

**CITY OF KEENE  
NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES**

Monday, June 27, 2016

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

Members Present

Gary Spykman, Chairman  
Mayor Kendall Lane  
Douglas Barrett  
Andrew Bohannon  
Christine Weeks  
George Hansel  
Pamela Russell Slack  
Chris Cusack

Members Not Present:

Nathaniel Stout, Vice-Chair  
Tammy Adams  
James Duffy

Staff:

Rhett Lamb, Planning Director  
Michele Chalice, Planner

---

**I. Call to order – Roll Call**

Chair Spykman called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and a roll call was taken.

**II. Minutes of previous meeting – May 23, 2016**

Chris Cusack stated he was not included in the names of Board members present at the meeting.

Christine Weeks offered the following corrections:

Page 6 of 39, item b. fourth line down “residential buildings” should say “residential units”.

Page 7 of 39, after item d. Ms. Weeks asked whether it was his company which was involved in the lawsuit because of poor lighting or whether it was a client’s company. The Chair clarified it was Mr. Phippard’s company which was involved in the lawsuit.

Page 10 of 39, last sentence in the fourth paragraph, *Ms. Chalice noted straw was biodegradable and does have to disagree but stated the decision was now up to the Board.* Ms. Weeks felt there needed to be added clarification to this sentence. Chair Spykman suggested this language “...disagree with Mr. Phippard but stated the decision was now up to the Board.”

A motion was made by Mayor Kendall Lane to accept the May 23, 2016 minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by George Hansel and was unanimously approved.

**III. Continued Public Hearing**

**SPR-04-14, Modification 6 – Talons Restaurant – 141 Winchester Street – Site Plan** – Applicant Katie Cassidy Sutherland, Architect, on behalf of owners, 141 Winchester St, LLC, proposes an 80-seat restaurant. The primary proposed use is a 4,000SF restaurant with a 450SF accessory indoor recreation area with pool table and video games, and a 500SF accessory bar service. The site is 0.29 acres in size and located in the Commerce Zoning District (TMP# 052-02-004). The applicant has requested the Planning Board consider an additional 60-day extension of the decision deadline for the Board to act as required by NH RSA 676:4.

B. Public Hearing

Attorney Kelly Dowd stated this matter is tied up with zoning issues. The applicant has had two unfavorable decisions from the Zoning Board and the matter is currently in front of the Superior Court. Attorney Dowd explained the matter has been appealed to superior court and if the motion for rehearing in front of the ZBA is denied then it will go before the Superior Court.

Ms. Weeks referred to last month's meeting minutes and noted Mr. Lamb had stated the City Attorney could be asked to weigh in on this issue at the June meeting. She asked whether there was any input from the City Attorney. Mr. Lamb stated he had spoken to the City Attorney regarding Attorney Dowd's proposal for a continuance of 60 days and Attorney Mullins is aware of it and has no objection.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Mayor Kendall Lane that the Planning Board continue the public hearing and extend the Planning Board decision deadline for SPR-04-14 Modification 6, 141 Winchester Street, Talon's Restaurant Site Plan to the August 22, 2016 Planning Board meeting. The motion was seconded by George Hansel and was unanimously approved.

IV. Public Hearing

1. SPR-947, Mod. 9 – Residential Units and Dental Office – Unit 6C – 819 Court Street – Site Plan – Applicant, Brickstone Land Use Consultants, LLC, on behalf of owner, Ashuelot Management & Services Inc., proposes to construct a 3,200SF mixed use building on the 1.79 acre parcel. This proposal modifies the size and location of a previously approved building for Unit 6C and represents the final building of the four-unit development. The site is located in the Commerce Zoning District (TMP# 914-06-016.0630).

A. Board Determination of Completeness.

Planner Michele Chalice recommended to the Board that Application SPR-947 was complete. A motion was made by Mayor Kendall Lane that the Board accept this application as complete. The motion was seconded by George Hansel and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Mr. Jim Phippard on behalf of Ashuelot Management & Services Inc. addressed the Board and stated this is their ninth modification since the original approval of 2004. The original approval called for four buildings to be located on the 1.79 acre lot which contained mixed uses. One building has been constructed which is occupied by a dentist's office and there are five residential properties in this building as well.

