

**CITY OF KEENE
NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**JOINT PUBLIC WORKSHOP
PLANNING BOARD/
PLANNING, LICENSES, AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

Monday, April 11, 2016

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

Planning Board Members Present

Gary Spykman, Chair
Andrew Bohannon
Mayor Kendall Lane
Nathaniel Stout
Douglas Barrett
George Hansel
Councilor James Duffy
Chris Cusack

**Planning, Licenses and Development
Committee Members Present**

David Richards, Chairman
Councilor Philip Jones
Councilor Bettina Chadbourne
Councilor George Hansel
Councilor Robert Sutherland

Planning Board Members Not Present

Christine Weeks
Tammy Adams
Pamela Russell Slack

Staff Present

Rhett Lamb, Planning Director
Michele Chalice, Planner
Tara Kessler, Planner

1. Roll Call

Chair Richards called the meeting to order at 6:45 pm and a roll call was taken.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes – March 14, 2016

Nathaniel Stout offered the following correction:

Page 3– to indicate he was recused from the discussion relative to the library.

Doug Barrett offered the following correction: Page 6, second paragraph from top “asked how long *105 West Street* was used as an orthodontics office”

Nathaniel Stout offered the following correction: Page 11, third paragraph from the bottom – “might *inadvertently* send a negative message”

Nathaniel Stout offered the following correction: Mr. Stout felt Mayor Lane had mentioned some very positive things soon after he made the comment in the sentence above. Staff agreed to re-listen to the recording and fill in this portion.
(01:31:00 – please see my email).

A motion was made by Dave Richards that the Joint Committee accept the March 14, 2016 meeting minutes as amended. The motion was duly seconded and unanimously approved.

3. Public Workshop

Ordinance - O-2016-01 and O-2016-02 – Relating to Zone Change. Petitioner, City of Keene Planning Department, requests the creation of three zoning districts; a Business Growth and Reuse District, a Neighborhood Business District and a Residential Preservation District and the associated, zoning map changes. The two hundred and fifty-six parcels of land affected by this request total an area of 266 acres. The project area is generally east of Main Street, south of Water Street, west of Eastern Avenue and north of Baker Street.

Mr. Lamb stated the purpose of these ordinances date back several years and recalled the PLD Committee recommending this area along of Marlboro Street for changes to zoning. What is before the Joint Committee today is the result of number of years of hard work and many Committee meetings. Staff sees what is drafted here as a first of several meetings for the Committee to review this draft.

Planner Michele Chalice was the next speaker who addressed a handout which the Committee was given.

Ms. Chalice stated she was happy to talk about three new districts being proposed as part of the Marlboro Street rezoning project. She stated this is a combination of two ordinances; O-2016-01 is the three new zoning districts and O-2016-02 is the associated map changes.

The project started in January 2013 and the Marlboro Street Committee held 24 meetings over a two year period and four community workshops were held over the spring/summer timeframe which was attended by nearly 78 citizens.

In Fall 2013, citizens provided 64 comments at the Monadnock Food Co-op and City Hall.

In January 2015 – The consultant for the project presented their report to the City Council.

Spring 2015 – The Ad Hoc Committee made a recommendation and presentation with their priorities.

Fall 2015 – A community workshop was conducted to review zoning recommendations.

Spring 2016 – Public Workshop to discuss the three proposed zones and to encourage redevelopment.

The larger rezoning project purpose was to –

- Promote reuse and redevelopment of under-utilized properties
- Preserve residential neighborhoods
- Strengthen the areas as a vibrant, walkable, mixed-use district
- Improve stormwater management practices
- Increase access to public green spaces

Ms. Chalice said during the Committee process, the public had additional concerns and referred to a map which was used at the first public meeting to summarize some of the concerns raised. Ms. Chalice oriented the Committee with the locations on this map – Main Street to Marlboro

Street, Tiffin, Brown and Baker Streets to the north and Eastern Avenue to the east. Ms. Chalice stated the neighborhood (shown in blue) on the map liked the fact they had good walkability to the Food Co-op and downtown as well as good sidewalks and streets. However, the neighborhood disliked the large trucks using Grove Street, Water Street and Victoria Street, especially at the residential corners. The public has in mind a greenway coming from the existing conservation area along Beaver Brook. The public is also looking for additional trail connections.

