

These minutes were approved at the November 5, 2014 meeting.

DURHAM PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, July 23, 2014
Town Council Chambers, Durham Town Hall
7:00 p.m.
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Peter Wolfe
Vice Chair Andrew Corrow
David Williams, Secretary
Lorne Parnell
Bill McGowan
Councilor Julian Smith, Council Representative to the Planning Board
Wayne Lewis, alternate
Linda Tatarczuch, alternate
Councilor Kathy Bubar, alternate Council Representative to the Planning Board

MEMBERS ABSENT Richard Kelley

I. Call to Order

Chair Wolfe called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm

II. Roll Call

The roll call was taken

III. Seating of Alternates

Ms. Tatarczuch was seated as a voting member in place of Mr. Kelley.

IV. Approval of Agenda

Councilor Smith MOVED to amend the Agenda, to include the May 21st and June 11th Minutes. David Williams SECONDED the motion and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.

V. Town Planner's Report

Mr. Behrendt said he'd met with Councilor Carden Welsh, Administrator Selig, Ute Luxem of the EDC and Durham Business Park owner Eric Chinburg regarding potential revisions to the elderly housing Zoning amendment that had been brought forth previously and rejected by the Town Council. He said these revisions would come to the Council in a month or so, and said if the Council liked them, they would initiate another proposed Zoning change and it would then come to the Planning Board for

consideration. Chair Wolfe said under New Business, the Planning Board might want to discuss other possible uses for the Business Park parcel that were appropriate. Councilor Smith said he liked that idea.

Mr. Behrendt said the public hearing on the Council initiated Zoning change to allow single family uses in the MUDOR and ORLI district would be held at the Council's first meeting in August.

He said the HDC met two weeks ago and had their first meeting with developer Scott Mitchell about the potential reuse of the existing Town Hall site as a pharmacy. He said a preliminary site plan design was presented but no building elevations were provided. He said some concerns were expressed about the project by some members of the public.

Mr. Behrendt said the Master Plan Advisory Committee met recently. He said they would like to meet with the Planning Board in September, to discuss chapters that were in the works. Chair Wolfe said part of the rationale for this was that Strafford Regional Planning Commission had developed some interesting data that most people had been unaware of and that might impact views on a lot of things concerning the Master Plan. He said SRPC wanted to share this data with the Planning Board so everyone would be on the same page as the chapters were worked on. It was agreed that this would be scheduled for the second Planning Board meeting in September.

He noted that there were a number of projects under construction right now. He said Orion would start blasting soon, and in preparation for this had recently held a neighborhood meeting with property owners located within 200 ft of the Orion site. He said there were 16 properties involved, and said all except one of these properties was visited in order to videotape the conditions there before blasting.

Mr. Behrendt said the Pauly's Pockets project was hoping to break grounds within a few weeks.

He noted that the Farmers Market met every Monday from 2:15-6:00 pm.

VI. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

VII. *Public Hearing - 90 Bennett Road – Thompson Inn. Amendment to approved site plan for new parking lot and driveway and conversion of barn for function hall for 10-room inn. Stephen and Lori Lamb, applicant; Rokeh Consulting, Site Designer. Tax Map 14, Lot 34-1 Rural Zoning District.*

Chair Wolfe noted that the drainage plan wasn't finished yet and Mr. Lamb noted that it was very close to being done. Chair Wolfe said it would be discussed at the next meeting. Mr. Behrendt said the Board could go through the draft Conditions of Approval tonight or could wait until the next meeting. There was discussion.

Councilor Smith said on page 2 of the plans, the note on the driveway permit needed to be more specific, and should say it was the permit for the driveway on the west side.

The consensus of the Board was to go through the conditions of approval at the next meeting.

Chair Wolfe asked if there were any members of the public who would like to speak.

