

*These minutes were approved at the July 27, 2011 meeting.*

**Durham Planning Board Agenda  
Wednesday June 8, 2011  
Durham Town Hall - Council Chambers  
7:00P.M.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Lorne Parnell; Secretary Susan Fuller; Bill McGowan (arrived at 8:11 p.m.); Town Council representative Jay Gooze; alternate Town Council representative Julian Smith; alternate Wayne Lewis

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Vice Chair Peter Wolfe; Richard Ozenich; Richard Kelley; alternate Andrew Corrow

**I. Call to Order**

**II. Approval of Agenda**

*Susan Fuller MOVED to approve the Agenda. Councilor Gooze SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 4-0.*

Chair Parnell called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. Chair Parnell said Mr. Lewis would be a voting member in place of Mr. Ozenich.

**III. Planner's Report**

Mr. Campbell said the Master Plan survey response period was now closed and said Charlie French at Cooperative Extension was tackling the results. He said there would be a meeting next week with the Master Plan Survey subcommittee, and said at some point the survey results would come to the Planning Board for review. He said about 430 surveys had been returned, including partially completed surveys.

He said work had started on developing design guidelines, and noted that there had been a good meeting that day with the Historic District Commission. He said consultant Roger Hawk would be at the Planning Board's June 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting to discuss design guidelines.

Mr. Campbell noted that the Planning Board's decision on the Capstone applications had been appealed, and that the paperwork on this had been included in Board members' packets. He said he would keep everyone posted on how the upcoming hearing went.

Chair Parnell asked if there were any countersuits, and Mr. Campbell said not yet. There was further discussion.

Mr. Campbell said at the upcoming quarterly planning meeting, the Board would

continue discussion on the draft workforce housing amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. He also said Bob Chamberlin from RSG would update the Planning Board on traffic model runs being done to look at the idea of turning the one way traffic loop in the downtown area into a two way loop. He said this information had also been presented to the Traffic Safety Committee.

#### **IV. Approval of Minutes**

April 6, 2011  
April 13, 2011

Chair Parnell noted that only three members now present were at the April 6, 2011 meeting, and only two members present now were at the April 13, 2011 meeting. It was agreed that approval of these Minutes would be moved to Item VIII on the Agenda, so that if additional Board members subsequently arrived at the meeting, there might be a quorum to approve those Minutes.

#### **V. Acceptance Consideration of an Application for Boundary Line Adjustment** submitted by Attorney Peter J. Loughlin, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, on behalf of Capstone Development Corp. & CDC-New Hampshire LLC, William & Edna Woodward Rev Trust and John B. & Candace L. Shea to adjust the boundary line between two lots. The properties involved are shown on Tax Map 9, Lots 6-2 and 10-3, are located on Main Street/Technology Drive and are in the Office Research/Light Industry Zoning District.

There was discussion about whether Councilor Gooze or Councilor Smith would be the voting member for this application, since Councilor Smith had been the voting member when the Capstone applications themselves were heard. It was agreed that the boundary line application was pretty straightforward, and that Councilor Gooze would be the voting member.

Attorney Peter Loughlin noted that as the Capstone applications had been reviewed by the Planning Board, there was a good deal of interest in the protection of the Oyster River. He said with the encouragement of the Planning Board, Capstone had entered into negotiations with the Shea family, and a Purchase and Sale agreement was subsequently developed for Capstone to acquire 4.4 acres from the family. He said the Woodward property being sold to Capstone contained approximately 1300 linear ft of frontage on the Oyster River, and said with the addition of the 4.4 acre parcel, there would be a total of 2700 linear ft of frontage on the river.

He said nothing would be built on the lot, which was located in both Durham and Lee, and said approval of the boundary line adjustment needed to be obtained from both towns. He explained that there was 29 sf of land in the riverbed that wasn't part of the application. He said the Woodwards would probably convey this to Capstone separately, using the Town line as a boundary.