At the first public workshop the following are what participants felt were important items: Fix the flooding problem; develop and preserve green space; redevelop and improve the former Kingsbury property and the Ford dealership property; make the area more attractive to families; create access to the bike path; enhance depth and width of brook; and encourage more mixed uses and businesses

After two years and 32 meetings the Ad Hoc Committee came up with the following. These meetings were with residents (elderly and workforce as well as Keene State students) and businesses in the area:

1. Reduce flooding and stormwater
2. Marlboro Street – complete street improvements
3. Limiting additional converted student housing from single family homes
4. East side, linear, urban, public, green space
5. Restore single family housing

Ms. Chalice stated the public priority was student housing in single family, rental homes. The project examined other options to address this highest zoning option and these are some of those options: creating a “definition of family” for people who live in these single family, now rental homes; reduce the number of unrelated people allowed to live in these single family, now rental homes; create residential parking permits; increase code enforcement or increase a landlord’s obligation to address conduct of tenants and parking problems. Staff and the ad hoc committee deemed these options “unworkable”.

Ms. Chalice then went over certain definitions which she said are going to be used throughout the evening.

She said the intent of the commerce (COM) district is to provide an area for intense commercial development. The sites are typically accessed by vehicles and more than one business in a building would be typical.

The intent of high density (HD) district is to provide for high density/high intensity residential areas with no limit on the number of residential units per structure other than those required in a very long list of conditions.

The intent of the industrial (I) district is to provide for manufacturing, processing, assembling, wholesaling; transportation-oriented activities and related services such as trucking, warehousing, refueling depots. Retail sales and offices are intended to only be accessory to the main uses in the district.

The intent of the low density (LD) district is to provide for low density/low intensity residential lots for single-family dwelling units.

Ms. Chalice went on to say when travelling down Marlboro Street, there is Commerce on either side of Marlboro Street, followed by High Density and Low Density and then is Industrial on the north of Marlboro Street going all the way down to Optical Avenue.

The first proposed district which will be discussed tonight is the Neighborhood Business District. These are parcels that are currently High Density and Commerce and would shift to Neighborhood Business District. These would be mixed uses, with small businesses to support the adjacent neighborhoods. Upper floors of the buildings will contain offices or apartments and new buildings will be constructed at the sidewalk, similar to downtown. The Ad Hoc Committee heard a desire for a more interesting and welcoming street with small businesses that could cater both to the neighborhood and to the 500+ corporate jobs at Timken, Markem and C&S.

Ms. Chalice referred to the current allowable uses as outlined in the Committee's handout in the current Commerce and High Density Districts. The proposed allowable uses will be multi-family dwellings, funeral parlors, greenhouse/nursery, health/fitness, historic sites, home occupation, neighborhood grocery, office, restaurant, retail sales/service.

The second district is the Residential Preservation District. Over time and with the construction of new buildings, the area shown in yellow will only allow single-family homes. There are three clusters – west of Wheelock School to Main Street, north of Marlboro Street; surrounding Grove Street and Water Street extending to the brook; and north of Baker Street and southwest of Marlboro Street. Ms. Chalice referred to homes preferred for this district; small houses on small lots.

Ms. Chalice referred to the current allowable uses in the Residential Preservation District which is High Density and some Industrial. The proposed allowable uses will be accessory dwelling units less than 1,500 square feet in size, single-family dwellings, non-commercial, raising of farm animals, nursery/childcare.

The third district is the Business Growth & Re-Use District. Ms. Chalice called the Committee's attention to the current allowable uses as outlined in the handout. The proposed allowable uses are assembly, greenhouse/nursery, health/fitness, historic sites, home occupation, and institutional use by special exception, manufacturing and processing (less than 20,000 square feet), nursery/child care, office, research and development, restaurants, warehousing and wholesaling. Proposed new allowable uses restaurants, clinics, bulk storage and distribution of non-flammable material, dwellings - multi-family only and by special exception as part of a business, greenhouse nursery, health/fitness, neighborhood grocery less than 1500 square feet.

Ms. Chalice then went over the incentive options for new construction. This has worked well in the SEED District. In exchange for shared or reduced parking, increased building stories, increased unit density, decreased minimum lot size – a developer would provide, state of the art, efficient buildings and developments and use the 1st floor only as parking with façade screening.

