

These minutes were approved at the July 13, 2011 meeting.

**Durham Planning Board
Wednesday April 13, 2011
Durham Town Hall - Council Chambers
7:00P.M.
MINUTES**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chair Peter Wolfe; Secretary Susan Fuller; Richard Kelley (arrived at 7:22 pm); Richard Ozenich; Town Council representative Jay Gooze; alternate Town Council representative Julian Smith; alternate Andrew Corrow

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chair Lorne Parnell; Bill McGowan; alternate Wayne Lewis

I. Call to Order

Vice Chair Peter Wolfe called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm, and served as Chair for the meeting.

He said Mr. Corrow would be a voting member in place of Chair Parnell for the meeting.

II. Approval of Agenda

Susan Fuller MOVED to approve the Agenda. Richard Ozenich SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 5-0.

III. Planner's Report

Mr. Campbell said he had recently met with UNH Campus Planner for their monthly meetings, and said he would provide the Board with a memo on the meeting in the next packet.

He said the Economic Development Committee met on April 11th and heard a presentation by Yusi Wang Turell on the results of the Business Visitation & Retention interviews and surveys.

He said a second presentation from Ian Colgan from Development Concepts, Inc. (DCI) and Charlie Colgan from the University of Southern Maine covered the results of the recent Town-Wide Market Analysis conducted on behalf of the Town. He said copies of the results were available at his office, and should also be on the Town's website soon. He noted that the EDC meeting was available online under DCAT on demand at the Town web site.

Mr. Campbell said he attended the April 8th MPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

meeting at the Strafford Regional Planning Commission. He said the most important topic discussed at the meeting was the recommendation from the TAC to the Policy Committee regarding the NH Ten Year Plan Project Listing. He noted again that there were several projects within that Plan that might be removed due to the removal of the \$30 fee on car registrations.

He said the recommendation from the TAC at the meeting was to keep all of the projects from Strafford County in the Ten Year Plan. He also said there was a discussion on prioritizing the list of projects, with the Route 108 shoulder widening project one that should be on top of the list.

Mr. Campbell said there was also a discussion at the TAC meeting on the proposed Scenic Byway from Route 4 at the Rollinsford, NH/Maine state line to Newfields along Route 108, which would include Durham. He said the proposal on this was being put together by the SRPC, and said it would be for the State of NH designation, and possible federal designation in the future. He noted that with this designation, there could be possible federal grant opportunities. He said he'd provide the Board with more information on this.

Mr. Campbell said the Master Plan Survey Subcommittee had met that day regarding the draft survey the Planning Board had reviewed at the March 23, 2011 meeting. He said he and Charlie French of UNH Cooperative Extension had also met to discuss the Planning Board's comments, and said these were brought back to the subcommittee. He said some comments from the Parks and Recreation Committee were also incorporated into the draft survey, and said the draft would come back to the Planning Board for its April 27th meeting, when there would hopefully be the final review of it.

He said he had received a proposal from Hawk Planning Resources LLC to help the Town complete the draft design guidelines that his intern had worked on in 2010. He said a process that included both the HDC and the Planning Board was envisioned, and said the next step would then be to work out a contract and then move forward with further developing the guidelines and possible amendments to the HDC Ordinance.

Mr. Campbell said no new applications were received for the April 27th meeting. But he said there was an inquiry from the Phillips 66 station to amend their landscaping plan to replace some of the existing trees that had been found to be problematic because they had grown too large. He said he would review the information provided and discuss it with the Phillips 66 representative and Mr. Johnson, and would let the Board know what action would need to be taken.

IV. Acceptance Consideration of an Application for Site Plan Review submitted by Richard Gsottschneider on behalf of Van Rich Properties, LLC, Durham, New Hampshire, to construct a one story, 2 bedroom unit on the site which would be attached to an existing duplex, creating a multi-unit building. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 9, Lot 20-1, is located on 279 Mast Road, and is in the MUDOR Zoning District.

V. Acceptance Consideration of an Application for Conditional Use Permit submitted by,

Richard Gsottschneider on behalf of Van Rich Properties, LLC, Durham, New Hampshire, to construct a one story, 2 bedroom unit on the site which would be attached to an existing duplex, creating a multi-unit building. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 9, Lot 20-1, is located on 279 Mast Road, and is in the MUDOR Zoning District.

Chair Peter Wolfe asked if the applications were up to date and complete.