Attorney Loughlin said the land would be subject to a conservation deed restriction,

explaining that Capstone had been unsuccessful so far in getting the Strafford Rivers Conservancy or the Southeast Land Trust to accept a conservation easement for the parcel. He also noted that the Conservation Commission had previously declined to hold the conservation easement. He said there would be a deed restriction, which would be enforceable by the Town.

Chair Parnell asked Attorney Loughlin to explain what would happen regarding the 29 sf..

Attorney Loughlin said under the statute regarding municipal boundaries, it said landowners could treat the municipal boundary as a property line. He said the Sheas owned the land around it, and said the Woodwards would convey the 29 sf to the Sheas just for title purposes, and said it would be cleaner that way.

Chair Parnell asked who owned the property to the south, and Attorney Loughlin said the owner was Rose Realty.

Mr. Campbell said the application was ready for acceptance.

***Susan Fuller MOVED to accept an Application for Boundary Line Adjustment submitted by Attorney Peter J. Loughlin, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, on behalf of Capstone Development Corp. & CDC-New Hampshire LLC, William & Edna Woodward Rev Trust and John B. & Candace L. Shea to adjust the boundary line between two lots. The properties involved are shown on Tax Map 9, Lots 6-2 and 10-3, are located on Main Street/Technology Drive and are in the Office Research/Light Industry Zoning District.***

***Wayne Lewis SECONDED the motion and it PASSED unanimously 4-0.***

Chair Parnell noted that the Board could deliberate and vote on the application that evening.

Mr. Campbell explained that with boundary line adjustment applications, abutters, easement holders, etc had the right to be heard concerning them, but said he hadn't seen any requests to do so. He said the Board could treat this as a modified procedure, and therefore accept and deliberate on the application on the same night.

The Board reviewed the draft Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval

Chair Parnell asked if what happened when the application was reviewed by the Lee Planning Board was relevant to the Durham Planning Board.

There was discussion, and Mr. Campbell said he didn't see why the Lee Planning Board would deny the application.

Attorney Loughlin said he had had a preliminary meeting with the Lee Planning Board. He said everyone had seemed fine with what was proposed and was pleased that the 4.4 acres would be conservation land.

Chair Parnell and Mr. Campbell discussed the idea of having a condition of approval to be

met prior to signature, that the Durham Planning Board's decision would be conditional upon the decision from the Lee Planning Board.

Conditions to be met prior to the Signature of Approval on the Boundary Line Adjustment Plan:

1. The applicant shall supply two mylar plans and one paper copy for signature by the Planning Board Chair.
2. A certificate of monumentation must be provided to the Planning & Community Development office.
3. All final plans must be stamped by appropriate professionals.
4. The Durham Planning Board's approval is predicated on the Town of Lee's approval of the Boundary Line Adjustment application.

Conditions to be Met Subsequent to the Signature of Approval on the Boundary Line Adjustment Plan:

1. The referenced Boundary Line Adjustment Plan and these Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval shall be recorded with the Strafford County Registry of Deeds, at the applicant's expense, within seven (7) days of the Chair's signature on the Plan.

*Susan Fuller MOVED to approve, as amended, an Application for Boundary Line Adjustment submitted by Attorney Peter J. Loughlin, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, on behalf of Capstone Development Corp. & CDC-New Hampshire LLC, William & Edna Woodward Rev Trust and John B. & Candace L. Shea to adjust the boundary line between two lots. The properties involved are shown on Tax Map 9, Lots 6-2 and 10-3, are located on Main Street/Technology Drive and are in the Office Research/Light Industry Zoning District. Wayne Lewis SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 4-0.*

- VI. Conceptual Consultation for Site Plan Review** submitted by MJS Engineering PC, Newmarket, New Hampshire on behalf of GHL LLC, Newburyport, Massachusetts to move the current Grange building to the front of the lot and to construct an addition to the back of the building for commercial and residential uses. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 5, Lot 1-5, is located at 37 Main Street and is in the Central Business Zoning District.