Mr. Lamb said he and his wife had discussed a possible change to the site plan involving an addition to the barn at the end of the barn where the porch now was. He noted that the drainage analysis was being viewed with this in mind. He said the addition would be there instead of a temporary tent. He said it would be located on the north side away from the road. Chair Wolfe said he would need to see the revised plan in order to comment on this. Mr. Lamb said he would put the proposed addition on the plans. Using the existing plan, he showed Board members and the public where it would go.

Councilor Smith noted that with the tent, there was a limitation on how many events could be held each year. Mr. Lamb confirmed that this limitation was specific to the tent and not to additional space in general. Councilor Smith asked that this be clarified with Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Lamb said the addition would probably be done instead of the tent, explaining that he had been told that it was more difficult to move people and things from a tent space to the building, and it was better to have everything in one location. He said it would look like a barn and would be in keeping with the rest of the property.

Ms. Tatarczuch said she assumed that to recoup the investment in a permanent structure, the Lambs would need to use it more than 18 times per year. Mr. Lamb said 18 was the number of times the tent could be used in a year, not the number of events that could be held on the property. It was noted that if there wasn't a temporary tent, the Lambs wouldn't have to get a permit every time there was an event. Mr. Williams asked if a tent might still be used for some events, and Mr. Lamb said they hoped they wouldn't have to do this. He said having the permanent structure would satisfy their needs. There was discussion. Chair Wolfe asked if the usage would increase with the addition to the barn, and Mr. Lamb said he didn't think it would. He said the addition was intended to handle the number of people they thought there would be with the tent. He said there was a limit to what they could handle effectively.

Councilor Smith asked what would happen if it turned out that the Thompson Inn became popular with UNH students for big weekend parties. He asked if this was part of the business model, and Mr. Lamb said he liked the property far too much to allow that. He said there would be limitations on what the property could be used for, and said penalties would be imposed if needed.

Mr. Parnell asked Mr. Behrendt to check with Mr. Johnson about the issue of the number of events.

VIII. **17 & 21 Madbury Road - Madbury Commons.** Minor changes (Modification or Amendment to be determined by the Planning board) to a previously approved Site Plan and Conditional Use for Madbury Commons, a mixed use project with housing, office and retail. The change involves several minor changes to the site plan and to improvements located in the 75 foot wetland buffer. (A modification is a simple, straightforward review. An amendment is used for more complex changes and involves public notices and a public hearing.) Ken Rubin, Barrett Bilotta, and Eamon Healey, dba Golden Goose, applicant. Tax Map 2, Lots 12-3 & 12-4.

Mr. Behrendt said there were five proposed changes. He said notices were sent out that these proposed changes were an amendment to the site plan, instead of a modification, but said he recommended that the Board decide whether to treat the proposed changes as an amendment or a modification to the approve

site plan application.

He said most of the changes occurred within the 75 foot buffer so were changes in the conditional use and the site plan approval, but he noted that some of the changes occurred outside of the buffer area so were changes in the site plan approval only.

Mr. Behrendt said the original approval showed a transformer surrounded by grass at the southwesterly corner of the building within the wetland buffer. He said the applicant needed to move it to the street/court area, and said it would be screened by 6 ft high opaque lattice fencing on 4 sides and there would be landscaping on one side, fronting the court.

He said five window wells were proposed along the southerly side of Building B, and said one of the wells would be located in the wetland buffer.

He said the original plan showed a gravel drip strip along the southerly side of Building B. He said because of the proposed window wells, the applicant proposed to replace the gravel drip strip with a gutter system on the building. He said as part of this, the underground drain pipe would remain but would be increased slightly in size. He also said the rip rap at the outlet would be relocated slightly. (The outlet and a portion of the drip strip and drain pipe are located in the wetland buffer.)

Mr. Behrendt said the applicant proposed to adjust the footprint of Building A slightly, and noted that he had emailed the drawing of this to the Board today. He said most of adjustment involved reducing the amount of building within the wetland buffer, but also said there would be a small section of the building located within the buffer where it had not been before. He noted that the building reconfiguration was a change to the site plan as well as to the conditional use permit.