Last month's approval was for the location of a bank branch at the front of the property which took the place of two previously approved buildings. Today what is before the Board is the last building (Unit 6) which has changed slightly from the previous approval. This building would need to be moved slightly to the east and south to accommodate the drive-thru for the bank. The size of the building was also changed from 36' x 72' to 40' x 80' (600 square feet larger). Since the building has moved forward on the site, there would also be a change to the parking. Originally there were nine parking spaces, which have been eliminated and replaced with spaces in front of the bank which will still provide for 71 spaces – zoning requires 62 spaces.

There have been small drainage improvements made at the property. Mr. Phippard stated since 2004 they have used an infiltration system whenever the site permits it. The same was used here. The drainage at the rear is getting tied into the infiltration system at the bank which then gets tied into the onsite stormwater system which ultimately discharges into a stormwater system near the family

housing complex. He noted there is an error in the staff report in that it does not tie into the Court Street system at all. The only runoff which goes into the Court Street system are from the curb cuts at the corner of the property where there are storm drains.

Landscaping - Green plantings have been added at the rear of the building. There is one tree being lost but it is being replaced with a Pin Oak. One of the parking lot lights is also going to be relocated 30 feet to the easterly location of the new building.

The architecture has not changed except for the length of the building. It would still be a two-story building with brick veneer at the front and an arched canopy over the front entrance of the building.

Ms. Weeks asked whether it was real brick. Mr. Phippard answered in the affirmative.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Chalice stated this is a pretty straightforward project, and staff only has one request and it is from Assessing. They are looking for the completion of the Condominium Agreement. She noted Mr. Phippard has stated there are now going to be three buildings instead of four which would require a revision to the legal description of the condominium parcels. The following condition is being proposed:

*Prior to signature, submittal of a completed revision of the condominium document and plan as registered with the Cheshire County Registry of Deeds.*

Ms. Weeks referred to page 18 as follows: "...Savings Bank of Walpole project anticipated 42 AM and 100 PM trips..."

However, the set of minutes projected 22 AM and 44 PM trips. Ms. Chalice stated this was a mistake on her part. Ms. Weeks asked whether this would have an effect on this item at all. Ms. Chalice explained what she made the mistake on was the number of trips for comparison; the idea was to indicate the number of trips for this particular project. The number of trips attributable to this particular building was what was described as inconsequential as it relates to the rest of the site.

Mr. Phippard stated the applicant had Steve Pernaw look at this intersection for traffic counts. The proposed new building will have five residential units, office and an orthodontist's space, similar to what already exists on the site. Based on this, Mr. Pernaw estimated 106 vehicle trips per day with eight to ten vehicle trips during PM peak hour.

The Chair asked for public comment. With no comments, Chair Spykman closed the public hearing.

Mayor Lane stated this is the most straightforward application the Board has seen in a while. He stated he was pleased to see the build-out and noted Freihofers opened today. He felt it was in City's best to move this project forward.

Dr. Cusack noted the office was 2,000 square feet in size and asked whether this would mean the remaining 1,200 square feet would be for the five apartments. Dr. Cusack stated this question is to determine trip generation. Mr. Phippard agreed and added they would all be one bedroom apartments.

### C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Mayor Kendall Lane that the Planning Board approve SPR-947, Modification #9, as shown on the plan entitled "Dental Clinic & 5 Residential Units, 819 Court Street, Keene, Cheshire County, NH, dated May 20, 2016 and revised June 6, 2016, drawn by Brickstone Land Use Consultants at various scales with the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature, submittal of a completed revision of the condominium document and plan as registered with the Cheshire County Registry of Deeds.
2. Prior to signature, submittal of a security for landscaping and an “as-built” plan in a form and amount acceptable to the Planning Director and City Engineer.
3. Prior to signature by Planning Board Chair, Owner’s signature on plan.

The motion was seconded by George Hansel and was unanimously approved.

V. **Advice & Comment**

1. **17 Washington Street** – Proposed 112,000 SF, 4-story residential building (132 units) with associated parking and facilities (TMP#017-07-007).

Mr. Lamb referred to Planning Board Regulations Section 4, Paragraph B. and stated because this is not something the Board does very often; he felt it would be good for the Board to keep these items in mind:

*The primary purposes of the discussion are to:*

- a) *Inform the Board about the concept for the proposed Development and familiarize the Board with the location and general character of the land and its surroundings;*
- b) *Discuss the proposed project in light of the City’s Master Plan, goals and policies; and*
- c) *For the Board to provide the prospective applicant with guidance about the submission and procedural requirements set forth in these regulations.*

Chair Spykman added this is not a public hearing and as such the Board is not obligated to open this up for public comment. However, often times the Board does take public comment.

