking area was its proximity to Main Street and Mill Plaza, and said with more commercial activity in these areas, the tax base could be broadened.

Mr. Campbell asked what would happen with the bike lane on Pettee Brook Lane when the work was done on the corridor in 2012. He asked if the new sidewalk would eat into it.

Administrator Selig said it might make sense to do both projects in one year in order to coordinate the work. He said right now, half of the project was planned for 2011, and the other half was planned for 2012.

Mr. Lynch said the bike lane would fit along the stonewall piece that Mr. Campbell had referred to. He said it was in the plan right now to include it. He noted that right now, the lane was enlarged, but wouldn't be as wide in the future.

Mr. Kelley said he would like to know how much use a new boom mower would get, and how many streets it would be used on.

Administrator Selig explained that DPW was trying to find more effective ways to do the things it was already doing. He said a lot of man hours were spent mowing, and said this mower would allow the work to be done more quickly. He said he had asked for the cost benefit analysis on it, and said the mower would save the Town \$14,000.

Mr. Kelley said in general, they didn't get a true cost benefit analysis done for proposed project, and said doing that would be beneficial.

Administrator Selig said the contract with Waste Management expired in November, and said the Town was working to extend it by 5 years at the same price point. He also said he had asked DPW to provide pricing options for other possible waste management approaches, such as single stream recycling. He noted that a challenge with this approach was that the Town would need to have a packer in order to condense waste materials.

Mr. Lynch said single stream recycling would change the entire collection process. He said the same amount of volume would be involved, but a different type of truck would be needed, which was why the plan would have to be flexible.

Administrator Selig said the Town would need to evaluate the price of single stream recycling. There further was discussion on this approach.

Mr. Roberts said the opening of the gravel pit after the ice storm to allow brush removal from properties had been a life saver.

Mr. Lynch noted that there was a gigantic chip pile there now. He said the pit had been open for two months after the wind storm, and said there had been requests to make it available for brush drop off again. He said this could be done, but said the challenge would be to man it properly. He noted that Durham had received 10 times more debris from the storm than any other place in the State.

There was discussion that people had really liked it when the gravel pit was open, and took the opportunity to clean up their yards, so it was not just storm debris that was brought there.

Mr. Lynch said it sounded like an opportunity for transfer station #2.

There was discussion on the expired permit for the wastewater treatment plant. Mr. Kelley said for the Town to spend \$1.5 million for the consultant in 2011, that permit better be forthcoming soon.

Mr. Lynch explained that the cost figures would be modified depending on what the permit was. He said Durham's wastewater treatment plan was not on EPA's radar screen right now, noting that there were other plants in NH that were more of a priority in terms of upgrading.

Mr. Kelley said there were still some big ticket wastewater treatment items ahead for the Town in the future.

Administrator Selig said that was an understatement. He noted that the Town's Wastewater fund was only funded by a fraction of the population. He said although the University would pay 2/3 of the cost of the wastewater treatment plan upgrade, there would still be a tremendous expense for the Town, if they were required.

Mr. Kelley noted that the big ticket items in 2013 and 2014 were major equipment replacements that would be occurring.

Mr. Roberts noted that he had previously asked Mr. Lynch if any of his plans involved incremental facility investments for wastewater and water extensions at various locations in Town.

Administrator Selig said what was in the CIP was to support the existing infrastructure. He said the College Brook Interceptor would be an improvement to the sewer system, but said most of what was planned was replacement of existing equipment.

Mr. Roberts said in other words, there would be no increase in the capacity of the sewer system, and Administrator Selig said that was correct.

Mr. Kelley asked Administrator Selig to challenge the staff to look beyond 2014. He said it looked like there would be a major jump in the sewer bond schedule over the next few years, which would be reflected in sewer rates. He said it would be nice to

know what happened after 2014. He noted that the bond schedule would be paid off strictly by Town water and sewer users and the University.

Mr. Roberts said he would like to discuss the Planning Board budget for 2011, and noted specifically that he had some questions in regard to the Master Plan update.