Mr. Campbell said yes, and recommended that the Board schedule the public hearing for May 11th.

Mr. Gsottschneider said his plan was to add one story, measuring 24 ft by 30 ft to his existing duplex building in the MUDOR zone, which would be used for a two bedroom apartment.

Mr. Campbell noted that the applicant had needed two variances, one of which was for an incursion into the wetland buffer, and the other which was for a 10 sf incursion into the front setback along the Mast Road extension. He said both variances were granted by the ZBA the previous evening.

Mr. Gsottschneider explained that 10 years ago when he built the duplex, he intended to add this unit in the future, so the building was designed to accept the addition that he now proposed.

Susan Fuller MOVED to accept the Site Plan Application and Conditional Use Permit Application submitted by Richard Gsottschneider on behalf of Van Rich Properties, LLC, Durham, New Hampshire, to construct a one story, 2 bedroom unit on the site which would be attached to an existing duplex, creating a multi-unit building, and scheduled the Public Hearing for May 11, 2011. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 9, Lot 20-1, is located on 279 Mast Road, and is in the MUDOR Zoning District. Richard Ozenich SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 5-0.

The site walk was scheduled for the night of the meeting, May 11th.

David Potter, Mast Road, said he was a direct abutter, and had no problem with the plans. But he noted that there had been issues with Mr. Gsottschneider's property before he owned it. He said when the property was developed in 1960, a wetland on it was filled that resulted in some runoff issues that impacted his own property next door.

He said a concern now was that there would be more non-permeable surfaces there and more runoff, and said an issue was how to control that. He said he had a map that showed where the wetlands were, and said having this map when the Board went to look at the property would allow it to understand how his property would be affected if the runoff wasn't contained.

Chair Wolfe recommended that Mr. Potter submit the map to Mr. Campbell in advance of the site walk, and he would distribute it to Planning Board members.

VI. Continued Discussion on Application for Site Plan Review submitted by Capstone Development Corporation, c/o Appledore Engineering Inc., Portsmouth, New Hampshire on behalf of William & Edna Woodward Rev Trust, Durham, New Hampshire to construct approximately 100 residential units consisting of single-family and duplex residences with a total of 619 beds and 650 parking spaces. The property involved is shown on Tax map, Lot 10-3, is located on Technology Drive, and is in the Office Research/Light Industry Zoning District. (The applicant has requested that this application be postponed to a future Planning Board meeting date yet to be determined.)

VI. Continued Discussion on Application for Conditional Use Permit submitted by Capstone Development Corporation, c/o Appledore Engineering Inc., Portsmouth, New Hampshire on behalf of William & Edna Woodward Rev Trust, Durham, New Hampshire to construct approximately 100 residential units consisting of single-family and duplex residences with a total of 619 beds and 650 parking spaces. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 9, Lot 10-3, is located on Technology Drive, and is in the Office Research/Light Industry Zoning District. (The applicant has requested that this application be postponed to a future Planning Board meeting date yet to be determined.)

Chair Wolfe noted a letter from Attorney Loughlin on behalf of Capstone that they wanted to delay the vote on their applications until there was a full Planning Board. He said the Board needed to decide if it wanted to delay the deliberations, and if so, when they would have the deliberations.

Councilor Gooze noted that he had recused himself for these applications, and said Councilor Smith would serve in his place.

Mr. Kelley arrived at the meeting at 7:22 pm.

Councilor Smith said he hoped that if the Board didn't deliberate on the applications this evening, it could still discuss in some detail the draft Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval.

Chair Wolfe agreed that this should be done.

Councilor Smith MOVED to continue the deliberations at the April 27, 2011 Planning Board meeting. Richard Ozenich SECONDED the motion.

The Board determined that there would in fact be a full Planning Board at that meeting.

The motion PASSED unanimously 6-0.

Mr. Campbell said during deliberations at the last meeting, there was some discussion back and forth with the applicant. He noted that someone in the audience had called for a point of order that there was something being discussed that was new. He said there had been a couple of meetings of deliberations, and said a lot of things were discussed at

those meetings. He said the Board had looked at the transportation information, some energy conservation issues, received a new management plan and lease, and heard about the applicants' plan to use of organic fertilizer.

