

*These minutes were approved at the April 13, 2022 meeting.*

**TOWN OF DURHAM**  
**DURHAM PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday March 9, 2022**  
**Town Council Chambers, Durham Town Hall**  
**7:00 pm**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Paul Rasmussen (Chair), Lorne Parnell (Vice-Chair), Heather Grant, James Bubar, Sally Tobias (Council Rep), William McGowan, Richard Kelley, Nicholas Germain (Alternate); Ellie Lonske (Alternate-remote), Chuck Hotchkiss (Alternate Council Rep-remote), Barbara Dill (Alternate-remote)

**ALSO PRESENT:** Town Planner Michael Berendt

**I. Call to Order**

Chair Rasmussen called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

**II. Roll Call and Seating of Alternates**

Chair Rasmussen took roll call: Full attendance no one to seat; introduced Emily Friedrichs as newest Alternate to the Planning Board. Reasons for Remote: Ms. Lonske's last meeting, Ms. Dill due to weather, Councilor Hotchkiss due to illness.

**III. Approval of Agenda**

***Mr. Bubar MOVED to approve the Agenda as distributed; SECONDED by Vice-Chair Parnell; APPROVED by a vote of 7-0, Motion carries.***

**IV. Town Planner's Report**

Mr. Michael Behrendt stated that the next agenda on March 23, 2022 was busy: 74 Main Street, 19 Main Street, 32 Madbury Road, and CU for driveway on Durham Point Road.

**V. Reports from Board Members who serve on Other Committees**

Reporting from Town Council: Councilor Tobias said the Council met Monday; moved Amanda Merrill to replace Energy Committee Chair as Durham's representative to the Community Power Coalition of New Hampshire; 2.5 hours of Public Comment about the dam. The Town voting the next day to uphold the Council's decision to remove the dam by a 75% majority. Council Member results of election: Eleanor Lonske, Eric Lund, Joe Freidman; Retiring: Dinny Waters, Allan Howland, Andrew Corrow.

Reporting from the Conservation Commission: Mr. Bubar said there was an excellent presentation at February 28<sup>th</sup> meeting by Mr. Tallamy, University of Delaware, about insects, native species, and

invasive species; approved \$1,000 to replace the Bridge at Wagon Hill based on an Eagle Scout proposal.

Reporting from the Historic District/Heritage Commission: Mr. McGowan said the Commission met last week; had valuable conversation with local representatives from indigenous cultures.

Reporting from the Integrated Waste Management Advisory Committee: Mr. Kelley said the Committee met March 2, 2022; will be before the Town Council for March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting re Regional Composting Working Group (RCWG) final report. Mr. Kelley said he is questioning continuing on this Committee.

## **VI. Public Comments**

**Joshua Meyrowitz** of 7 Chesley Drive thanked Vice-Chair Parnell for his statement at a previous meeting regarding the importance of Public Comment and stating he did not support any restrictions on public speaking due to its importance to this community, which the Board ultimately agreed with. Mr. Meyrowitz said subsequent Planning Board meetings were more interactive and mutually informative making many points clearer for everyone.

## **VII. Review of Minutes (old): January 26, 2022**

All corrections requested by Board members were made to the minutes.

***Vice-Chair Parnell MOVED to approve the minutes of January 26, 2022 as amended; SECONDED by Ms. Grant; APPROVED by a vote of 7-0, Motion carries.***

**VIII. Deliberations - Mill Plaza Redevelopment.** 7 Mill Road. Continued review of application for site plan and conditional use for mixed-use redevelopment project, drive-through facility for bank, and activity within the wetland and shoreland overlay districts. Colonial Durham Associates, property owner. Sean McCauley, agent. Joe Persechino, Tighe & Bond, engineer. Emily Innes and Sharon Ames, Harriman, project designer. Rick Taintor is serving as the Town's Contract Planner. Central Business District. Map 5, Lot 1-1. Recommended action: Deliberate on applications for conditional use permits and continue to March 23 or April 13.

Town Planner Michael Behrendt left the table at 7:14 pm and was replaced by Contract Planner Rick Taintor.

Chair Rasmussen said the Public Hearing has been closed on this item and the Board can move straight into deliberations, with all Board Members including Alternates welcome to participate. Board members need to state why they are voting the way they are for the record and move through the votes.