Peter Murphy explained that the process had started in October when he responded to an RFP for the Grange, and said the project was now getting close to coming together. He read through an Executive Summary regarding the project. He said as part of the redevelopment project, the Grange would be moved closer to the street, new commercial space would be put in on the first floor, and 3 workforce housing apartments would be constructed in the building. He said a 3 story, 6000 sf barn-like structure would be constructed behind the

Grange, and would contain 5 luxury student apartment units, including one handicap accessible unit. He said the old walkway in back would be redone, and would include a change of grade, the addition of lighting, fencing, etc.

Mr. Murphy said this proposal would increase the tax base to the Town, as well as preserve the Grange Hall's status on the National Register of Historic Places. He said by providing student housing in Town, there was the possibility of bringing in students from residential neighborhoods, thus spurring economic development and retail activity without the need for a car or parking. He said improving the pedestrian walkway would contribute to a green walking and biking community.

Chair Parnell asked what the difference would be between workforce housing apartments and student apartments.

Mr. Murphy said he was working with consultant Jack Mettee regarding the workforce housing aspect of the project. He said the Grange would be gutted down to the studs, and said the new workforce housing units would not be rented to students. He said most likely they would be rented to people who lived and worked in Durham and were looking for an in-town apartment, which was something they previously hadn't been able to find because students filled apartments up. He said there was a company in Portsmouth that managed the process of making sure that the workforce housing tenancy rules were followed.

Mr. Campbell explained that there was a private company whose exclusive focus was making sure that workforce housing covenants, income levels, etc. were followed.

Councilor Gooze said when the workforce housing subcommittee met with Mr. Mettee, he assured them that the way the covenant would be written, it would be very unusual for a student to be in workforce housing unit, because he/she wouldn't meet the income requirements.

Mr. Campbell noted that the income level of parents were considered, since students were still dependants.

Councilor Smith asked Mr. Murphy if there was a fallback if he couldn't find workforce renters.

Mr. Murphy said this issue had been discussed, but said there was no final language yet regarding it. He said there would need to be a back-up plan in case there wasn't a demand for the apartments as workforce housing. But he said the price point would be reasonable, so renting these beautiful in-town apartments should go well. He said he expected to have the back-up plan ready soon.

Councilor Smith asked if University staff would qualify for workforce housing, and Mr. Murphy said he didn't know. He said he certainly wasn't opposed to this.

Ms. Fuller asked if there would be any parking on the site, and Mr. Murphy said no. Ms. Fuller said there might be a tenant who worked in a town close by, and asked if there would

be a restriction that someone renting a workforce housing unit would have to work in Durham.

Mr. Murphy said this was still being worked out with Administrator Selig and Mr. Mettee, and said the final wording would reflect it.

Ms. Fuller said if Mr. Murphy wound up renting to someone who worked in Dover, there would need to be some place nearby where the person could lease parking.

Mr. Murphy said both the Varsity property to the left of the Grange and Mill Plaza behind it provided opportunities to rent parking space, and said both were within 20 ft of the Grange property..

Mr. Murphy said the spirit of the workforce housing idea was that if there was a woman who worked as a teacher in Durham and lived in Dover, this would be a great opportunity. He said he would be better versed on all of this next time.

There was further discussion by the Board about who might want to live in these workforce housing units. Mr. Campbell said as long as a person met the income level, they should be able to live there.

Councilor Gooze said for practical purposes, this was really set up for people who wanted to be able to walk to work.

Ms. Fuller said working people would need to have a vehicle, whether they could walk to work or not.

Mr. Campbell said they could rent a Zip Car.

Councilor Smith said if someone lived at the Grange and worked in downtown Newmarket, she could get on Wildcat Transit. He also noted that there was a grocery store next door.

