

**CITY OF KEENE  
NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES**

Monday, March 25, 2019

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

**Members Present**

Douglas Barrett, Chair  
Chris Cusack, Vice-Chair  
Mayor Kendall Lane  
Councilor George Hansel  
Michael Burke  
Martha Landry  
Gary Spykman  
Pamela Russell-Slack  
Andrew Weglinski

**Staff:**

Rhett Lamb, ACM/Community  
Development Director  
Mari Brunner, Acting Planner

**I. Call to order – Roll Call**

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

**II. Minutes of previous meeting** – February 25, 2019 Planning Board Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Councilor George Hansel to accept the February 25, 2019 minutes. The motion was seconded by Pamela Russell-Slack and was unanimously approved.

**III. Public Hearing**

1. **SPR-11-18, Modification #1 – 96 Dunbar Street – Site Plan** – Applicant Brickstone Land Use Consultants, LLC, on behalf of owner Knotty Pine Antique Market, Inc., is requesting a modification to building elevations that were approved as part of a site plan for property located at 96 Dunbar Street (TMP 585-007-000-000-000) in the Central Business District.

A. **Board Determination of Completeness**

Acting Planner Mari Brunner recommended to the Board that application SPR-11-18 Modification #1 was complete. A motion was made by that the Board accept this application as complete. The motion was seconded by Councilor George Hansel and was unanimously approved.

B. **Public Hearing**

Mr. David Bergeron of Brickstone Land Use Consultants addressed the Board and noted that the owners of the property were here with him tonight to request a change to their approved plan. The request is to modify the west elevation of the building, which faces the courtyard and the east elevation, which faces Community Way. Photos of these walls are shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3 of the staff report, which show that the walls have already been partially filled in with green siding. He indicated the original proposal for these walls was to alternate between green and red siding in order to mimic the brick pilasters, which exist on the other sides of the building. However, because of the way these materials are constructed, the applicant has not been able to do that and showed the Board samples of the material. The plan was to be able to cut the red siding into 20-inch wide pieces, however the siding material is designed to have an overlap to

prevent water from getting into the cracks. This prevents them from creating a straight line. Therefore, they would either need to add a full red piece (rather than cutting it down to 20 inches) which would not look like the rest of the building, or cut the red piece down to 20 inches and create a seam where water could get in and damage the building. As a result, the applicant is requesting to go to the full green panels for the west and east facades.

Mayor Lane asked whether there would be brick behind these panels. Mr. Bergeron answered in the negative and went on to say the brown areas for instance shown on picture 3 is wood. There is no brick on the areas of the building that are going to be covered by siding.

Mr. Weglinski noted that the siding panels would have to be cut at the ends to fit in the rectangular area; Mr. Bergeron confirmed this is true and said that the siding company makes J channels to go with this product which are used to seal the ends. The issue is where the two different siding panels come together; they would have to put two J channels back-to-back, which would leave a seam that water could get through. Mr. Weglinski stated he has used this product a lot and suggested using a vertical lineal that could receive the two J channels to create a water-tight seam and create a positive solution. Mr. Bergeron stated they did not see a lineal with this product.

Ms. Landry asked whether what is shown on Figures 2 and 3 is what was originally proposed. Mr. Bergeron stated the applicant originally wanted to just use green siding, but during the Planning Board process (in response to staff comments before the Planning Board meeting) the red strips were added to better conform with the Planning Board's standards. However, when the work started the contractor was not using the revised plan. The work was stopped at that point, but they could not find the piece necessary to install the siding as indicated on the approved plan.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Brunner stated this project was approved by the Planning Board in October 2018 after the project received ZBA approval for a use variance. She stated the project is visible from Dunbar Street and Community Way and is located next to the Historic District. The only change being requested today is in reference to Development Standard 19 – architecture and visual appearance. The proposal the Board originally approved consisted of two colors but what the applicant is proposing today is just one color.

Ms. Brunner went on to say when staff reviewed this proposal prior to the October Planning Board meeting, the proposal consisted of just one color. Staff had asked the applicant how they were planning on meeting standard 19, and referred to a couple provisions of this standard. Standard 19. b.1. requires the front façade and exterior walls to be articulated to reduce the massive scale and to provide visual interest in keeping with the City's identity, and Standard 19.b.4. states that exterior materials and colors shall minimize visual aggressiveness and harmonize with the City's unique architectural identity. Based on these comments from staff, the applicant revised their plan and presented a revised proposal with two colors to the Board for their approval in October. This concluded staff comments.

The Chairman asked for public comment. With no comments from the public, the Chairman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Spykman did not feel what is being proposed is a major change.

Dr. Cusack referred to page 14 of the staff report and felt what is presented today seems very different to what the Board approved. He stated he was concerned mostly with the east elevation which fronts Community Way and the bike path and felt this could be a jarring view.