Mr. Rick Taintor reminded the Board they were talking about CU permits, and for each CU permit there is one final vote on whether or not to grant the permit. He said each CU permit lists the standards that must be met in order for it to be granted; if one of the standards is not met the permit will not be granted. The Board needs to go through all of the criteria under each of the 4 CU Permits with 1 vote at the end of that permit.

Chair Rasmussen asked that the Board start with the Wetlands; work includes modifications of primary route along College Brook, length of the property, construction of a curbed raised pedestrian walkway between Mill Road and rear of site continuing into Chesley Drive, installation of underground conduit for electrical services, construction of Stormwater with underground detention facility, gravel wetland and new outflow into College Brook, and construction of retaining wall between parking area and gravel wetland.

The Board discussed the possibility of addressing WCOD and SPOD criteria together but decided to address them separately.

#### **Wetlands Conservation Overlay District (WCOD) Specific Criteria**

**Item 1:** No alternative location for the parcel outside of the WCOD that is reasonably practical for proposed use.

Ms. Grant said the Board wanted the sidewalk along that back corridor and had agreed it should not be moved as it would create an issue with other access points, and she felt there was no alternative location practical. Councilor Tobias said the driveway is an access point into different parts of the parking lot, and it was set up in a more practical way to reduce congestion. Mr. Bubar said he was the one who convinced the Conservation Commission the driveway should remain where it was for public safety reasons but said he had not seen any supporting evidence from Traffic Safety or Police.

Vice-Chair Parnell said the Traffic Safety Committee did not consider the safety implications of moving the entry but provided information on the crosswalks based on the entry staying where it was, and he personally felt that because of the sight lines there moving it would be less safe. Chair Rasmussen said the Traffic Safety Committee supported that traffic coming down the hill into Mill Plaza from Main Street would immediately engage brake lights if the distance were shortened.

Vice-Chair Parnell said the design the Board has for the road is the best design for this site under the circumstances. He said the pedestrian sidewalk were a major addition to the site and were doing more than the addition of more buffer. Mr. McGowan agreed and said the applicant restored as much buffer as they could, given the circumstances. Ms. Lonske said she fully supports the recommendation of the Conservation Commission, which the Board should seriously consider, and was not convinced moving the driveway would cause engineering problems.

Mr. Kelley said he shares the concerns about moving the driveway north but felt north-bound vehicular traffic heading to Main Street may create a problem at the intersection. He said he was okay with the driveway encroaching on an existing condition within the site, saw the pedestrian sidewalk as a benefit, supported the underground conduit for electrical services as well as Stormwater, and said the retaining wall is required to limit impact, but had a problem with the internal access way because it is one of choice to accommodate the building footprints.

Ms. Friedrichs seconded what Mr. Kelley said as none of the existing infrastructure is grandfathered in. Although, she commends the applicant for restoration of the buffer, there is nothing specific in WCOD criteria that tells us whether improvement of an existing condition is enough, and all criteria need to be met. She said safety issues for the entry have been discussed but there has not been a complete study on the effects of moving the entry, and no evidence suggesting Stormwater facilities and underground conduits have to be placed in the buffer.

Mr. Bubar agreed that he did not see the access way needing to be in the wetland buffer and felt there would also be noise issues and visual buffering that will be needed. He said he did not feel that entrance to be safe at all and said the sight line south was compromised by brush along the shoreline that cannot be removed. Councilor Tobias said the crosswalk coming down from Main Street is fairly dangerous, and moving the entrance higher and shortening that space would be a safety issue.

Chair Rasmussen said his thoughts on the size of the buffer are based on feedback from DPW regarding pavement over the sewer line, and he is willing to accept the existing sewer line and proposed curb line as it is now. Ms. Friedrichs brought up the 15 Madbury Road project as being similar to this project with the Board denying the WCOD permit in that instance because an alternative location was available, and she did not see evidence here of the applicant demonstrating that there is no alternative.

Chair Rasmussen said the buildings are sized for commercial space which is a requirement of the settlement agreement. Ms. Grant said this is a shopping plaza and it has a good flow going into it and cutting it would make access throughout awkward. Councilor Tobias agreed this is a large commercial center and said she has no problem with the location of the entry roadway and having Stormwater access easily available.

Vice-Chair Parnell said a lot of people may feel the applicant is demanding a lot of parking for what is existing now, but said he was willing to take the applicant's word that this is what potential clients want. Mr. Bubar said there are only a handful of parking spots in excess of the Site Plan Regulations for type of uses for proposed structures.