He said the applicant proposed 2 new transformers at the northerly end of the site, within the wetland buffer.

Mr. Behrendt said acting Town Engineer April Talon had reviewed all of these proposed changes and had no concerns about them. He said her only suggestion was to screen the transformer on all four sides. He said the Conservation Commission had reviewed the proposed changes, and said their only recommendation was to locate the two new transformers outside of the buffer if possible. He said his understanding was that the applicant had been working on this and might be able to do this, but said this would involve putting the transformers on the sorority property next door.

He recommended approval of the changes tonight as a modification. There was discussion on whether the Board should handle this as a modification or an amendment to the approved site plan. The Board agreed that they would like to hear more from the applicant.

Barrett Bilotta of Golden Goose provided copies of a plan showing the adjusted footprint. Ken Rubin of Golden Goose said the adjustment was minute so was hard to discern on the printout. He said the building had been adjusted by two inches in order to accommodate the HVAC system. He said the building size had not been increased and explained that it had been rotated on the site, and the net effect was that 286 sf of the building would be receding from the setback. He said the largest amount of linear distance the building would be moving was about a foot, and said the average was about 6 inches. Mr. Behrendt noted that the entire front of both buildings was moving closer to Madbury Road. Mr. Rubin said 8 inches was involved.

Mr. Parnell said he wondered how much the building needed to move in order for the proposed change to be considered an amendment and not a modification to the approved site plan. He said a change of a foot could be significant.

Mr. Rubin said the square footage involved was 1.4% of the space the building occupied within the setback, and also said this same square footage compared to the square footage for the entire building was extremely small. He said there would be a small rotation of the building as a result of the geotechnical analysis that had been done of the site. He said they were already pouring the footings.

Councilor Smith said he had no problem with what was proposed. He said if a visual comparison of the approved footprint and proposed footprint were made, he didn't think the Board would see anything. There was discussion that the plan that was provided did show the change in footprint. There was further discussion.

Mr. Rubin said the window wells were proposed in order to provide emergency egress. He said they weren't on the original site plan, but said having them was always part of the plan and dialogue with the Planning Board. He said at that time, the grading of the site and the soil conditions weren't known, and said the window wells were included in the plan when they had this information.

There was discussion by the Board on their standards concerning a modification to an approved site plan as compared to an amendment to an approved site plan.

Councilor Smith MOVED that the proposed changes be considered a modification to the approved site plan. Andy Corrow SECONDED the motion.

Mr. Parnell said he would support the motion, but said he had concerns about treating what was not an insignificant change to the footprint as a modification. He said Madbury Road was always a concern for residents, and said the building would be moving a foot closer to it.

Mr. Williams said an argument for considering this a modification was that there would be a 1.4% decrease in the setback, which was a quantitative consideration. He also said the move toward Madbury Road was a qualitative consideration, and said the Board should be thoughtful about this.

Mr. Lewis asked whether there would be an impact on the sidewalk. Mr. Bilotta said the Town sidewalk wouldn't change, but said the patio space of Building A would decrease by a nominal amount. It was noted that the setback requirement was 0 ft. Mr. Rubin said their setback was 23 ft, which far exceeded what was required, and was part of their commitment to make Madbury Road more of a pedestrian area. He said the proposed change affected 6 inches of space.

Chair Wolfe called the question.

The motion PASSED unanimously 7-0.

Chair Wolfe determined that the Board didn't need to go through the conditional use criteria because this was a modification to the approved conditional use permit.

There was discussion about the proposed movement of transformer #1. Mr. Rubin said they had received explicit guidance from the Planning Board on the transformers that they be as invisible as possible and as far away from Madbury Road as possible. He said PSNH was unable to provide power to the Pettee Brook side of the property, so Golden Goose moved the transformers to locations that could be fed on Madbury Road but were not on it. He said they wouldn't be visible and offensive to the eye. He said there would be screening on all four sides of all of the transformers. He said there would be landscaping on the court side and on the eastern side. He said the other two transformers wouldn't be visible, so didn't think it was important to landscape them.