Councilor Gooze said there were actually people who didn't want to drive. He said people could take Wildcat Transit to the mall, and said people could lease a parking space, or could rent a car. He said this project was a great opportunity to see workforce housing happen in Durham.

Ms. Fuller said she had just been curious about the parking. She noted that in Portsmouth there were a lot of condos that didn't have parking, and tenants rented space in the parking garage.

Councilor Smith said the basic issue was that in the Central Business District, a developer was not required to provide parking if there wasn't any parking already on a parcel.

Mr. Murphy noted that Mr. Mettee would be at the Board's quarterly planning meeting, and said he was quite knowledgeable about these kinds of questions.

Councilor Gooze noted the present width of the walkway leading to the Plaza, and said there were questions on the width, lighting, whether people could ride their bikes on it, etc.

Mike Sievert of MSJ Engineering first noted that there would be discussion with the owner of Mill Plaza about the portion of the path that extended onto that property. He said in the front, about 40 ft would be 10 ft wide, which was what it was now. He said the rest of the path would be 6 ft wide, so there so could be some landscaping and lighting as well.

He said the reason to keep the path wider in front was to allow better access. He noted that there was currently a fire lane, and said he didn't think this would stay that way. He said there would be an area available up front that would allow people to get off the street and access the property on move-in and move-out days, and said bollards would be placed there so people wouldn't drive in and down the access way.

Councilor Gooze said the 6 ft width would restrict bicycling on the path.

Mr. Sievert said they wanted to get peoples' thoughts on this, and said if it turned out that an 8 ft width was better for the pedestrian walkway, it would be adjusted. He said the front part would be 10 ft wide, and said they didn't want to go much wider than that.

Councilor Gooze re-stated his concern as to whether 6 ft would be wide enough for bikes and pedestrians, and said he would prefer to see an 8 ft width.

Mr. Sievert spoke about designing the path so it wouldn't slope down so suddenly in the back, by starting the sloping down closer to the front of the site. He described possible options for designing the middle section connecting the Grange and the new building in the back, which would be the third workforce housing unit. He also described how they were working with the slope on the site in terms of the layout of the middle section and back building.

Mr. Sievert said two variances were proposed for the project, one of which was to allow non-commercial use of a portion of the first floor, so it could be used for workforce housing. He said another variance was received so that the front wall of the building, facing Main Street, did not have to be 20% glass. He noted that for historic preservation reasons, the HDC didn't want the front face to contain that much glass.

He said the pathway would be pervious in some way, and provided details on this. He also described a proposed patio area for the commercial space.

Councilor Gooze suggested that in order to get 2 ft more for the 6 ft walkway toward the back, the new building could be 2 ft less. There was discussion. Mr. Sievert agreed that there was plenty of room to get up to 8 ft without jeopardizing much.

Chair Parnell referred to the fact that there would be 5-7 students per unit in the student housing units in the new building, and noted that the Planning Board had previously

received comments concerning the idea of 6 students living in a unit.

Councilor Smith asked where the stairs in the townhouse unit went to, and Mr. Sievert said they went to the second floor of the unit. He said one would step down into the unit, and said the stairs went to the second floor. There was further discussion on the floor plans, and Mr. Sievert explained that things weren't laid out 100% yet.

Mr. Campbell noted that Town water and sewer existed for the property, and asked if any upgrades would be needed.

Mr. Sievert said yes, noting that the water line had a leak and also wasn't big enough, so had to be replaced. He said they didn't know yet about the sewer line, but said he was sure that it would have to be changed as well.

Mr. Campbell asked about electric service, and Mr. Sievert said because the building would come right up to the front of the site, they would propose to go underground from the utility pole in front,

Mr. Campbell noted that 60% of the entrances needed to be ADA accessible.

Mr. Sievert said this needed some work. He showed some possible ideas for this, and noted that there might be an ADA accessible workforce housing unit as part of this. He also said they potentially might make the whole path handicap accessible, but said that might take more work than the neighbors wanted to participate in.