Chair Rasmussen said the difference with this project and most other wetlands projects is the preexisting site conditions. He said SPOD talks about preserving natural resources within the buffer, but they are not preserving anything here and are trying to reclaim and restore which gets to the minimum regulation to maintain the existing buffer at least 50 ft in width adjacent to the

reference line of the wetlands and keeping it natural, which is the best our Ordinance allows us to do here.

Ms. Friedrichs said while she appreciates the intention of the proposed use as a shopping center, supports good traffic flow and adequate parking, she is concerned that the Board cannot say they have considered and eliminated all alternative locations for each of these. Mr. Bubar said he understands asphalt over the sewer line, but digging up the sewer line will make it difficult getting in and out of the parking lot.

Councilor Tobias said the Board discussed that particular area at length and this was the plan in front of us. Mr. Kelley said you can fault the applicant for this but ultimately the Board responds to what is put in front of them, and he said he is not going to design for the applicant, and he is here to assess the application and respond to it.

**Item 2:** The amount of soil disturbance will be the minimum necessary for the construction and operation of the facilities.

Chair Rasmussen said in this case we want soil disturbance in order to restore the buffer. Ms. Friedrich said she understands soil disturbance being minimized for underground installations and the retaining wall but asked why the sidewalk needs to be curbed and raised. Chair Rasmussen said we want a curb to control rainfall so it does not flow into the buffer or the Brook. Mr. Bubar said he would question the need for a sidewalk; Chair Rasmussen said for a community desired pedestrian flow.

**Item 3.** The location, design, construction, and maintenance of the facilities will minimize any detrimental impacts on wetlands and mitigation activities will be undertaken to counterbalance impacts.

Chair Rasmussen said the question is whether these things are being done to the satisfaction of the Board. Mr. Bubar said the wetland is already compromised and it will reduce the compromise in the worst case; Chair Rasmussen agreed. Ms. Friedrichs disagreed and said her concern is the need to consider drainage into College Brook and whether it is set up to minimize detrimental impacts. Ms. Grant said there will be slower release of water into the system and an improved Stormwater system, with an increase of total volume but reduction in the rate, and felt they were minimizing detrimental impacts.

Vice-Chair Parnell said there is no question that what is being proposed here, with Stormwater management, increased size of buffer, and better treatment of snow, is far superior to what is now existing. Ms. Friedrichs expressed concern about the increase in the volume of water from the Stormwater system into the already impacted area of the Brook.

Mr. Kelley agreed the volume would increase but felt they were just about balanced here with the peak rate decrease. He said it would depend on the intensity and duration of a rainfall event, which is not used for modelling, and said the increase here is minimal. He said Stormwater pertains to WCOD because they are encroaching into that area for the gravel wetland, which is a strong mitigation activity along with treatment of Stormwater runoff. He said this area is a floodplain as well as Chesley Drive residences, but solutions to these issues are outside of this application. He said he gets stuck with location of the driveway further to the east not the access.

Ms. Friedrichs agreed that the proposed Stormwater treatment is an improvement over existing, but Item 3 does not mention the improvement of an existing condition. She said potential flooding puts the burden on the taxpayer, but requirements for approval of this permit put the burden on the applicant for no detrimental impact on the wetlands. She suggested possibly rerouting some of the stormwater outflow to another location. Mr. Kelly said that would be an infiltration system, which is not part of the application in front of us. and if we do not like what we see, thumbs down. Chair Rasmussen agreed.

Ms. Friedrichs said she appreciated that the volume increase was a fraction of an acre, but if something is already at 150% capacity, then even a slight increase does not change the detrimental and adverse impact to College Brook. Councilor Tobias said this is occurring all over Town with our ailing infrastructure, and we are getting to a point where changes need to be made or halt all development which the Town needs, but this is not part of this application.

Mr. Kelley said in the profiles of College Brook and Mill Road in the flood insurance study, the Mill Pond Road culvert is creating a flooding effect upstream which is not the applicant's burden but the Town's, and removal of the Dam may alleviate some flooding issues.

**Item 4.** Restoration activities will leave the site as near as possible in its existing condition and grade at time of application.

Mr. Bubar said the Board does not know how much further down they will go after the asphalt is removed and what it can handle for plants. Chair Rasmussen said the question here is restoration activity after the work and how it will leave the site, and I think we all agree it will leave the site in better condition.

Mr. Taintor said WCOD continues up to page 5, and Town Council advised the Board to do one vote on each conditional use permit.