Ms. Tatarczuch asked for more details on the possibility of having the other two transformers on the sorority property. Mr. Rubin said Golden Goose was fairly sure it would have a solution for this but couldn't commit to this right now. There was discussion. He said they were asking for a modification to put the transformers straddling the setback area, but were optimistic that they would find another solution.

Councilor Smith asked if another modification would be needed and requested for this. Mr. Behrendt said if the transformers could be moved to the other lot, presumably they would be placed in an area that was set back and screened. He said his sense was that if this could be done, it was a gray area about site plan review. He asked the Board if they thought he could approve this administratively. Councilor Smith said he thought this could be done administratively as long as nothing would come back and bite the Board. Mr. Behrendt said he would only do that if the transformers were screened appropriately and he thought no one would object to them.

Mr. Williams asked if an easement would be involved. Mr. Rubin said it wasn't proper for him to discuss right now alternative plans that were half baked. There was further discussion about whether an administrative approval could be done if there were alternative plans. Chair Wolfe said he would be nervous about doing this administratively. It was noted that it would be easy and better practice to bring this back as a site plan application.

There was further discussion on the transformers and how what was proposed and their location differed from what was proposed before. Mr. Rubin provided further details on this.

Councilor Smith MOVED to approve a Modification to a previously approved Site Plan and Conditional Use for Madbury Commons, a mixed use project with housing, office and retail for the property located at 17 and 21 Madbury Road, Tax Map 2, Lots 12-3 & 12-4, to include the five items delineated on page 3 of the Planners Recommendation of July 23, 2014: (1) The original approval shows a transformer surrounded by grass at the southwesterly corner of the building within the wetland buffer. The change removes the transformer replacing it with permeable pavers. The transformer will be relocated out of the wetland buffer, at the easterly end of the court, screened by 6 foot high lattice fencing on all four sides and with landscaping on two sides – facing the court/boulevard and facing Madbury Road. (2) Five window wells are added along the southerly side of Building B. One of the wells will be located in the wetland buffer. (3) A drip strip along the southerly side of Building B is replaced with a gutter system. The underground drain pipe is increased slightly in size. The rip rap at the outlet is slightly relocated and reshaped. The outlet and a portion of the drip strip and drain pipe are/were located in the wetland buffer. (4) The footprint of Building A is adjusted slightly, as shown on the drawing

submitted via email from Barrett Bilotta on July 23, 2014. There will be a small section of the building located within the buffer where the building had not been located in the original approved drawings. (5) The addition of 2 new transformers at the northerly end of the site within the wetland buffer. David Williams SECONDED the motion.

Mr. McGowan asked if confirmation concerning the drainage items had been received from the DPW. Mr. Behrendt said yes, and said an email from acting Town Engineer April Talon had been forwarded to the Board.

Mr. Parnell said despite what was said before about a modification, he could not support the motion. He said he thought the addition of two new transformers was more than a modification, and said the Board was always careful about where transformers were put and screening, etc. There was discussion about what the Conservation Commission had concluded about the location of the transformers. Mr. Parnell said he was fine with the other proposed changes, including the rotating of the building.

Mr. Williams confirmed that the transformers would be cleared through the Code Enforcement office.

Councilor Smith noted that the wetland buffer in question at the northern corner of the property was a drainage swale, and was not close to Pettee Brook. He also said it was his understanding that the three transformers would replace one larger transformer. There was discussion.

Mr. Bilotta said it was always intended that a second transformer would be needed, even though only one was shown on the site plan, and that they would need to come back to the Board concerning this if it was near the Madbury Road side. He said due to the IOL electricity requirements, there ended up being a total of three transformers. Ms. Tatarczuch asked why there would be two new transformers instead of one larger one. Mr. Bilotta said their electrical engineer had recommended that there be two transformers to power Building A. Mr. Sievert said all three transformers proposed for the project were the largest size because of the electrical requirements. Mr. Corrow noted the existing transformer in the southwest corner and discussion at the site walk that having it there would be problematic.