He said a few trees in front would have to be removed. He said there would be trimming of vegetation in the back, but said other than that, whatever vegetation was there on the outskirts of the property would stay.

Mr. Sievert said another reason they were trying to narrow down the path was to allow some areas for better infiltration on the site, with a rain garden, etc. He said there was quite a bit of impervious surface there now, and said the project would obviously increase this.

He said the tentative schedule was to come to the July 13<sup>th</sup> Planning Board meeting for the acceptance hearing, and to get through the public hearing and approval of the project at the July 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. He said they hoped to be able to move the Grange onto the new foundation before the fall semester at UNH. Mr. Sievert said the goal right now was to flush out concerns about the project.

Chair Parnell asked if when this project was finished, there would be two separate buildings.

Mr. Sievert said yes. He said architect Nick Isaak was looking at the idea of having a firewall between them, and said there would be sprinklers in both buildings. He said the student housing building would be a stand alone building, even though it was attached, and said people wouldn't be able to travel internally from the student apartments to the commercial space.



There was discussion that the roof lines for the two buildings wouldn't be that much different from one another.

Chair Parnell asked if it was envisioned that there would be changes to the look of the Grange.

Mr. Sievert said no, and said it would be redone with the same materials there now, with the exception of the back piece. He noted that they would be going before the HDC.

Mr. Murphy said quite a bit of time had been spent talking about materials, and said it would be stone and cedar throughout. He said they would stay with cedar clapboards and the granite steps facing the street. He also said there would be cedar shingles on the back barn, and said the property would be kept as historic as possible. He said the windows would be true divided panes, and also said they would have sound deadening features.

He said the entrance to the student housing units and the workforce housing units would be kept separate from one another, and said there would be no common area they both would pass through. He said this was done on purpose, to make it easier for everyone to coexist.

Councilor Gooze asked if there was any sense of what the commercial space would be used for, given the fact that there would be people living above it.

Mr. Murphy said he would be very sensitive as to what went in there, and said it wouldn't be anything like a bar or a pool hall. He said he couldn't say what the use would be, but said it was a major priority in making the whole project work.

Councilor Gooze said this project was a great experiment, and said he hoped it would work.

Mr. Murphy provided some details on what would be done to create as much of a sound barrier as possible between the commercial space and the residential space above it.

Mr. Lewis asked whether apartment units would have air conditioning.

Mr. Murphy said there had been discussion about this, and noted that his apartment building on Rosemary Lane did not have air conditioning. He said he was leaning toward providing some with the new building, and said it would be central air, so there wouldn't be any air conditioners hanging out of windows in this high visibility area.

Councilor Smith asked if the leases would restrict this.

Mr. Murphy said probably, but said he would have a definite answer on this in two weeks.

Mr. Campbell said screens were a good idea.

**VII. Conceptual Consultation for Subdivision** submitted by MJS Engineering PC, Newmarket, New Hampshire on behalf of Grant Development LLC, Durham, New Hampshire to

subdivide the existing business park into smaller lots. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 11, Lot 27-0, is located off of Piscataqua Road and is in the Durham Business Park Zoning District.

Mike Sievert of MJS Engineering said what was proposed now was for developer Eric Chinburg to subdivide the Business Park parcel into smaller lots in order to try to attract smaller businesses there rather than large companies. He said with a larger company there, there could be 50-60 employees coming and going from the site during peak hours. He said the idea with this change was to minimize traffic impacts from development of the Business Park site. He noted that because of the traffic limitations at the site, the larger companies had not been attracted to locating there.

Mr. Sievert said between 6 and 9 separate lots were proposed, and said he didn't think the number would go below 6. He said things got too tight if there were more than 9 lots. He said what would dictate the number was the amount of buildable area when the various setbacks were taken into account. He noted that there was plenty of frontage available.