#### **WCOD Performance Standards**

All buildings and structures [will/will not] be erected, altered, enlarged or moved and all land within the WCOD [will/will not] be used in accordance with performance standards of the Zoning Ordinance, including a naturally vegetated buffer and using best management practices for sedimentation and erosion control.

Mr. Taintor said there are 6 of these performance standards and only 3 apply: (1) providing a naturally vegetated buffer strip; (2) sedimentation and erosion control meeting the 4 standards for best management practices; (3) possibly maintenance of trails for the Chesley path could be considered. Chair Rasmussen said he did not think the definition of a trail applied to the Chesley path. He said there are no buildings, just pavement and a retaining wall, and only sedimentation and erosion control had not been discussed. Mr. Kelley said the sedimentation and erosion control issue does not end with the Board and extends on for AOT and felt there were no issues.

Vice-Chair Parnell said the new Stormwater system will prevent water from the parking lot flowing directly into the Brook and will move it east where water falling into the Brook will be improved. Mr. Bubar said even if they continue snowplowing it will have some degree of buffer and will be an improvement over existing conditions. Ms. Friedrichs agreed the proposal very much improves the erosion issue but was still concerned about increased Stormwater runoff and asked about including some permissions to allow more filtration.

Chair Rasmussen pointed out that sediment will get trapped in the retention system. Mr. Bubar said typically the first inch would scrub the parking lot of most of the sediment. Mr. Kelley agreed that when designing for water quality the first inch removes suspended solids.

Ms. Friedrichs raised further issues regarding the naturally vegetated buffer strip, septic setbacks, the 75-ft wetland buffer, and structures in the buffer. The Board discussed these issues further.

### **General Standards for Conditional Uses**

Planning Board finds that the application to allow each of the proposed structures and use of land within WCOD [conforms/does not conform] to all of the conditional use permit criteria listed in the Zoning Ordinance as follows:

**Item 1. Site Suitability:** **a.** vehicular and pedestrian access for intended uses; **b.** adequate public services to serve intended uses; **c.** environmental constraints or mitigation of impacts; **d.** appropriate utilities to serve intended uses.

**a. Adequate Access:** Vice-Chair Parnell said there is a second exit for emergency vehicles, and Mr. Taintor said this actually has to do with WCOD and most of the conditions do not apply. Chair Rasmussen asked if the entryway and pedestrian walkway are generally adequate.

Ms. Friedrichs asked about something to improve visibility for pedestrians crossing that entrance, which could be a condition of approval. Vice-Chair Parnell said there are some changes being made in that area with the crosswalk moved left and increased in width to provide a straight sightline for pedestrians going in both directions. Mr. Kelley suggested raising the crosswalk to slow down traffic and putting a note as a possible condition of approval for additional safety improvements at intersection.

**b. Adequate Public Services:** Board agreed this does not apply to WCOD.

**c. Environmental Constraints/Mitigations:** Chair Rasmussen said it comes down to the rainwater handling. Mr. Kelley added the steep slope at the bank itself, which is being proposed to be stabilized, which is mitigation. Ms. Friedrichs asked about proposed uses on the steep slope, and Chair Rasmussen said the slope will be worked on and stabilized which means there will be disturbance.

**d. Appropriate Utilities:** Chair Rasmussen said there is only Stormwater disposal, and Mr. Taintor added the electrical conduit for the lights. Mr. Bubar said there was no discussion on streetlights for the sidewalk and whether they are necessary. Chair Rasmussen said the only lighting proposed on the Town sidewalk is in the Town right-of-way. Mr. Kelley said there are lights along the sidewalk bordering the access drive which are really meant for the driveway.

**Item 2. External Impacts:** The external impacts on abutting properties and neighborhood of proposed structures and uses of land within the WCOD [will be no greater/will be greater] than the impacts of adjacent existing uses or other uses permitted in the zone. Additionally, the location, nature, design and height of proposed structures and land uses in WCOD [will/will not] be compatible with established character of the neighborhood and [will/will not] mitigate and external impacts of the use on the neighborhood.

Chair Rasmussen said he did not see anything that is occurring in WCOD as greater than the current use, with a slight increase in traffic due to number of parking spaces. Mr. Bubar said if the Board were putting in a noise buffer it should be put in here, and he said has not seen a real Landscaping Plan to help understand what is being buffered and what is not. Councilor Tobias said the Board may want to increase buffering but should hold that until discussion of mixed use.