He said he wanted to make sure the Board was comfortable with those, and said if not, they should reopen the public hearing in order to hear comments on any new material that came out at recent meetings or anything new discussed that the public might be interested in. He said he didn't want to open this up to include everything that had been heard or discussed since the beginning of the review process.

He noted that this was a big application, and that there was a chance there would be an appeal of some kind. He said the Board should err on the side of caution and reopen the hearing for a limited purpose.

Chair Wolfe said if the Board did this, it should enumerate the topics that were new at the previous hearing.

Councilor Gooze said there was a lot of discussion with the applicant during Planning Board deliberations, and said some of this was informative. He said the Chair had some discretion on what could be asked of an applicant, and said certainly some informational things were appropriate. But he said there was the issue of when the Board was deliberating as part of this, and that people impacted by the additional information didn't get a chance to respond.

Chair Wolfe said new information was presented at the March 27th meeting, and said the hearing would be opened to address this.

Councilor Gooze said he had no problem with that, and said it would be prudent to reopen the public hearing.

Mr. Campbell said he would notice this, and as part of this would send notices to the abutters.

Councilor Smith said as the Board went through the draft Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval provided for the present meeting, there might be issues that came up that might be included within the boundary of that limited public hearing.

Chair Wolfe said he was therefore willing to wait to articulate the issues until later at the meeting.

Mr. Kelley said he thought the Board had just voted to continue deliberations to the next meeting.

Chair Wolfe said the Board was just checking now to see that the FOF and COA were accurate, and reflected the Board's decisions and understanding as of last Wednesday, instead of having to spend time discussing this at the next meeting.

Mr. Campbell said he didn't want to get into anything new or anything further that the Board hadn't discussed.

The Planning Board next reviewed in detail the revisions to the wording of some of the conditions, as well as any new wording discussed at the previous meeting concerning the FOF and COA for the Site Plan Application.

Concerning FOF #4, Councilor Smith asked if it was a fair question to get input from the public on what standard they would build to. Also, Mr. Ozenich received confirmation that if the Energy Star standards changed, the project specs wouldn't have to change.

Concerning Site Plan Application COA to be met prior to signature, it was noted that the proposed gas lines was new information. It was also noted that the wording in #5 addressed new information provided concerning organic fertilizers. There was also discussion concerning #5 that maintenance plan approval would need to be discussed with the applicant.

Concerning condition #15, Councilor Smith asked what "short length" meant in regard to the fence. It was agreed that this would be left to the Cemetery Committee to decide.

Concerning Site Plan Application COA to be met subsequent to signature, Chair Wolfe noted the wording on bus service that he had provided for condition #2, and said he thought it reflected what the Board had discussed.

There was discussion. Councilor Smith suggested some changes to the wording, and Chair Wolfe said this was a change over what was discussed by the Board, and should be brought up at the meeting on April 27th. The Board agreed that for the most part, the wording reflected what they had discussed.

Concerning condition #9 Councilor Smith asked about the language "natural features suitable as buffer strips".

Mr. Kelley said he was uncomfortable with where the discussion was going, and Chair Wolfe said # 9 hadn't changed, so if there were questions on it, they should have been asked previously or should be brought up at the next meeting. He said right now they were just discussing the edits, to make sure they reflected the understanding of Board members who had been at the last meeting.

There was discussion on the condition regarding the School Impact fee assessment, regarding what the condition actually said about when the school impact fee would be assessed. Some wording changes were suggested.

The Board next discussed the wording of the FOF and COA for the Conditional Use Permit application. It was first noted that the same changes recommended for the Site Plan Application FOF applied to Conditional Use Permit Application FOF as well.

Concerning COA to be met prior to signature, Councilor Smith noted the distinction in condition #5 between being on site, and living on site. He said the present language suggested that the person could never leave the property. There was discussion on what the language meant, and what it should actually say. It was agreed that this should be discussed with the applicant.

Concerning COA to be met subsequent, Chair Wolfe noted that #3 contained the wording regarding bus service, and that #4 now included wording on single stream recycling. It was noted that the former #7 regarding inspection of residential units had been removed.

Mr. Kelley said the new condition #8 met his concerns.

Councilor Smith said he liked the new condition #9 regarding parking permits.

Councilor Smith asked who would make the determination concerning monitoring and invasive species removal, as outlined in condition #5. Board members said this hadn't been discussed, and it was agreed this would be addressed at the next meeting.