Chair Wolfe called the question.

The motion PASSED 6-1, with Lorne Parnell voting against it.

- IX. **Edgewood Road**. Subdivision & Boundary Line Adjustment for 4-lot subdivision. Jack Farrell, applicant. County Line Holding, LLC and Mark Morong 1991 Trust, owners. David Vincent, surveyor. Map 1, Lot 15-0. .

Mr. Farrell said the property contained about 14 acres, and said there was a modest proposal for the site. He said HISS mapping indicated that it could support as many as 22 sf units, but they would prefer not to do this, especially because one of the abutters was interested in purchasing the majority of the property. He said he'd been to the ZBA to get a variance to allow this to be considered a subdivision outside of the conservation subdivision process. He said he'd also been to the Technical Review Committee and the Conservation Commission, and had also spoken with the Town Engineer about the proposed layout.

He said three new single family lots were proposed toward the Route 4 frontage, and said the remaining

acreage in the original parcel would be sold to the abutter, Mr. Morong. He said there would also be a boundary line adjustment to convey some of the larger lot to Mr. Morong's existing lot in order to give him more setback in the back. He said they also proposed to narrow the access way down to 40 ft in order to allow Mr. Morong more setback for his existing home site. He said this would also mean it wouldn't be possible to create a Town road there.

Mr. Farrell said conditions of the variance received limited the property to residential single family use forever, and limited the total lots on the property to 4. He said the plan the ZBA based its approval on also showed significant amount of setbacks and forested buffer areas, which would be put in as restrictions on the property in perpetuity. He said it would end up as an ad hoc conservation subdivision that addressed most of the goals of conservation subdivision in the Zoning Ordinance, but would also provide an opportunity for the abutter to have a home site there.

Councilor Smith asked if common space would be included. Mr. Farrell said there would be common open space according to the definition, but said there would not be commonly owned open space. There was discussion.

Mr. Farrell said there were a number of waiver requests, some related to the fact that this wasn't a conservation subdivision, and some related to the fact that there was no construction contemplated other than the home sites. He said the driveway would require a wetland crossing and also a conditional use permit because of the wetland. He said a state wetland permit would be needed for the wetland crossing, and said he would like the approved design for this to be a condition of approval.

Chair Wolfe said it looked like the driveway also crossed parcel #4. Mr. Farrell explained that the narrower part of Edgewood Road was Town property and where it widened out it belonged to the State. He said they were trying to make improvements in the area that was Town property so they wouldn't have to deal with the State, and said they had therefore picked the narrowest part of the wetland to cross, and were also trying to stay within the Town right of way with the access point.

There was further discussion on the limitation on future subdivision in the ZBA's variance approval. Councilor Smith confirmed that lot 15-0 would be a 10 acre lot that couldn't be subdivided. Mr. Farrell also noted that a condition of the ZBA variance approval was that only 5 acres of this lot could be cleared.

Mr. Behrendt said the application was complete. He said the information provided was sufficient.

In answer to a question from Mr. Parnell, Mr. Behrendt said he had originally determined that this should be a conservation subdivision, and he provided details on this. But he said Mr. Farrell had a different view so appealed this to the ZBA. He said Mr. Farrell had also applied for a variance in the event that the ZBA upheld his (Mr. Behrendt's) determination that this was a conservation subdivision. He said the ZBA upheld the determination, but then granted the variance, based on the size of the lot and the other assurances Mr. Farrell provided.

Mr. Farrell said there were some very specific conditions of approval, which would have to be in effect regarding any Planning Board approvals. He said there was also some sympathy from the ZBA that there was some ambiguity in the Ordinance concerning conservation subdivision and he spoke further

on this. He said the conditions of approval he had suggested concerning the variance essentially met the terms of the conservation subdivision ordinance.