Chair Rasmussen said they are talking about whether or not traffic in WCOD is greater than existing or other permitted uses, and the Board can say it is equal (commercial) and not greater than other permitted uses. Ms. Friedrichs raised the issue of the number of lumens coming from the lights which extends beyond the applicant's property boundary and in the direction of residential areas, which could easily be addressed by conditions of approval. She said the Ordinance specifies zero footcandles along property lines; Mr. Kelley said Site Plan Regulations give a measure of ½ footcandle at property line and 1 footcandle for regular property.

Mr. Taintor said one of the problems is that there are different regulations that apply to different things and said regulations to "parking lot" do not apply here as there is no parking in the WCOD. He said the Board has to look at more general requirements as in the Site Plan Regulations.

**Item 3. Character of Site Development:** Layout and design of proposed structures and uses of land within WCOD [will/will not] be compatible with established character of the neighborhood and [will/will not] mitigate any external impacts of the use on the neighborhood.



Chair Rasmussen said this concerns the driveway, entrance, and sidewalk, and whether the sidewalk is sufficiently buffered from adjacent properties. Mr. Bubar mentioned the lights of traffic coming and going, and said he is uncomfortable with the lack of a detailed buffer plan. Chair Rasmussen felt that belonged in discussion of the overall Site Plan. Ms. Friedrichs felt it would be wise to include a discussion of the buffer in external impacts for character of site development.

Chair Rasmussen said Mr. Bubar is talking about the potential necessity to rehabilitate the existing soil so it can take the landscaping plan. Mr. Bubar said that is part of it along with the noise and buffering issues and felt there should be one discussion on the buffer and not piecemeal in various places.

Mr. Taintor said one way to look at this is lights from cars not in the WCOD coming down the aisles. Mr. Bubar said they would be flashing on Brookside Commons. Councilor Tobias said there may be a need for increased buffering there. Mr. Taintor said the Board could say here if they think there should be conditions in the Site Plan to buffer these impacts. Chair Rasmussen said there is a much greater discussion under mixed use because they would be talking about the entire parking lot, activities there, and how they affect abutters.

**Item 4. Character of Structures:** The design of new structures within WCOD [will/will not] be compatible with established character of the neighborhood; includes scale, height and massing of structures as well as materials/colors proposed to be used. Chair Rasmussen said this includes the walkway and the road.

**Item 5. Preservation of natural, cultural, historic, and scenic resources:** Chair Rasmussen said the key word here is preservation and there is nothing in WCOD we are preserving, we are restoring.

**Item 6. Impact on Property values:** The proposed land uses within WCOD will not contribute to a significant decline in property values of adjacent properties. The Board agreed to wait for mixed use discussion.

**Item 7. Availability of public services & facilities:** Adequate and lawful facilities or arrangements for necessary public and private services are assured and capable of proper operation; not causing excessive demand on municipal services. N/A

**Item 8. Fiscal Impacts:** Proposed uses of land within WCOD [will/will] not have a negative fiscal impact on the Town. N/A

### **Conditions of Approval**

Chair Rasmussen asked if the Board felt any condition of approval needed to be added here. Ms. Grant said the Board talked about a plan for pedestrian crossing adjustments. Vice-Chair Parnell said anything involving the crosswalks will have to involve more than the Planning Board (Traffic

Safety/Police), and the Board could put a condition this be evaluated after project completion. Mr. Kelley suggested asking the applicant to explore additional safety improvements at driveway entrance, and Chair Rasmussen said this should be explored with the Traffic Safety Committee.

Mr. Bubar said he would like to have a water quality survey taken in the southeast and southwest corners before and after construction of the Stormwater management system, coordinated with the Town Engineer. Chair Rasmussen asked if he meant just the southeast corner or the effluent coming off the property. Mr. Bubar said he wants both, and he would like to see some facts about Stormwater management and water quality.

Mr. Kelley said there are 6 outlets/drainage channels, or 6-point sources, draining from the parking lot today to use as sampling points. Mr. Taintor said he could try to capture this in his Draft Decision, once the Board has voted, and have it back at the next meeting. Chair Rasmussen asked if there were any other conditions before the vote.

Mr. Taintor said we need a motion to grant the CU Permit with positive findings on all criteria which the Board will direct me to draft; and this needs a vote of 5 Board members.

***Chair Rasmussen MOVED that the Planning Board find the proposed work in the WCOD to meet the Conditional Use criteria as set forth by the Durham Ordinance with the conditions of approval that were discussed; SECONDED by Mr. McGowan;***

Mr. Taintor said the actual motion will be a revised version of this form. Vice-Chair Parnell said the motion he heard does not include uses and asked if the retaining wall was included. Mr. Taintor said the motion assumes all conditions included (these 5 pages) to be assumed conditions. Chair Rasmussen said the Board would do a roll call vote and anyone who votes nay can explain the conditions.