Ms. Chalice then referred to parcels which were part of the Industrial district where Bentley Commons, Findings and Hamblett Electric are located. The surrounding existing zoning is Medium Density. The proposal is for Hamblett Electric and its adjacent parcel join the Medium Density while Bentley Commons and Findings are proposed to be Central Business District.

Ms. Chalice in closing referred to some definition updates:

Restaurant (amended definition) – a structure in which the primary use is in the preparation, cooking, consumption and sale of food and beverages.

With the new definition the term “Bar” is separated out:

Bar – any establishment devoted primarily to the selling, serving and drinking of alcoholic beverages.

Manufacture (amended definition) – the processing, assembling, and/or converting of raw, unfinished materials or products into articles or substances of different character or for different purpose.

Mixed-Use Development (new definition) – A development on one zoning lot that combines uses with commercial and/or office uses, consisting of one or more buildings.

Neighborhood Grocery Store (new definition) – Establishment primarily engaged in the provision of frequently or recurrently needed for household consumption, such as prepared food, beverages, limited household supplies and hardware.

Ms. Chalice stated the next steps in the process will be questions and answers today, public comments, discussion and potential changes and continue the public workshop to the Committee’s next regularly scheduled meeting on May 2nd. On May 2nd the Committee will start to discuss changes to development requirements. She also referred to url’s to look at today’s presentation and all other material pertaining to this item. This concluded Ms. Chalice’s comments.

Councilor Hansel asked why there is a 20,000 square foot limit for manufacturing and processing in the Business Growth & Re-Use District. Ms. Chalice stated they are trying to distribute the base of existing businesses and look for a greater number that could contribute to the local economy instead of that one business which could stay or could go. The Councilor stated he understands this but if there was a manufacturer who wanted to locate a 50,000 square foot property the City should welcome them with open arms. He questioned if this restriction was necessary.

Councilor Jones stated the Council often gets applications for institutional use and asked whether it would not be prudent with two of these Districts – Neighborhood Business District and Business Growth & Re-Use District to include the institutional uses which could help facilitate things in the future. Mr. Lamb stated he does not see an issue with this. Institutional use concept in Keene is not done on a District by District basis instead is done by street.

Mayor Lane stated he is concerned in the Residential Preservation District the City wouldn’t allow owner occupied duplexes. The Mayor stated owner occupied duplexes makes it possible for families to take current multi-family homes and rehabilitate them into affordable housing. He felt this is something which should be considered. Ms. Chalice stated the neighborhood expressed such strong concerns about rental units and their care, that the notion of owner occupied duplex might satisfy that concern.

Chair Richards added 17 years ago he purchased his home which was an owner occupied duplex and it was in bad shape. He has worked for many years rehabilitating the property while living in it. He went on to say on Elm Street there are a number of people who work with him who have purchased duplexes and have lived there as long as he has. He questioned whether a restriction can be placed asking that it be "owner-occupied". Mr. Lamb stated staff could look into this and added the City has had the Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance with that requirement for quite some time. He stated staff will look at this issue from the duplex standpoint.

Councilor Jones talked about a letter he had written to the Council which was later used for the Overlay District on Gilbo Avenue requiring in commercial zones, buildings to be located close to the sidewalk and parking located at the rear of the site which makes it a more walkable community. He asked whether there could be a similar requirement in the Neighborhood Business District. Ms. Chalice stated one of the requirements in the Neighborhood Business District is to have the buildings right at the sidewalk with no setback and parking will be on the side or the rear. She noted this would only be for new buildings.

Mr. Stout referred to the Notice of Public Workshop referred to in the bottom paragraph where there is mention of publishing companies and stated he does not see this mentioned in the report Ms. Chalice presented. Mr. Lamb stated there were changes made to the zoning ordinances (Industrial and Industrial Park) to accommodate certain uses and those changes have continued in the Industrial District. What staff is doing here is to eliminate those specific elements because the particular nature of these provisions is not clear. In establishing this new District, those idiosyncrasies which had been adopted through amendments in the Industrial District are being deleted.

Mr. Stout referred to the Residential Preservation District or in any District; historic site has been crossed off and asked for clarification. Ms. Chalice stated this was a typographic error on her part and stated historic sites would be permitted in any District.

Mr. Duffy stated the SEED District was used as a comparison for creating incentives in these new Districts and noted when the SEED District was first created there was the Returning Homes Program which was put in place and asked whether an updated could be provided on the Returning Homes Program. Mr. Lamb stated this program was proposed where if incentives could be created, former student housing could be returned to single family home-ownership. He indicated this incentive program has not progressed at this time; it has not received staff or Council/Planning Board priority, so the program hasn't been fully developed yet.