Tony Marcotte of Washington Park, LLC of Hudson NH addressed the Board. He indicated they have owned this property for five years and have had many tenants. For the last six months they have worked on a plan. He referred to the existing building and to where the four-story, 132-unit structure is going to be located. Mr. Marcotte stated the plan is for condominiums which over time will be sold.

For the existing building, the applicant has a demolition permit and has been working on demolition work and in the future a new roof, new windows will be installed and renovations will begin shortly. Since work started there is a tenant interested in leasing the auditorium and cafeteria and turning it into a Bistro, Night Club, Restaurant and outdoor patio area. Their use will cover almost 60,000 square feet of space.

The proposed new building is 96 one-bedroom and 36 two-bedroom units. This would be a four-story structure which is what the applicant can do by right. This building will be constructed in wood, the owner is a drywall carpentry company and they will be doing all the work themselves. Mr. Marcotte stated they needed to purchase a city-owned parcel, 0.2 acres in size. The applicant has a purchase and sale agreement with the city subject to site plan approval.

Mr. Marcotte stated they have found a conflicting item in the Board’s regulation with that which exists in zoning (what is allowed in the Central Business District for impervious cover) which is 100%. What the applicant has tried to do is to add some landscaping. He noted for a site such as this, for a parking area any parking over 50 spaces would require 10% internal landscaping. Mr. Marcotte stated in the Central Business District the more landscaping that is added would mean more vehicles would be put out on the street. He added they have submitted the application for site specific to the

State and this would be amended based on Board and staff review as well as the shared driveway issue with the new YMCA owner.

Mr. Marcotte stated they would like to move forward with the change of use for the existing structure. This site would utilize parking at the front of the property as well as City street parking; this is what the former Middle School relied on in the past. Mr. Marcotte stated he was just involved in a residential project in Nashua which houses 140 elderly residential units and a 186 unit apartment complex in Fitchburg which has 95% occupancy. He noted based on the owner's market study there is a need in Keene for this type of housing.

Mr. Robert Baskerville, civil engineer from Bedford Design Consultants was the next to address the Board. Mr. Baskerville stated the survey for the property was done by SVE Associates. Mr. Baskerville stated they have met with the Engineering Department to talk about drainage, water/sewer lines to see what they have in their file and what was discovered in the survey, and this information does not match. He stated when the projects moves forward, they will make sure everything works properly.

He explained some of the utilities will need to be directed and the applicant will be working with the City on this. Mr. Baskerville explained the area behind the YMCA will be an area for a large underground infiltration system. Information has been submitted to the State to show a two-year, 10-year, 25-year and a 50-year flow rate for storms.

Mr. Baskerville stated there are minor items that keep changing. This is a four-story building and would have a larger percentage of one-bedroom units compared to two-bedroom units; 96 one-bedrooms, 36 two-bedroom, 132 total bedrooms. The two parcels combined would be just less than five acres in size. Originally the building was going to be a one-level building, which would have resulted in a very long façade. As a result it was decided it would be stacked, which would help break up the roofline.

The applicant has hired Steve Pernaw to perform a traffic study. This study is not back yet. Mr. Baskerville noted the plan before the Board says there will be 162 additional parking spots, which seem to change from day to day. The connection between the old Middle School building and the YMCA building will not exist anymore. This site is not located in a floodplain.

Mr. Marcotte referred to the shared driveway issue and stated this is something most people would like to see if the abutter permits it; trying to work on fewer driveways for this site.

As far as greenspace is concerned, they are going to try and locate some greenspace behind the building. Mr. Baskerville stated if they are able to do a shared driveway with MoCo Arts they could try and locate some landscaping in between some of these parking lanes or in front of the building. Mr. Marcotte added what this shared driveway would do is to get them another 12 to 15 feet, and the question is whether the location of a landscape buffer along the southern half (rain gardens) of the applicant's building or whether the Planning Board feels their standards supersede the Zoning Board's standards and 10% internal landscaping for every 50 parking spaces would be necessary.