The Board next discussed what were the "new" issues that the public hearing could address. Chair Wolfe listed energy issues, the gas line, and fertilizers.

Mr. Kelley noted the traffic evaluation, and the wetland and upland buffer assessment, and then said since the hearing would be opened up anyway, it should be open to all the items that had come subsequent to the public hearing being closed. He said everything after #26 in the submittals was subsequent to the close of the hearing, and said to him, they were therefore fair game. He said it would then be at the discretion of the Chair to determine if what the Board was hearing at the meeting was redundant.

There was further detailed discussion on what the public notice on the hearing should say. Chair Wolfe said he hated opening the public hearing again without providing some kind of limited scope on what the hearing should include. He agreed that since the hearing had closed, there had been a lot of information provided that the public hadn't had the chance to comment on.

Attorney Loughlin suggested that leaving this broader would be better.

After further discussion, Chair Wolfe suggested that the public hearing should include all new information supplied to the Planning Board after the close of the February 23rd, 2011 public hearing. He said the Chair would then have to determine what was appropriate to discuss, and what was redundant.

Richard Kelley MOVED to reopen the Public Hearing on the Capstone Development Corporation applications, and limit the testimony to new information the applicant has submitted since the close of the February 23rd, 2011 Public Hearing. Susan Fuller SECONDED the motion.

Mr. Campbell provided some other wording for a motion, which he had put together previously.

After further discussion, Mr. Kelley withdrew his motion in order to reflect this wording, and Ms. Fuller withdrew her second of the motion.

Richard Kelley MOVED that the Planning Board hold a Public Hearing at the April 27, 2011 Planning Board meeting for the limited purpose of accepting comments on any new information that may have been received by the Planning Board after the closure of the February 23, 2011 Public Hearing, on the Site Plan Review Application and the Conditional Use Permit Application submitted by Capstone Development Corporation, c/o Appledore Engineering Inc., Portsmouth, New Hampshire on behalf of William & Edna Woodward Rev Trust, Durham, New Hampshire to construct approximately 100 residential units consisting of single-family and duplex residences with a total of 619 beds and 650 parking spaces, at the property shown on Tax map, Lot 10-3, located on Technology Drive, and in the Office Research/Light Industry Zoning District. Susan Fuller SECONDED the motion.

Councilor Smith said he liked the motion very much, and said it didn't limit what was discussed.

Councilor Gooze asked that the Chair put some limit on the discussion.

The motion PASSED unanimously 6-0.

- VII. UNH South Drive Traffic and Air Quality Model Analysis** – Presentation and discussion on a proposed new road through UNH Campus called South Drive. The proposed new road will run from Main Street at the new roundabout to McDaniel Drive via the Southern Underpass, which then connects to Mill Road. This is not a request under RSA 674:54 and is a presentation and discussion item only.

Director of Campus Planning and University architect Doug Bencks said the University wanted to provide an opportunity for analysis of this project with the Town in a public forum. He said there had previously been discussion with the Traffic Safety Committee. He noted that this was a project for the future, and that there was no funding or schedule for it right now. He said the shared Town/UNH traffic model was used to see the impact of a significant new road on University property, and how this would benefit both the Town and the University.

He said they had learned a lot from the analysis, and wanted to share it with the Planning Board and get input on issues they should be aware of as they went forward.

Mr. Campbell noted to the Board that this was not a request under RSA 674:54, and said when the University got the funding for the project, it would have to come back.

University transportation planner Steve Pesci explained that the road would start from the roundabout and would continue down around behind the stadium, under the south

underpass, and connect with McDaniel Drive. He said it would be open to general traffic and also used by University buses. He said they had put a lot of effort into improving access and circulation on the campus, and were also mindful of impacts on the Town and its neighborhoods, and regional air quality and traffic.

He said the 2004 campus Master Plan established a network of streets, and said South Drive was an important component of that. He said it was one of the first network projects evaluated by the shared traffic model with the Town, and explained that three possible scenarios for South Drive were developed, and said one would be focused on that evening. He said when they built the roundabout, they started to narrow in on solutions.

Mr. Pesci said there was currently no funding, but said they were pursuing funding partners. He provided details about the fact that the University had been very good at finding funding partners.