With reference to what Councilor Hansel had stated about the 20,000 square foot limit, Mr. Duffy felt for this District was quite appropriate but felt outside this area along Optical Avenue, it would be a good location for a future manufacturing company. He felt anything larger would affect the other goals for this District and felt what is being proposed is to accommodate what is present and to develop for the future. Mr. Stout agreed with Mr. Duffy but felt what Councilor Hansel's perspective is important and stated we might be looking at this plan as what could be but felt it might be necessary to look at what we might be excluding.

Mayor Lane noted that 80% of the jobs in Keene are in businesses that use less than 50,000 square feet of space. As to the point Councilor Hansel makes as to where to locate these larger manufacturing companies or larger industries is a discussion the City is going to have to undertake sometime in the near future.

Mayor Lane said with reference to the proposed new uses, there seems to be quite a bit of overlap between the Neighborhood Business District and the Business Growth and Reuse District. The area on the south side of Marlboro Street is proposed to be Neighborhood Business District and the area to the north is proposed to be Business Growth and Reuse District. The Mayor stated he doesn't quite see a distinction when it comes to this neighborhood. He felt with the Ice Arena now being opened, he can see smaller supporting businesses opening in this area. Mr. Lamb in response stated the areas proposed for the Neighborhood Business District, staff looked at the conversions that have already taken place. The proposal tries to reflect the trends that are already taking place here. This is the reason you see more on the north side and less on the south side and felt this is a good topic for a future agenda. Chair Richards referred to the former Millwork Masters building and felt more buildings like that would be great for this street. He asked under the current proposal whether a building like that could be located in that area. Mr. Lamb stated those are the kinds of buildings this new District is proposing.

Councilor Hansel stated he could perhaps be more specific in his suggestion in removing the 20,000 square foot suggestion. He asked why be specific only to manufacturing and assembly when there is also office, warehousing and wholesaling. Mr. Lamb agreed this is something they need to look at. He added he agrees with the explanation given by Mr. Duffy and added there is also historic precedence in the Industrial District and Industrial Park (Optical Avenue) where there were large manufacturers. With the transition to newer corporate activity, office use became much bigger, for example the C&S building on Optical Avenue is not truly manufacturing, and instead it is more office activity located in the Industrial area. Mr. Lamb stated because the proposed district is a mixed used district there should be an opportunity to create both office and manufacturing and if there wasn't a cap put on the office element, the City could end up with all office, which is not bad but is not giving the opportunity for manufacturing opportunities. Councilor Hansel stated he does not see a restriction for office. Mr. Lamb stated there should be and added the cap that exists today comes from the cap that existed historically on Optical Avenue. Ms. Chalice stated in the current ordinance as it is written it does say office, small corporate no more than 10,000 square feet.

Councilor Hansel stated he and Councilor Jacobs attended a workshop at Keene State College Maker Space which promotes local artists to adventure into that realm. He stated if we acquire a small business that eventually succeeds as we would all want and that business exceeds the 20,000 square foot limit the City shouldn't want them to have to move to accommodate their growth. He asked the Committee to revisit this issue.

Councilor Sutherland stated this corridor has a history of having car dealerships, garages, gas stations etc. and clarified under this new proposal these uses will be eliminated. Ms. Chalice stated the community was very clear those uses are not part of a neighborhood in this residential neighborhood so close to downtown. The Councilor clarified Public Works operates a fueling station on Marlboro Street. Mr. Lamb stated it is one fueling island where they provide diesel for City vehicles. The Councilor also noted there is a garage at this facility as well.

Mayor Lane stated Councilor Sutherland brings up an interesting issue and shows the impact a zoning change has on a neighborhood. Until 1976 this type of use was encouraged in this neighborhood – in 1976 the zoning was rewritten and those uses were moved predominantly to Winchester Street and it has taken about 45 years for these uses to migrate to Winchester Street. He felt the City probably does not want to reverse direction right now and go back to 1976. He stated once zoning is changed it takes a long time for those uses to infiltrate and reflect the new zoning the City has established.