Councilor Hansel felt this was a great project which is needed in this area. He asked whether there was going to be a flat roof on this building. Mr. Baskerville stated it would be ¼ inch per foot. The Councilor felt there is potential for rain water to come off that building. Mr. Marcotte stated they are planning on locating gutters as well as down spouts which would be tied into the drainage system which will help water not pour off the building.

Councilor Hansel felt if there was extra room to locate landscaping, it should be located right along the building; when you drive down Roxbury Street this would help break up the façade of this four-story building. Mr. Marcotte stated if they have some relief from having to locate 10% landscaping in the parking lot maybe some of the islands could get bigger. He added the view that is important to the Historic District Commission is the view from Roxbury Street.

Mayor Lane asked whether the applicant plans on locating rain gardens at the end of the parking isles. Mr. Baskerville stated they are proposing one or two in the islands right now. The Mayor asked what is the likelihood there will be trees and felt with 162 parking spaces it would be necessary to break up this façade. Mr. Baskerville stated they always do a landscape plan. Mr. Marcotte stated if trees are preferred his suggestion would be to remove the rain gardens as certain trees don't like standing water.

Ms. Weeks asked whether the front entrance would be on the west side. Mr. Marcotte agreed and added there will also be stairs on either side. Ms. Weeks asked about the east side, Mr. Marcotte stated this would be greenspace for the residents. Ms. Weeks also asked about the dots in front of the parking spaces. Mr. Marcotte stated these were parking lot bollards as the board regulations call for some type of barrier for parking lots. Ms. Weeks asked who their target market was. Mr. Marcotte stated their typical tenants are working class people (\$30,000 - \$40,000 range). This complex however, would target a higher range, \$40,000 range. He stated what they understand is there is a need for new housing.

Mr. Barrett stated he is excited to see the new use of the old Middle School. He indicated he is glad to hear as per the request from the Historic District Commission the applicant has agreed to take out the eight spaces on Roxbury Street and replace them with landscaping. Mr. Barrett stated his concern is with pedestrian accessibility onto Roxbury Street. Mr. Marcotte stated they could perhaps take out the parking next to the YMCA lot and turn that into a dedicated sidewalk or striped area with bollards. He further stated there would be amenities for residents living in this building at the old Middle School building and the owner would be looking at access across the parking lot which will be "hatched".

Mr. Barrett asked about the east side and asked whether this would be an emergency access point. Mr. Marcotte stated this is something which would need to go through Code review. He stated they would like to have at least a 15-foot landscape area in this location but still allow for access to the rear of the building but it would not be for fire truck access.

Chair Spykman stated the Planning Board is the body the applicant would come before with a site plan but they are also the body which is in charge of the implementation of the Master Plan of the City; development happens in accordance with the Master Plan. He stated he was pleased this company was planning on investing in our downtown. However, that said the Chair noted he is concerned with the massive scale of this development. He stated he understands the argument about the existing large scale buildings but those are mitigated by the existing field and the residences to the east. The Chair went on to say that what is being proposed is a four-story building on a raised platform against residences. He stated his concern is from 2 pm on; none of those homes will get any sunlight. The Chair stated this is a concern to him and asked whether three buildings oriented the other way could be considered with parking in-between.

Mr. Marcotte stated they have worked for 3½ years on this project and when they considered an 'L' shaped building on Roxbury Street it required a parking structure which doesn't make the numbers work. He indicated 80 units would not justify for a full-time maintenance person, office person etc. The owner needed at least 120 units to make this project work. Mr. Marcotte went on to say he

understands the abutters will have a four-story building next to them but the City's zoning permits six stories with zero setback. He pointed out the intent of the Central Business District is to be fully built-out. He further stated he understands there are homes here but these are homes in the Central Business District where four to six stories are permitted adjacent to it. He added if they could not obtain the needed number of residences here, then residences would need to go into the old Middle School building.

As far as the parking, their experience has been 1.2 parking spaces per unit has worked well, and as long as they are close to 150 units, all of these spaces will be reserved for the tenants in this new building. He stated he understands there are neighbors, but these are neighbors in a zone which permit four to six story buildings. The reason they purchased this property is so that it could be built-out.

Mr. Marcotte stated this property has been on the market for five years they feel it is time to develop it. He stated he has worked on many different options for the orientation for this building. He felt a parking structure might work well in a TIF District but constructing a parking structure for a residential development just doesn't work.