He said right now, they were doing additional soils work at the site in order to see if there was additional land that could be factored in for lot sizing although not necessarily as actual building area unless it was a conditional use. He said it was possible that the Conditional Use process could come into play if lots contained wetland and/or shoreland areas. He said that was probably why they wouldn't get to 9 lots, because he didn't think there would be enough space to build on without the Conditional Use process, and said he wasn't sure that was the way to go.

Mr. Sievert described a small area off of the cul-de-sac and another small area, each of which contained wetlands that were not considered to be a part of the wetlands conservation overlay district because they had less than 3,000 sf or were a swale associated with drainage. He said he would take the liberty to say that these areas would not be considered to be a part of the wetland overlay district, and said he would provide more information on this at the next meeting. He said they were looking at the idea of somewhat poorly drained soils in these areas within the wetland conservation overlay district potentially picking up conditional square footage to count as lot acreage.

Mr. Sievert said the utilities and road had been on the site for some time. He said the road wasn't in great shape and would have to be upgraded to some extent, and said it wasn't clear whether it was a private or Town road. He said the drainage system on the site was in good shape, but needed cleaning.

He also said the sewer line was in good shape, and said although it was leaking, it was leaking in and was holding water. He said that was typical, and said it would need to be pressure tested to be sure things were still intact. He spoke about the pump station, and said it had hardly been used. He said there was some rust because of this, and said they were looking to get it back up and running. He also said something would have to be done in terms of getting the force main over to the wastewater treatment plant.

Mr. Sievert said the water system had regularly been tested by the Fire Department, and explained that it would need to be extended out on the site. He summarized that fairly minimal new utility work as well as some re-working of the existing infrastructure would be needed.

Chair Parnell and Mr. Sievert discussed the buildable acreage on the lots that were proposed, and Chair Parnell noted that some of these were not contiguous.

He asked if businesses had expressed interest in this revised approach, and Mr. Sievert said there had been no larger company interested in the site since Mr. Chinburg had been involved. He said what had started this current idea was interest shown on the site by Seacoast Aquaculture, which had said it could exist on one of the lots. He also said there had been some additional interest expressed in some of the smaller lots. He said locating on the site was currently a back up plan for Seacoast Aquaculture.

Councilor Gooze asked whether with the extra lots and the parking that would be required for each of them, this would change the amount of paved parking overall. He noted that the Business Park site was very close to the water.

Mr. Sievert said the greater the number of lots that were allowed on the site, the smaller the buildings, the smaller the parking area and the smaller the number of employees that would be allowed. He said he would check to see what the numbers were for the original large building and parking proposed on the site.

Councilor Gooze said he would like to see that.

Mr. Sievert provided further details on some possible parking options, with the smaller lots.

Mr. Lewis asked about some nearby land owned by DOT, and Mr. Sievert said it was part of the right of way on Old Piscataqua Road, which connected to the site from the hockey rink.

Councilor Smith noted that DOT had encouraged the Town to open up that road all the way over to Grant Circle on the Business Park site, in order to keep traffic off of Route 4. He said that might eventually happen.

Mr. Campbell noted that this would require some major improvements. He also said with proposed lots 1 and 6, he didn't see how the Conditional Use Permit process could be avoided, because all the building area was within the 250 ft shoreland district overlay, for nonresidential developments. He said that with lots 2,3,4 and 5, there was more room to play with, but said when the parking was considered, these lots might involve Conditional Use as well.

Mr. Sievert said the bottom line was that the property wouldn't be developed without the

### Conditional Use process

Mr. Campbell asked about road upgrading that was planned.

Mr. Sievert said Mr. Chinburg wasn't proposing to make any changes to the road as part of the subdivision process. He said Town Engineer Dave Cedarholm had looked at the pavement, and said it came down to whether it was a private or public road. He said he suspected that it would be a public road, and said if it was, the road would be ground up and repaved. He said this would be a good opportunity to bury overhead wires, which could be required as part of the site plan review process.