Chair Wolfe asked what the hardship was, in the variance application. Mr. Farrell said the ZBA said the variance criteria were satisfied, and also said the appeal period had run out so this was a fact of law. He said their decision and what he was proposing were reasonable, and noted that he was the author of the conservation subdivision ordinance. He said this proposal met its intent. There was further discussion.

Mr. Parnell asked if the proposed driveway would access lot 15-0, and Mr. Farrell said no. He said access to that lot would be from the 40 ft wide area. There was further discussion.

Councilor Smith MOVED to accept as complete the application for Subdivision & Boundary Line Adjustment for 4-lot subdivision presented by Jack Farrell, County Line Holding, LLC for the property located on Edgewood Road, Map 1, Lot 15-0, and set the public hearing for August 13, 2014. Lorne Parnell SECONDED the motion.

Ms. Tatarczuch determined that the 40 ft wide road would be a single family home driveway. Mr. Farrell also noted that it would be built in the future. He said there should be a condition that it would never be more than that. In answer to a question, he said the minimum fire safety standards would need to be met.

The motion PASSED unanimously 7-0.

The site walk was scheduled for September 13th.

X. Other Business

Chair Wolfe asked Board members for their thoughts on possible other uses for the Durham Business Park. Councilor Smith noted that the zone itself included the property owned by Mr. Chinburg but also included some Town land and some University land on the west side of the wastewater treatment plant. He said the basic issue for him was that the DBP zone included Town water and sewer. He said it would be appropriate to consider what the Town Council years ago did not want to consider, which was to put this land in the RA district. He asked the Board to consider two basic options: to leave the Durham Business Park zone with its 3 lots as it was and consider changing the Table of Uses; or to consider rezoning it as RA, which was what it used to be.

Mr. Behrendt noted again that a revised ordinance change concerning elderly housing would be coming back to the Council. Chair Wolfe said he was bringing this matter up now because the Town Council vote on the original ordinance change proposal was pretty one sided against elderly housing. Councilor Smith provided details on this. He said at one point there was a recommendation that the proposal go back to the Planning Board, and he recommended against that. He said he would like to see something unique, original, innovative at the Durham Business Park, including some elderly housing and appropriate commercial uses, including some kind of small local retail if there were a fairly dense residential development there. He said because it was on water and sewer, it made sense to have some density there, but he noted that what was originally proposed was considered to be too dense.

Chair Wolfe recommended that this could all be discussed in September if they got something new from

the Town Council concerning an elderly housing Zoning amendment.

Chair Wolfe asked how the idea of color coding of plans was going. Mr. Williams said he had spoken with Exeter planner Sylvia Von Aulock on this, and said there were three approaches to consider:

- Ask that applicants provide an 11 ft by 17 ft aerial photo of a project, in color, showing what would be included in the project and what would be left over, abutters, etc.
- Ask that applicants color code the plans provide with a site plan application.
- Have Ms. Von Aulock give a class for the Planning Board, ZBA and HDC on reading site plan documents

Mr. Behrendt said he would follow up with Ms. Von Aulock. He also said Mr. Sievert thought these things were very doable. Chair Wolfe noted that a number of people, including members of the public had suggested this. He said at a minimum digital copies of the site plan could be provided in color, and the building footprint and lots for proposed projects could be superimposed on Google Earth aerial photos.

Ms. Tatarczuch said it would be helpful if the plans provided digitally to the Planning Board could be expanded. Chair Wolfe noted that it was when they got last minute information like this by email that there were sometimes problems. Councilor Smith suggested the use of a magnifying glass in order to read the fine print on site plans.

Chair Wolfe asked Mr. Williams to get some language from Exeter on possible language to include in the site plan regulations concerning color coding of plans. He also suggested that there could be a session with Ms. Von Aulock in the fall. There was further discussion.