Mr. Campbell said there was money for 2010 and 2011 for the Master Plan update. He said this would be combined and used to do the rewrite of five chapters.

Mr. Roberts asked if the B Dennis group would be involved in the Master Plan update process, the way planning consultant Mark Eyerman had been involved with the Planning Board previously.

Mr. Campbell said the process would be somewhat different this time. He said the consultant would do the writing instead of the Planning Board.

Mr. Roberts said the Planning Board would need direction, and Mr. Campbell said the consultant would provide this.

Administrator Selig said in the proposed 2011 Planning Board Budget under consultants, \$20,000 was recommended for the Zoning rewrite, updating the Master Plan and creating a downtown parking plan . He said there was an additional request under the Planning Board Budget of \$40,000 for contracted services. He said \$30,000 of this was for the Master Plan update.

Ms. Jablonski said there was also \$50,000 in the 2010 Budget for this work.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Campbell if he thought this funding was sufficient to accomplish the work, and Mr. Campbell said yes.

Administrator Selig said thought had been given to the idea of charging some of the Master Plan work to the UDAG fund, which would mean there would be no impact on the tax rate.

Mr. Roberts asked when UNH Cooperative Extension would be working with the Town, and Mr. Campbell said it would happen this year. Mr. Roberts asked if they would be doing the rewriting of the Master Plan.

Mr. Campbell said no, but would work with the person who did this. He said Cooperative Extension would be in charge of working with the Master Plan Advisory Committee as well as doing the statistically valid survey of residents.

Mr. Roberts asked if the Strafford Regional Planning Commission would have a role in this process.

Administrator Selig said right now, this role had not been defined.

Mr. Campbell noted that by statute, Towns were supposed to notify the State and regional planning commission that they were engaging in the Master Plan update process. He said this provided the opportunity for them to be involved.

Mr. Roberts said he was concerned about the survey drafting. He also said the question was how to interface a 2000 Master Plan that in some ways didn't come to fruition with what was going on now. In addition, he asked if SRPC had any guidance concerning what those doing planning in Durham should be thinking about in terms of regional planning.

IV. Access Management – Discussion with Strafford Regional Planning Commission on Access Management and Access Management Memorandum of Understanding

Executive Director Cynthia Copeland and transportation planner Mark D'Ambrosi from the Strafford Regional Planning Commission spoke before the Board. Ms. Copeland said she was present in order to provide historic reference if needed.

Mr. D'Ambrosi said the goal of access management was to find a balance between keeping traffic moving on roads while allowing access to these same roads for members of a community.

Break from 8:47 to 8:54 pm

Mr. D'Ambrosi provided a slide presentation on Access Management.

Mr. Kelley and Mr. Campbell discussed the fact that this topic had been before the Planning Board in 2006. Mr. Kelley said he thought it had met with favor at that time and that the MOU was approved. Mr. Campbell said it hadn't gone anywhere after the Board discussed the idea.

Ms. Copeland described what had been involved when the town of Barrington had been the first town to go through the process of developing a Memorandum of Understanding with the State. She noted that NHDOT District VI was good to work with, and that its District engineer attended Traffic Safety Committee meetings and was actively involved in transportation issues in the region.

She said District VI had some young engineers who wanted to try some of the new ways of doing things in terms of permitting driveways and having direct communication. She said Barrington was the first town to have an MOU and Northwood was the second. She said SRPC had made presentations on this process around the State, but said there hadn't been any movement forward.

Mr. D'Ambrosi said this was a perfect time to do this, with the Master Plan update planned. .

Mr. Kelley said Durham was special, in that when there was talk about access management and transportation corridors, they had to deal with the fact that there was the University. He asked Ms. Copeland if she had any advice on how to bring UNH to the table. He said right now, the University came to the Town out of courtesy, and that was all.

Ms. Copeland said that at a Commission meeting last week, UNH representatives had provided an update on the campus master plan. She said there could be a three part Memorandum of Understanding, which included the University.