He said he would like to get a better sense of these kinds of issues, and noted that as costs escalated, the feasibility of developing the site went down. He said he didn't think the road would be fully ground and rebuilt if it wasn't turned over to the Town.

Mr. Campbell said that concerning the site plan review process, utilities within the right of way were exempted. He said the same thing applied with the subdivision regulations.

Mr. Sievert said it was a cost issue for his client, because no one was lining up to develop on the site. He said the idea was to keep costs down and offer as much variety as possible to potential businesses. He said it looked like the bottom line was that the possibility of developing the site was stronger if there were smaller lots, but said the more lots there were, the more that the Conditional Use process would be needed.

Chair Parnell asked what came next, and Mr. Sievert said he was trying to get the soils analysis completed, along with the DPW issues and costs, within the next few weeks, in order to finalize the subdivision plan.

Chair Parnell said there appeared to be no downside to the subdivision, and said the lots could always be joined together if someone wanted this.

Mr. Sievert agreed. He said it was a better marketing position to have these smaller lots, and said with some of the lots, minimal use of the Conditional Use process would be needed. He said with smaller developments, there would be less visual impact than from a larger development. But he said there was nothing to say that Mr. Chinburg couldn't come back and say he wanted to combine the lots in order to be able to build a bigger building.

Break from 8:29 - 8:33 pm

### **VIII. Approval of Minutes –**

April 6, 2011

Councilor Smith was a voting member for this agenda item.

Page 2, line 16, should read "...three managers would have offices..."

Page 4, line 45, should read "...a married couple could rent a bedroom, and the price..."

Page 5, line 23, should read "...but said that control also meant that as long as they were paying rent for the other person, they could stay there."

line 32, should read "...where more than three unrelated people..."

Page 6 line 4, should read "...as having them integrated throughout the ..."

Page 8 line 13 should read " Councilor Smith said with the various...."

line 14, should read "He asked if outdoor drying of laundry would be..."

line 22, should have a period at the end of the sentence.

Page 9, line 14, should read "Chair Parnell asked if there could be some kind of central generator for more than just the clubhouse, and ..."

Page 10, line 27, should read "Mr. Acken said the landscape maintenance plan..."

Page 20 line 23, should read "Chair Parnell said it was a bit too open ended to..."

line 41, should read "He noted that the 2700 linear ft of frontage..."

Page 24, line 35, "...in terms of lost revenues, but ..."

Page 25, line 18, should read "Shea", not "Shay".

***Councilor Smith MOVED to approve the April 6, 2011 Minutes as amended. Bill McGowan SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED 4-0-2, with Councilor Gooze and Wayne Lewis abstaining because of their absence from the meeting.***

#### April 13, 2011

The Board postponed approval of these Minutes because there weren't enough Board members present who had been at the April 13, 2011 meeting.

#### April 27, 2011

Page 4 line 38, should read "...about the queue,,,"

Page 5, line 21, should read "...and where people would park if there were parties..."

Page 6, line 42, should read "John Shea"

Page 8, line 6, should read "...that landscape plans were appropriate,..."

Page 17, line 30, should say "Wolfe". Also remove extra period from line 31.

Page 20 line 26, remove the word "unanimously" from the motion.

***Councilor Gooze MOVED to approve the April 27, 2011 Minutes as amended. Bill McGowan SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED 4-0-1, with Wayne Lewis abstaining because of his absence from the meeting.***

### **IX. Other Business**

A. Old Business:

B. New Business:

C. Next meeting of the Board: **June 22, 2011 (Quarterly Planning Meeting)**

### **X. Adjournment**

***Susan Fuller MOVED to adjourn the meeting. Bill McGowan SECONDED the***

*motion, and it PASSED unanimously 5-0.*

Adjournment at 8:49 pm

Victoria Parmele, Minutes taker

---

Susan Fuller, Secretary