Chair Wolfe said Peak would be going live in August-September. He said he would like to arrange for the Planning Board to visit the site. He also said he would also like to hear from Town staff on what the Planning Board could have done better in its recent approvals, in order to make the projects better and make the work of staff easier. Mr. Behrendt suggested that other Town boards could also be asked for their input concerning this.

Councilor Smith said Scott Mitchell, who had the option to buy the Town Hall property had come before the HDC recently. He said he attended that meeting and spoke there as a citizen. He said Planning Board members might want to watch the meeting. He said a key element of Mr. Mitchell's plan was a drive thru pharmacy window, but he said the Zoning Ordinance only allowed drive thrus for banks. He said he wasn't opposed to a drive thru window for a pharmacy and understood why some people would want to use them.

He suggested that the Board give Mr. Behrendt some direction for talking to Mr. Mitchell about the layout for traffic flow in the plans and provided details on his concerns about this layout. He said a variance would be needed for the drive thru window, and said he thought the ZBA might be amenable to it if the drive thru was in a better location and the traffic flow was planned differently.

Chair Wolfe said he thought it was premature to discuss that layout at this point. Councilor Smith said he was simply alerting the Planning Board concerning it, and asked them to encourage Mr. Behrendt to do what he could to talk Mr. Mitchell into having a better site plan. Chair Wolfe said the Planning

Board was a long way from anything to look at for this project.

Mr. Behrendt said because the HDC's review was more challenging, the project started there. he said if and when it looked like it was starting to come together but wasn't approved yet, it came to the Planning Board at a preliminary level. He spoke further on this. Chair Wolfe recommended that people look at the process followed with the Orion project, which took over a year.

Mr. Behrendt noted an email he had sent to the Planning Board regarding proposed antennas to be added to the Sprint tower and the possible scheduling of a site walk. He said a public hearing wasn't required, but said the Town as the host for the tower wanted to require it because some neighbors had some concerns about what was proposed. After discussion, it was agreed that the public hearing for the application would be scheduled for the September 10th meeting, or in August if there was a tight time frame for Sprint.

Mr. Williams said he would like Molly Donovan to speak with the Planning Board about what would be coming forward concerning the Master Plan in the fall. Mr. Behrendt said he would confirm that she would be able to be at the August 13th Planning Board meeting. Chair Wolfe said the second meeting in September should be well advertised because there was a lot of really good information that Strafford Regional Planning Commission would be providing at that meeting.

XI. Review of Minutes:

June 25, 2014

Page 1, line 26, should say Vice Chair Corrow

Page 2, line 15, should say DPW Director Michael Lynch

Page 7, line 42, should say "...had also spoken with the Durham Boat Company"

Page 16, line 31, should say "...the design was too ornate.."

Councilor Smith MOVED to approve the June 25, 2014 Minutes as amended. Lorne Parnell SECONDED the motion and it PASSED 6-0-1, with Chair Wolfe abstaining because of his absence from the meeting.

June 11, 2014

Page 5, line 37, should say "Mr. Kelley"

Councilor Smith MOVED to approve the June 11, 2014 Minutes as amended. Andy Corrow SECONDED the motion and it PASSED 6-0-2, with Bill McGowan and David Williams abstaining because of their absence from the meeting.

May 21, 2014

Page 3, line 27, should say "Richard Kelley"

Page 4, line 1, should say "Mr. Smith" should be "Councilor Smith"

Page 8, line 9, strike “NS” and replace with “and”

Councilor Smith MOVED to approve the May 21, 2014 Minutes as amended. Andy Corrow SECONDED the motion and it PASSED 6-0-2, with Bill McGowan and Linda Tatarczuch abstaining because of their absence from the meeting.

XII. Adjournment

Lorne Parnell MOVED to adjourn the meeting. Linda Tatarczuch SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.

Adjournment at 849 pm.

Victoria Parmele, Minutes taker

David Williams, Secretary