Mr. D'Ambrosi said the University had a stake in the safety of the roads in Durham for pedestrians, etc. He said he believed this was something they would love to work with the Town on, and said it was in their best interest to do so.

Mr. Roberts said the Town had tried this, and he noted the Transportation chapter of the Master Plan. But he said the University was an entity unto itself. He said Main Street had as much traffic as Route 4.

M. Kelley said the University was the greatest traffic generator in Durham, and said he was especially concerned about the truck traffic that beat up the Town's roads. He noted the concept of the northern connector as a possible solution, but said there didn't seem to be a desire on the University's part to entertain that idea.

Ms. Copeland said this was one of the areas University representatives received repeated questions on from neighboring communities and Durham commissioners at the recent Commission meeting.

Mr. D'Ambrosi said they seemed pretty firmly against the idea of a northern connector as something that wouldn't be the highest and best use of the land. He said they also mentioned that they were trying to consolidate traffic to the entrance they built the roundabout on this year, and Route 108.

Ms. Copeland said the Town was in a unique position because UNH was a member of SRPC's Policy committee and the TAC committee, and had equal standing with the Towns in the region. She said these might be the venues to talk to the University about regarding an MOU for access management and perhaps some other transportation goals. She said Durham and the University were equal partners in this federally recognized entity, which was where the money came from for projects.

Mr. Roberts said that as compared to the 1960's, when the State highway design process actively involved the Town and the University, things were now at an absolute standstill. He said he appreciated the work that SRPC had done in terms of traffic counts, etc, but said Route 108 was a State, Town and University problem, and the Board needed bigger people at the table.

Ms. Copeland noted that Mr. Campbell was the Chair of TAC, and said she thought this might be the path to follow, because the University was interested in being successful in getting grants.

Mr. Campbell noted that Durham had been turned down several times for grants to study the idea of a northern connector. He said it had been said that if the University didn't want something to happen, it wouldn't happen. He also said he had put funding for this in previous CIP's, but former Councils had either taken the project out completely or pushed it out to the future.

Ms. Copeland spoke about the idea of selecting transportation corridors the Town would like to focus access management on.

Mr. Roberts said the Board needed a plan that was interrelated plan with the University's plans, noting as an example the University's plans to exit traffic flow onto Mill Road.

Ms. Copeland said perhaps there were areas other than the northern connector where there was a shared interest between the Town and the University.

Mr. Wolfe agreed that it would be good to focus on issues that affected both of them, and to start by limiting this to something small and working it out. He said it might then be easier to move on to the next issue. There was discussion with Mr. Roberts on this. Mr. Wolfe asked if anyone had talked to the University about this issue of access management.

There was discussion that there was some common ground between the Town and the University. Mr. D'Ambrosi said focusing on these areas first was a good way to proceed.

Mr. Campbell said he thought the University would be amenable to talking about access management in general.

Ms. Copeland noted the Town's relationship with NHDOT right now in regard to the flooding issues on Route 108 and plans to improve this situation. She said there was also the Traffic Safety Committee, and the fact that the NHDOT district engineer attending these meetings. She said this was an established starting point where the Town was having success discussing transportation issues with other entities.

Councilor Smith noted that he was the Planning Board representative to the Traffic Safety Committee, along with Mr. Campbell. He said the University had recently made Quad Way a two-way street, and provided details on this, and also said a roundabout might connect Main Street, Pettee Brook Lane and Quad Way in the future. He said he thought things were starting to move with the University

in terms of joint transportation planning.

There was discussion about making Quad Way a two-way street. Mr. Kelley said there was no doubt that individuals from the Town and the University could work together, and noted that Mr. Campbell was doing this as part of the traffic model group. But he said he thought the big picture would be hard to crack, because the primary corridors to get people in and out of the University were local roads.