Mayor Lane stated ever since the School District sold this property the intent was to incorporate this property into the downtown. He stated the massing is not inconsistent to what exists in the downtown. The Mayor felt what is being constructed is getting a productive use in quite a number of years. He stated he was pleased with this proposal and does understand there will be an impact on the properties to the east but what is being proposed is what the City has desired for this corridor.

Ms. Weeks reminded the applicant about bike racks.

Mr. Marcotte stated he hoped there was no "heartache" from the Board and that they could move forward with a building permit for the existing building and if that could be issued before a Site Plan for the existing building. Chair Spykman stated the Board is not at a position to indicate a vote for a plan it has not yet seen.

Mr. Robert Gaskill stated he was the applicant who plans on constructing a 200 plus restaurant in the old cafeteria space, a 250 plus Night Club and eventually a pool hall/game room and the auditorium is being planned to be turned into a theater.

Mr. Gaskill stated he is very fortunate to have found this location for his venture. He stated he wants to work with the college to try and work with their students on internship opportunities

Mayor Lane stated he would like to encourage Mr. Gaskill to work closely with the Colonial Theater as the community has invested a lot of money into this organization. Mr. Gaskill agreed he would very much like to work with the Colonial and MoCo Arts and compliment both these organizations in the work he is planning on pursuing.

Ms. Weeks asked how much of the building Mr. Gaskill was referring to. Mr. Gaskill stated it would be the area from the cafeteria to the auditorium about 60,000 square feet in size. He went on to say when he fills this space it would be with businesses that complement each other; an inside place where people can go. Ms. Weeks asked about parking. Mr. Gaskill stated he has given this thought and everyone has problems with parking. He stated he would like to perhaps work with an entity like Thomas Transportation where buses could run on the hour and pick up and drop off at different locations in Keene.

Ms. Weeks asked whether the parking in front of the building will be dedicated to this business. Mr. Marcotte stated the area in front of the building will be shared, but there will be a certain number of spaces for employees which would need to be monitored. There are a few groups like the Fire Department and Court House who have been using these spaces. A lot of the parking for this structure will be throughout the Keene community. Mayor Lane felt this might be a mechanism to create a parking deck on Elm Street.

Mr. Bohannon felt this is a great addition for Keene. He stated he hears from many people who travel an hour and half to attend concerts. He also expressed concern about parking and felt the Mayor's suggestion regarding a deck was a good idea.

Ms. Weeks asked about plans for the rest of the existing building. Mr. Marcotte stated after the proposed use there would be 50,000 square feet left. He stated they would like someone to utilize the gym so that there could be a downtown gym again. The applicant has not started marketing that space yet. He stated the applicant's plan is to replace everything inside this building, electric, windows, sprinkler system, roof etc. He indicated they are currently in the demolition stage. The plan is to have mixed use facilities in this location.

Chair Spykman opened this item up for public comment next.

Mr. William Beauregard stated he and his wife own four properties which immediately abut this proposed building. He stated he is excited to see things happen at the old Middle School. Mr. Beauregard stated he as well as his neighbors however, have some grave concerns. He indicated his occupation is apartment rental and their standard has always been two spaces per apartment which he understood was the City's rule outside the Central Business District. He indicated his project is located in the Central Business District and as a result does not require parking. Mr. Beauregard noted the area on Spring Street has serious issues with parking.

He went on to say this proposal is talking about 132 units, and with a standard of two spaces per unit, which would be 264 spaces, the applicant would be 100 spaces short for this residential development. This does not consider the repurposing of the old school. Mr. Beauregard stated he is pleased to hear what Mayor Lane stated about the parking structure but the structure is not there yet. He added this proposal is only going to exacerbate an already difficult parking situation. Mr. Beauregard stated on Spring Street at their expense they had to locate an 18-car parking lot for his tenants and his concern is with the shortage of parking, overflow parking is going to end up on his private lot. Should the Board move forward with this proposal he urged the Board to close access to Spring Street.

Mr. Beauregard referred to where his parking lot is located on the applicant's plan. Mr. Beauregard also explained how nearly 64 feet of height would affect his properties. He added he heard the developer mention the abutters anticipated this happening, but added he didn't. He asked that this be mitigated as well.

Mr. Beauregard then talked about drainage. The properties on Roxbury Court have sump pumps, so does his property. He noted the upland area is this site and water flows downhill, so this is a concern as well.