Mr. Duffy asked the Mayor why this change was made for car dealerships to move out of Marlboro Street. The Mayor stated the change was made because the level of traffic was overwhelming and even though companies like MPB, Markem staggered letting their employees out at the end of the day; from 3 pm to 7pm there was bumper to bumper traffic on Marlboro Street. At that time the City did not envision Kingsbury going out of business or MPB (now Timken) to change dramatically as it has.

Chair Richards did not think according to NH State Law you could differentiate between a bar and a restaurant. Mr. Lamb stated they could provide more information on that. Mr. Lamb felt it would be prudent to let the audience know this is a continued public hearing and the Committee is not under any specific timeline to conclude this item. The public has every opportunity to provide comments to the Committee.

Councilor Sutherland stated extending Victoria Street to Marlboro Street has a physical barrier from the Rail Trail and asked whether the desire to change the zoning was with the extension of Victoria Street only – Mr. Lamb stated it would be either way. Mr. Lamb went on to say fundamentally if there is to be any kind of redevelopment, the City needs new zoning. The standard industrial zone which exists at the present time is a 1940s or 1950s version of industrial and does not fit the vision the City is trying to implement.

Mayor Lane stated the zoning that exists at Victoria Street was before the City became conscience of the limitations created by wetlands. It was foreseen at one point the extension of Victoria Street would open up land for industrial development. As the City became aware of the limitations imposed by the wetlands it has been realized that much of this land cannot developed.

Chair Spykman stated he is excited about this proposal. He lives at the edge of this district and has a business on Victoria Street and would be glad not to have trucks in front of his residence on Water Street.

Mr. Stout asked how this relates to the larger zoning for the entire city. Mr. Lamb explained the question Mr. Stout is asking is about the landuse code update which is a top priority in the 2010 Comprehensive Master Plan. Mr. Lamb stated this process is moving forward and will be before the City Council this week to recommend the selection of a consultant to help with the first phase. He indicated staff anticipates this will be a two-year process and if Council decides to move forward, staff will be looking to start the rewrite process next year.

Chair Richards asked for public comment next.

Mr. Peter Bradshaw of Greenbriar Road stated he is happy this item is finally moving forward. He stated he is however, concerned about the Residential Preservation District which currently has 16 permitted uses and under the proposed change that would be reduced to five. Mr. Bradshaw stated he agrees with the Mayor's comments about duplexes. He stated he bought his first home in 1985 on Elliot Street, lived in it and still owns it. He stated he understands people's concerns about students moving into residential neighborhoods. Unfortunately, most of that is because of the people who own these apartments. Mr. Bradshaw stated he owns duplexes and people who occupy these properties are people who work in places like C&S and Markem and stated his concern is if the City eliminates these properties it wouldn't only affect the students but also working people who can only afford to rent.

Mr. Bradshaw referred to the Residential Preservation District and asked in the area bound by Marlboro/Adams and Gates Streets how many were single family homes and how many were multi-family homes. He stated the homes on Elliot Street, Proctor Court are student rentals and there are not many single family homes until you get to Gates Street. He asked whether there was any “wiggle” room on where the boundary lines have been drawn and what the City hopes to achieve by the Residential Preservation District. He also asked how the City plans on making sure these are owner occupied properties.

Mr. Bradshaw asked how many of the existing multi-family units will become legally non-conforming under this new proposal and stated he understands staff doesn't have answers to some of these questions but would like to see how many properties will be affected. In closing, Mr. Bradshaw commended the work by the Committee.

Ms. Anna Tilton of 56 South Street reiterated what Mr. Bradshaw said and noted on South Street there are number of two-family homes and stated the people who occupy these properties work in places like the Granite Group, Thomas Transportation, they are not college students. There are some student occupied properties but these have been multi-family homes for a long time and did not think the City will be able to convince the owners to turn them into single family homes because these are very large homes.

Ms. Tilton stated she has made mention of this in the past and referred to the Credit Union on Marlboro Street and stated the corner of South Street and Marlboro Street is a disaster. South Street is a narrow street with no sidewalk, houses are very close to the street and the Credit Union has parking on the South Street side but they don't have enough parking. Cars park on South Street as well as half way down on Marlboro Street and if you are trying to pull into South Street you are likely to run into someone backing out. There are many accidents on Marlboro Street. Ms. Tilton stated when Marlboro Street is being looked at; this is something the City should be considering. Ms. Tilton in closing stated this does look like an interesting proposal.

