



**TOWN OF DURHAM**  
8 NEWMARKET RD  
DURHAM, NH 03824-2898  
603/868-8064  
[www.ci.durham.nh.us](http://www.ci.durham.nh.us)

***Town Planner Recommendations – Various Agenda Items***  
**DURHAM PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, June 24, 2015**

See individual write-ups for items not included below.

XIV. ***Public Hearing – Draft Economic Development Chapter of the Master Plan.*** The draft chapter has been endorsed by the Master Plan Advisory Committee.

- I recommend that the board:
- a) hold the public hearing;
  - b) close the public hearing if it deems appropriate;
  - c) incorporate any appropriate comments from the public hearing;
  - d) carefully review and incorporate appropriate comments from the Economic Development Committee; and
  - e) endorse the plan with changes or continue the review

The Master Plan Advisory Committee endorsed the enclosed draft at its meeting on May 7, 2015 subject to numerous comments (subsequently incorporated). This is the first public hearing on the draft.

\* Note that the Economic Development Committee reviewed the draft in detail at its meeting on June 16. A document with the committee's proposed changes is included in the packet.

---

XVI. ***Madbury Commons – Various Amendments.*** 17 and 21 Madbury Road. Various amendments and/or modifications to the approved site plan for multi-use development for 525 residents, with office/retail and several public spaces. Golden Goose Properties, c/o Ken Rubin, Eamonn Healey, and Barrett Bilotta, applicant; Mike Sievert, MJS Engineering, Design Engineer. Tax Map 2, Lot 12-3. Central Business District.

- I recommend the board: a) time permitting, review the enclosed "Madbury Commons Site Plan Changes Summary" to confirm if the board agrees which items may be reviewed administratively and which should be reviewed as amendments before the Planning Board; b) set a public hearing for the amendments for July 8.

Please note the following:

- 1) The applicant seeks to make a number of changes to the approved plans. Various related documents are enclosed. The enclosure from MJS includes a modification form and a list

of 12 items. The enclosed Summary shows fewer items (Some have been consolidated, I believe). Prior to the July 8 meeting, I will clarify these items with the applicant.

- 2) Items should be various reviewed as Administrative Modifications (reviewed and approved by staff) or as Amendments (reviewed by the Planning Board after notices and a public hearing). (There is also a Modification procedure with the board which does not involve notices or a hearing, but it is simplest to treat anything here with the board as an Amendment.)
  - 3) I have not reviewed this carefully yet, other than a quick review with Ken Rubin of the enclosed Summary. It appears that the changes marked Administrative Decision seem appropriate for me to review as Administrative Modifications (subject to appropriate reviews by other staff) and the others should be reviewed as Amendments by the Planning Board.
  - 4) If something is marked as an Administrative Modification, after I get into looking at it carefully, if it is more involved, then I will bump it to the Planning Board to review.
  - 5) If the board does not have a chance to look at this carefully on Wednesday, that is fine. We should still set the public hearing for July 8 simply for “various amendments.” If need be, I can clarify after the June 24 meeting which are best treated administratively and which as amendments, though it would be helpful to have the board’s guidance on June 24. Those appropriate amendments will thus be addressed on July 8.
  - 6) The enclosures include a site plan. The plan will need to be changed to clearly show the proposed changes.
- 

## **XIX. Other Business**

Richard Kelley has asked for a hiatus from the board for a few months due to pressing professional and personal commitments. The board started this discussion at the last meeting. The board can grant such a hiatus if it sees fit.

Lorne Parnell suggested that the Planning Board discuss the project that was recently withdrawn for the automobile facility at 3 Dover Road. I believe the board discussed this briefly on June 10. Do you wish to discuss this further or make it a specific agenda item at an upcoming meeting?

Andrew spoke with me about the board discussing a policy for emails and public hearings pursuant to the issues raised with the public hearing and the Recreation Master Plan. How does the board wish to proceed with this discussion?