He next spoke about the major findings of the model runs, and first noted that a model run looked at the traffic impacts and air quality impacts throughout the entire town. He said zeroing in on local impacts, one could see that in the Main Street corridor, from Route 155 A coming to the downtown, there would be traffic reductions of 15-22%. He said that conversely, in the Mill Road corridor, there would be an increase of traffic of 1-10% depending on speeds. He said the 10% increase was a worst case scenario for the a.m. peak hour, and represented 45 cars. He said a 15% decrease in traffic on Main Street represented 150-200 cars.

Mr. Pesci said the RSG report noted that this project had been one of the first uses of the model to do a full air quality impact study. He said this study was done because much of the funding for Main Street came under Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. He said because of emission benefits from reduced idling time, this project was eligible under that category.

He provided further details on the modeling that was done, including the fact that traffic data from 2008 was used as the baseline, and that because of the recession, traffic now wasn't much different now than it was at that time. He also spoke about how the model could look at impacts on intersections, turning movements, etc.

Mr. Pesci described scenario one in detail, in which the College Road signal remained. He said there was also a scenario that looked at removing it, and noted that the campus master plan had talked about that. He said it didn't seem logical to do that at this point, in part because of concerns about pedestrian safety. He also said there would be a stop sign at the intersection of College Drive and South Drive, which would be a great traffic calmer.

He noted that there were four primary intersections that were highlighted in the memo provided to the Planning Board. He said the volume impacts on those intersections were included in the memo, and provided details on this.

Councilor Gooze asked if the Mill Road increase was a result of people going left and then going to the University, or people going south the Newmarket.

Mr. Pesci said more people were choosing Mill Road to go around to the west, and said conversely, people wanting to go east or south were using South Drive, and making a right turn on Mill Road. He said they had been worried about what would happen on Mill Road, and overall were pleasantly surprised that traffic into Town on Mill Road was less than what they had anticipated. He spoke about how the model had been used to analyze how leakage onto other roads could be controlled.

Councilor Gooze asked if a new parking structure near Mill Road had been taken into consideration in the modeling, and said he thought it would affect the numbers.

Mr. Pesci said it had not. He noted that the 2004 campus master plan proposed a parking structure on A lot, and said there was also some discussion about one at B lot. But he said neither appeared to be on the horizon. He said parking demand had been flat.

Councilor Gooze noted that C lot would be directly affected by the amount of traffic, and Mr. Pesci agreed that with a parking structure there, there would be some changes in the traffic modeling.

Councilor Smith noted that drivers coming east on McDaniel Drive and approaching Mill Road currently went past the stop sign, which had the potential of causing accidents on Mill Road. He said this needed to be looked at if there was going to be 10% more traffic at the intersection, and said it should be on the Traffic Safety Committee agenda.

Mr. Pesci said if the project proceeded, all of these things would need to be looked at.

Ms. Fuller asked how long South Drive was, and Mr. Pesci said it was approximately 0.78 miles. She also asked about the width of the road, and whether there would be bike lanes, noting that the area the road would go through looked very rural. She said she would think that people would go faster there than the speed limit.

Mr. Pesci said it was understood that the road needed to be designed with enough meandering to keep the speed down. He also said there would be a separate trail for bikes, which among other things would mean that the road could be kept narrower. He said the road design would be one that was pedestrian and bike friendly, and said it wasn't intended to be a bypass. He noted that that area, which was a growth quadrant on the campus, didn't have bus service right now, which would change with the new road.

Mr. Kelley asked if there had been discussion on the 5% increase in traffic expected at Mill Road and Faculty Road, and where that traffic was going from there, either to Main Street, or as a cut through to get to Route 108.

Mr. Pesci said the model looked at all that, and said he recalled that they didn't see a lot

of Faculty Road cut through traffic. He noted the stop signs the Town had put in on Faculty Road, and said it wasn't an attractive route for cars. He said what would answer Mr. Kelley's question was determining whether there was an increase in traffic at the Mill Pond Road/Route 108 intersection.

Mr. Kelley asked about the Mill Road/Main Street intersection, and Mr. Pesci said he recalled that traffic slightly dropped at that intersection, in the model. He said he would need to check that.

Mr. Bencks and Mr. Pesci explained that they could go back and look at those other intersections. Mr. Bencks said this piece of road they were talking about was not a new route for people coming and going from south of Durham to campus. He said what this would be changing was the people west of campus.

Councilor Mower noted that there was no p.m. peak model right now, and said Mill Road was trickier in the afternoon. There was discussion. Councilor Mower said she would like that information to be taken into account.