Mr. Peter Hartz of 12 Brook Street stated obtaining public input is essential for this application and felt the proper process needs to be followed. Mr. Hartz stated he has lived here for 25 years and even though people would like to consider this central business, there is a residential neighborhood in this zone and this proposal is going to affect this neighborhood in many different ways such as traffic,



public school system, water and sewer and hoped these things will be considered. Mr. Hartz stated it is good to develop the downtown but thought needs to go into it.

Mr. Hartz noted there is a high crime rate in this neighborhood and questioned what 132 more units would attract. He also questioned where the market study for this development came from. He stated if one was to look on Craigslist for instance there are 147 apartments listed so does The Keene Sentinel. Mr. Hartz noted the population of Keene has not grown in the last 20 years and questioned what the demand is for these proposed apartments and what the consequences are for the rest of the City by over developing residential.

Chair Spykman talked about the process – if and when the applicant applies for Site Plan review, it would have the full public notice process. The community will have an opportunity to address this issue and added what is happening today is not a public hearing and hence the reason it did not receive public notice. Ms. Weeks asked whether the City now has the proper abutter list and reminded the issue that arose when the soccer program came before the Board. Chair Spykman stated that was not a City issue, it is the applicant who is responsible for putting together a list of abutters. Ms. Weeks stated it did slow down the process.

Mr. Bob Beauregard of 47 Spring Street stated he is probably the person who is going to be most impacted by this project. Mr. Beauregard showed the Board on the plan where his property is located. He noted the new building will be constructed 15 feet from the property line. He stated when he looks out the window all he would see is a large expanse of a building and the impact will be tremendous.

Mr. Beauregard stated his current tax bill is \$10,000 and he sees a major impact to be able to market his property.

He noted the afternoon sun will completely be blocked by this building plus the 15-foot buffer is not an adequate amount. Mr. Beauregard added this would not just impact his property but all the properties on Spring Street and Roxbury Court.

Ms. Joslin Kimball Frank of 104 West Street was the next speaker. Ms. Kimball Frank stated her concern is also about parking and asked the City to consider a good size parking structure so that some of this surface parking could be eliminated. Ms. Kimball Frank stated she would also like not to have parking in front of these beautiful buildings. The City does not have many parks and felt trees and grass would be nicer than having cars in front of the property.

Mr. Hartz asked whether the rendering before the Board today is available to the public. Chair Spykman stated because this is not an official plan, it is not available to the City but asked Mr. Hartz to talk to the developer. Mr. Lamb stated even though this is Advice and Consideration, it is still an application and as a result this plan is available to the public through the City. He added it is not a formal application and hence would not have all the pertinent details.

Ms. Russell Slack asked whether the developer has had any conversation with the abutters. Mr. Marcotte stated they anticipated the abutters will not like the project. He stated they research their projects before purchasing them and understand the concerns but the property was purchased in the Central Business District which permits this type of a development. He went on to say they do plan on having a conversation with the abutters regarding the back of the property. He added they don't plan on getting rid of this building unless someone required them to, but will attempt to work with the abutters.

With reference to the crime issue, Mr. Marcotte stated when they build a property they do so with good security and have always found they help reduce crime rate. They can't guaranty 24-hour security, but there will be security in some form.

Chair Spykman reiterated the traffic issue and added the Board will be looking closely at the traffic study. He added it was the Planning Director who had suggested connecting the property to Spring Street and Roxbury Court and added they try hard to work with communities.

**VI. Planning Director Reports**

Mr. Lamb stated the landuse code update project starts this week – update to subdivision, site plan, zoning, floodplain rules. The consultants have started their initial interviews. They will be participating in a Steering Committee meeting, and meeting with department heads and key staff people and then participate in stakeholder meetings for the rest of the day. This phase does not include a rewrite but evaluating what updates best fit the community, helping to educate what the options are. They plan on making a presentation to the Council and Joint Committee sometime in the September/October timeframe

**VII. Upcoming Dates of Interest – July 2016**

Planning Board Meeting – Monday, July 25, 6:30 PM

Planning Board Steering Committee – Tuesday, July 12, 5:30 PM

Joint PB/PLD Committee – Monday, July 11, 6:30 PM

Planning Board Site Visits – Wednesday, July 20, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Krishni Pahl  
Minute Taker

Reviewed by: Rhett Lamb, Planning Director  
Edits: L. Langaella