***Roll Call Vote: Heather Grant-aye, Sally Tobias-aye, James Bubar-aye, Paul Rasmussen-aye, Lorne Parnell-aye, Bill McGowan-aye, Richard Kelley-nay\*; APPROVED by a vote of 6-1, Motion carries.***

\*Mr. Kelley explained that he felt the driveway access was one of choice to accommodate building and parking footprints, and he said he will maintain consistency with this opinion moving forward with other CUs.

#### **Shoreland Protection Overlay District (SPOD)**

Chair Rasmussen said everything the Board discussed in WCOD applied to SPOD up to 75 ft, within 25 ft of entrance. The motion at the end will be: The Board finds that these uses within the shoreland setback are set back the maximum practical distance from the reference line of College Brook and therefore are permissible.

Ms. Friedrichs asked about the pathway and Mr. Taintor said the path is outside the 25 ft shoreland buffer. He said one light is out and one is in and suggested the Board address installation of underground conduit for electrical services and lighting; retaining wall is gone.

### **SPOD Specific Criteria**

Chair Rasmussen said the Board can review the items in the 25 ft, and all of this is the entrance to the property, including lights, and new Stormwater outlet. Mr. Taintor said the only new piece is at the bottom of page 6 regarding the shoreland setback from College Brook, and everything else is the same.

Chair Rasmussen asked the Board if they felt anything else here is not set back the maximum practical distance from College Brook. Ms. Friedrichs said the lighting could be moved out. Mr. Kelley pointed out that the type of light being used there would shine on abutters if switched to the other side. Chair Rasmussen said that pushed toward the gravel wetland which needs a buffer as well. He said the walkway is 10 ft wide and the gravel wetland is also the snow storage area.

Vice-Chair Parnell said he would not support proposing a change to this plan without talking to the applicant. Mr. Kelley said the impact of lighting is temporary during construction, and he did not see the impact being significant. Councilor Tobias said lighting is there for the safety of pedestrians, and said she is content with what is shown at this time. Mr. Kelley said he will not take issue with the light poles and conduits.

***Chair Rasmussen MOVED that the Planning Board finds the following on the proposed project involving the work in the SPOD, as documented on page 6 of Mr. Taintor's handout -- The uses within the setbacks are set back the maximum practical distance from the reference line of College Brook, and therefore, are permissible. The work meets the requirements of the Ordinance. Therefore, the Planning Board grants the Conditional Use Permit. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. McGowan. Roll Call Vote: Heather Grant-aye, Sally Tobias-aye, James Bubar-aye, Paul Rasmussen-aye, Lorne Parnell-aye, Bill McGowan-aye, Richard Kelley-nay\*; APPROVED by a vote of 6-1, Motion carries.***

\*Mr. Kelley explained that he voted nay for the same reasons as before, that the driveway access road is of choice to accommodate building footprint.

### **Mixed Use with Residential & Parking**

Chair Rasmussen said the Board can start their discussion. Mr. McGowan said the Board should wait until the next meeting if they are not going to finish it. Chair Rasmussen said the Planning Board would pick this up on April 13, 2022; already have 4 items for March 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Vice-Chair Parnell said in his view the Board has taken 3 hours to get through something he thought would go relatively quickly, and the next part with Mixed Use Residential & Parking will be much more complicated with more discussion. He said the Board should have a separate meeting for this project on April 13<sup>th</sup>, and it is possible to get through all that in one night including the Site Plan. The Board discussed a possible extra meeting but agreed on April 13, 2022. Councilor Tobias said there is not really a need to speed it up, and Vice-Chair Parnell agreed.

Chair Rasmussen stated that the next meeting on Mill Plaza Redevelopment will be held on April 13, 2022.

**IX. Other Business**

- X. Review of Minutes** (new): February 9, 2022, Site Walk Minutes of February 19, 2022 and February 23, 2022 – *postponed*

**XI. Adjournment**

***Vice-Chair Parnell MOVED to adjourn the meeting; SECONDED by Councilor Tobias; APPROVED 7-0, motion carries.***

Chair Rasmussen adjourned the meeting at 10:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Denmark, Minute Taker  
Durham Planning Board

---

Richard Kelley, Secretary