Mr. Kelley said it was important to remember that right now this wasn't a project, and said when there was one, a p.m. model could be incorporated to address concerns. He said there was something driving the increase at the intersection of Mill Road and Faculty Road, and said he was trying to figure out what that was. He said if one was using South Road to avoid Main Street, he didn't see it as a feasible alternative. He said the increase at McDaniel Drive and Mill Road had to be driven by the traffic that wanted to take the right hand turn on Mill Road, heading to Packers Falls Road.

Mr. Pesci said at Mill and Faculty, the range of increase was only 1-5%, or 4-10 cars in an hour, which could be statistical noise.

Councilor Gooze said by the time the project was actually going, there would be some land use changes. He noted a possible mall going in at the Durham/Newmarket border.

Mr. Pesci said the University and the Town had a long term goal to update the model, so it would reflect things like that, and the Capstone project. He also said there had been discussion about creating a p.m. model.

He said the University had been pleasantly surprised by the results of the current modeling, and felt South Drive was a good project for them to continue to pursue. He said it was thought that the net impact on the University and the Town would be positive. Councilor Gooze said something that creates more bike paths for Durham was good for him.

Mr. Bencks said there would be minimal impact on the athletic field, and said it didn't affect the planned expansion of the stadium although it did affect the orientation of the soccer field. He said they recognized the importance of this project to the community, and said the RSA process wasn't a really good vehicle for having a discussion about it.

He said they wanted this to be an opportunity to move the conversation forward now, and work things out rather than later on in the process.

Mr. Pesci said the Town had been very lucky with transportation funding, even in the current political climate. He said they had learned to have a project ready when funding came along.

Mr. Kelley asked how the road would function during sporting events, and Mr. Bencks said those details hadn't been worked out to a great degree. He said the athletic people were excited, because it would create more of a front door to the stadium.

There was discussion on expected speeds on South Drive, and levels of traffic. Mr. Bencks said the main purpose of this road was to reduce vehicle/pedestrian congestion and conflicts on Main Street, and to get traffic that wanted to get to the south part of campus over there. He said it was realized that there was a byproduct from this, in taking cars to Mill Road.

Mr. Pesci said the University transit system would benefit from this, noting that they frequently got stuck in traffic too, which made it hard to maintain schedules.

Mr. Kelley said he hoped that this road would be patrolled enough so it didn't become a motor cycle race track.

Mr. Campbell asked if they were leaning more toward the multi-use path done on Main Street, for pedestrians and bikes.

Mr. Pesci said there had been a lot of comments that people liked this, and said they would look to see if this would fit.

Mr. Wolfe thanked Mr. Bencks and Mr. Pesci for providing the opportunity for the Planning Board to hear about and discuss this project.

IX. Approval of Minutes – February 23, 2011

Page 1, Bill McGowan should be listed as absent

Page 2, line 12, "...so people driving down Church Hill would need to stop before they got to Madbury Road."

Page 4 lines 12 and 20 , should say "100 residential structures" in the headings

Page 7 line 19, "...un-fragmented block of high value habitat."

Page 9, line 23 "...and suggested a way that the owners of this housing could ameliorate..."

Page 11, line one and elsewhere on the page, should say "Realtor David Choate"

Page 12, line 6, "...from the dollars raised from generous members and donors."

Page 13, last line, - close quotation

Page 15, 4th line from bottom of page should read "...students would be relocating from dorms..."

Page 18, first line, should read "At Ms. Fuller's request..."

Line 27, should read "...property concerning expanding the easement area..."

Page 19, line 44, "He said as was the case..."

Page 21, line 16. "...concerns when they approved some 4 story buildings..."

Page 24. Line 20, - should include the complete property description.

Line 41. " and had proclaimed that there was no longer a stratified drift aquifer..."

Councilor Smith MOVED to approve the February 23, 2011 Minutes as amended. Susan Fuller SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED 5-0-1, with Andrew Corrow abstaining because of his absence from the meeting.

X. Other Business

A. Old Business: **Update on Master Plan Survey**

B. New Business:

C. Next meeting of the Board: **April 27, 2011**

XI. Adjournment

Councilor Gooze MOVED to adjourn the meeting. Susan Fuller SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 6-0.

Adjournment at 9:08 pm

Victoria Parmele, Minutes taker

Susan Fuller, Secretary