Chair Richards agreed with what Ms. Tilton said about the parking for the Credit Union. He indicated the zoning issue is being addressed before this Body but at the Council level there is discussion about redirecting funds and obtaining grants to address this portion of the City as well. For the next fiscal year nearly 50% of the CIP budget is dedicated to this portion of the City.

Mr. Toby Tousley of 499 Washington Street stated everyone is excited about this project finally coming to fruition. He stated one of the concerns he has is about the scale of some of the things that are being proposed and referred to the 1,500 square foot size limit for the neighborhood grocery store. Mr. Tousley stated he owns a store on Washington Street and noted his cooler takes about 300 – 400 square feet of space and cautioned the Committee about the size limitation. He agreed the neighborhood probably doesn't want to see a Walmart in this location but perhaps something similar to the bike shop on Winchester Street which he felt was at least 10,000 square feet in size is something this neighborhood might like to have. In closing stated if the City wants new businesses in this area, the area needs to be opened up so that a business can be viable.

Chair Richards asked whether there was any way the Committee could find out the size of places like Romy's Market and Beaver Street Market. Mr. Lamb stated this is information staff could obtain from the Assessing Department. Chair Spykman stated he did notice this size limitation as well, but just down the road is a very large area as part of the Business Growth and Reuse

District which doesn't have those limitations and felt if someone wanted to open a market it doesn't have to be in the Neighborhood Business District but could be on the other side of the street. He felt there is room within the Districts for a variety of things and felt there is "wiggle" room.

Mayor Lane agreed there were alternatives but added the City needs to be careful not to make it so small they are not economically viable. Mr. Lamb agreed the Neighborhood Business District does have some limitations and this is something staff will need to look at. He went on to say the intent is for a small business such as a market, store etc. but don't want to open it up to a large convenience store. That is what the City is trying to prevent.

Mr. David Curran of 16 Prospect Street felt it is very early in the process to start finding issues with this proposal and felt it was necessary to stand back and evaluate the real purpose.

Mr. Duffy agreed with Mr. Curran and added as far as neighborhoods are concerned, preserving neighborhoods and investing in residential properties brings in more tax dollars than investing in commercial activity. He stated this is a well-known fact. Mr. Duffy stated when he talks about investing he is not talking about constructing buildings rather changes like this to zoning. A change here is going to cause a ripple effect throughout the City. He noted Mr. Bradshaw had indicated he lives in West Keene which does not have many multi-family units, the bulk of multi-family units exist in the east side of Keene and the east side is what is in need of attention.

Mr. Josh Meehan of 65 Langley Road addressed the Committee next. First as the Director of Keene Housing he stressed the need for multi-family units especially close to where businesses exist and does recognize there is a tension here but did want to speak on behalf of the people his organization helps.

As far as the incentive option which has been outlined in the document, he asked who that option relates to – is this an option for the City Council to consider or would this be an option presented to a developer. Ms. Chalice stated an incentive option is something that would be available to a developer. Mr. Meehan referred to the *state of the art efficient buildings* and asked how this would be defined. Ms. Chalice stated there are specific criteria within the ordinance which would need to be met which are tied to LEED Standards. Mr. Lamb stated there are three different national standards one can choose from.

With no further comments, Chair Richards closed the public hearing. He stated this is the first of many meetings on this topic that is going to happen. The Committee meets the second Monday of each month and this topic will be discussed until the Committee is ready to approve it.

Mayor Lane stated he was pleased with today's meetings and the comments raised were things that would need to be looked at and was happy to see there was no-one who spoke against the basic structure. The Mayor stated it was important for the Joint Committee to make sure the citizens of Keene and ultimately the City Council are willing to buy into these modifications and the way to do this would be to consider all the issues raised and make decisions accordingly.

A motion was made by Phil Jones that the Joint Committee continue this public workshop to the May 2 meeting. The motion was seconded by George Hansel and was unanimously approved.

The reason for the shift in date for May is due to budget workshops.

4. Prioritization of Comprehensive Master Plan Implementation Strategies Update

Ms. Kessler stated staff is working on bringing in expert presenters to speak on the six different topic areas which have been identified.

5. Next Meeting – Monday May 2, 2016

The Chairman encouraged members of the public to keep attending these public workshops.

6. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Krishni Pahl,
Minute Taker

Reviewed by Rhett Lamb, Assistant City Manager/Planning Director; and Tara Kessler, Planner