Mr. Wolfe spoke about the importance of creating relationships in order to get things done, and said Mr. Campbell had been doing this, and Councilor Smith had been doing it on the TSC. He said again that they should pick smaller things where the conflict level was likely to be less. He said a “them versus us” approach would get the Town nowhere.

Chair Fuller said if there were MOU’s for some access points, these could perhaps make the University see the advantages of the northern connector.

Mr. Roberts asked whether the Transportation chapter should be ignored with the upcoming Master Plan update. He said there was a relationship with the University on transportation planning issues in the 1980’s but it changed in the 1990’s.

Mr. Campbell said the Town was getting along well with the University in a lot of ways now, although there was always room for improvement. He said the northern connector was something they simply didn’t want to move on.

There was discussion about what to say about the northern connector in the Master Plan update.

Chair Fuller said this was a good time to be updating the Master Plan. She also suggested that if the Traffic Safety Committee would be working on the MOU’s, perhaps they could be directed to focus on a particular location such as Route 108 or Route 4.

Ms. Copeland explained that the MOU’s were set up to specify areas where there would be points of collaboration. She noted that the town of Northwood had focused on Route 4 and other State highways in the town. She said the town of Barrington had included Route 9 and Route 125 as well as some other routes. She said Barrington had been extremely happy with its relationship with NHDOT since creating the MOU.

She noted that Durham was much further along with its relationship with NHDOT than Barrington was when it signed the MOU. She also said Durham’s subdivision and site plan regulations already had a lot of access management elements in them. She said going through the Master Plan update process, and looking at access management on a larger level could help in terms of organizing

and updating the subdivision and site plan regulations.

Ms. Copeland noted that the Town could be stricter with its permitting than the NHDOT standards were. She said there could be an access management strategy for Town roads as well as a separate strategy for State highways. She said an MOU would only apply to State highways.

Mr. Kelley asked what would be the appropriate next step on access management MOU. There was discussion with Mr. Campbell that the Planning Board should hash this out, hold a public hearing and then make a recommendation to the Council. Mr. Kelley recommended that Mr. Campbell bring this issue up with his monthly meeting with University planner Doug Bencks, and said the Traffic Safety Committee could also work on it.

Councilor Smith said the TSC tended to make recommendations on issues that weren't as broad as this.

Mr. Campbell said he would talk to Mr. Bencks, and would also give NHDOT engineer Doug dePorter a call and arrange a meeting with both of them.

Mr. Roberts asked if the Town could demand a State study because of the existence of the University in Durham. He said this was done in the 1960's and said one thing that came out of this was the right of ways that were purchased.

V. Unfinished Business List – Review of the Unfinished Business List.

Mr. Campbell spoke briefly on this, and said he had updated this list.

VI. Other Business

A. Old Business:

B. New Business:

Chair Fuller had said Historic District Committee member Andrea Bodo had sent an email regarding the October 6th meeting where the committee would be looking at design standards for the Central Business District and commercial core. It was noted that Planning Board members were invited to this meeting.

Mr. Campbell spoke about the fact that he had hired a UNH intern to do research on this issue, including looking at what several other communities had for design guidelines.

Mr. Roberts referred to work done previously on this topic by architect and former Planning Board member Nick Isaak. He also noted that the Master Plan had said to emphasize a variety of architectural styles.

Mr. Campbell emphasized that these would be design guidelines but not an ordinance, and that the guidelines would provide several choices.

Mr. Roberts spoke about the fact that the city of Portsmouth was taking a lot of heat for allowing a massive parking lot with the big new building downtown. He then said he would be glad to work with the HDC any time on design guidelines

There was discussion that the October 8th site walk at Christenson Hall would be held at 12 pm, and that the site walk at the Caldarola property would be held on October 9th at 9 am.

C. Next meeting of the Board: **October 13, 2010**

VII. Adjournment

Councilor Smith MOVED to adjourn the meeting. Steve Roberts SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 6-0.

Adjournment at 9:50 pm.

Victoria Parmele, Minutes taker

Susan Fuller, Secretary