Ms. Landry asked how this modification meets the standard. Ms. Brunner referred to Standard #19, b.1 and b.4., and noted that whether or not the modified proposal meets this standard would be a judgment for the Planning Board to make. Mr. Lamb stated the applicant understood the importance of the vertical nature of the red columns and the applicant in October demonstrated they understood this was important to the Board. Backing away from that, will result in creating a proposal which has large expanses that are unbroken. He said the vertical elements help break the large expanse and keep with the surrounding buildings in the area.

Chair Barrett noted that there is another section of Standard #19, part b.3., which is also relevant. This standard states: "Structures shall have architectural features and patterns that provide visual interest at the scale of the pedestrian, reduce massive aesthetic effects, and harmonize with the City's distinctive architectural identity, unique character, and prevailing scale."

Councilor Hansel stated having the vertical elements will help break up the large expanse green siding which is definitely preferable. He referred to the manufacturer's catalog online, and said he found a five-inch double channel lineal on page 18 of the installation manual. He encouraged the petitioner to investigate options for breaking up the large expanse and said he feels that the removal of the vertical elements takes away from the overall aesthetic quality of the building.

Mayor Lane stated his concern is limited to the façade that faces Community Way which is going to be the most visible to the public. He felt the large expanse of green consisting of two floors is a lot and needs to be visually broken up in some way.

Mr. Weglinski felt that even if the lineal is not available, there are other options to break up this façade that the applicant could explore. He said it is important to uphold the spirit of the standard and if the applicant can't do that with their original proposal, they should look into other options to do what they originally proposed.

Chair Barrett stated the east elevation does not address the pedestrian scale that standard 19 refers to, and stated he would like to see this addressed. He also stated that, while the applicant may have originally proposed to use only one color, they brought the proposal for two colors before the Board – the Board did not push the applicant to make that proposal; they did so on their own and that is what the Board approved. He would like to see the applicant make an effort to achieve the look that was approved one way or another.

The Chairman opened the public hearing to hear from the applicant.

Mr. Malcolm Katz introduced himself as the architect for the project and addressed the Board. Mr. Katz noted that the appearance of the building as it exists today is an eyesore. He stated the intent with this proposal is to preserve the building and to clean up the site. He noted the siding being used is the same material that is used at the housing complex a few blocks away. He felt what is being offered is a good solution for this building. Mr. Lamb stated what he was hoping for from the applicant is a response to the availability of the lineal connector which would offer the option for a different color pilaster as was originally approved by the Board. Mr. Katz stated that trying to obtain siding that comes in sections that are 20" to 24" wide was impossible to find absent going with vertical siding.

Mr. Bergeron stated the applicant would like to get this resolved tonight and asked the Board whether it would be possible to indicate their preference so that the applicant could come back with something to be reviewed by Mr. Lamb. He went on to say they could always add four-foot-wide red panels to these facades and this could be one option if there is no lineal. The only problem is that this option would not be the same width as the pilasters that exist elsewhere on the building.

The second option would be if they are able to find the material in the correct size, it can be brought to staff and the project could move forward without having to come back before the Board.

Mr. Lamb stated if this was going to be approved by staff, he is generally in favor of it but cautioned the Board about being very specific when it comes to standard 19. If not, the Board will be delegating too much authority to staff.

Mr. Spykman referred to page 14 of 30 which shows the original architectural elevations that were approved by Board as well as the architectural elevations for this proposed change. Mr. Lamb noted the two images on the top of this page is what the Board approved in October. Mr. Spykman noted he wasn't sure if what is shown on this page is actually 20 inches wide (red) and went on to say the Board's standard 19 is the most subjective standard and hence the reason Mr. Lamb is reticent to take on the approval process. He went on to say, as was noted earlier, that it appears that there is a product available through the company the applicant is using which could provide for some sort of break between the green material. If this is the case, what the Board is requesting is for the applicant to provide for a similar design to what was approved in October. Mr. Bergeron stated he understands what Mr. Spykman is saying but he is going by what the contractor had stated and that is he is unable to obtain the material which would work for this project. He added if they can obtain this material, what was approved can be done.

Ms. Landry referred to page 14 and compared the elevations and felt there is too much green in the revised proposal and asked whether this has already been done. Mr. Bergeron stated this is where the contractor was incorrect and went with the original plan which did not have the breaks; this work was stopped. Mr. Katz referred to Figure 3 on page 20, the lower portion and felt it is much better than what it looked like before. Ms. Landry stressed this is not what was approved.

Dr. Cusack agreed it is a much-improved plan and the Board was happy to see a business locate at this site, but noted what is before the Board is not what the Board approved.

Mr. Bergeron also added the red shade they are able to obtain will not match the color of the brick because it lacks hues and variations in shades typical of bricks.

Mr. Weglinski referred to the original elevations on the top of page 14 and asked whether the break out was supposed to be shingles; Mr. Bergeron answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Lamb asked whether it was possible to cut these red panels to the required width and fit them into the H channel. Mr. Bergeron stated this was the original intent.

Mr. Weglinski went over the options as follows: 1) see if this material is available with a lineal, and build the project as it was originally approved; 2) the Board approves what is being

presented tonight; or 3) the applicant develops a different plan such as using plywood to create the vertical columns to break up the green siding.

With no further comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing again.

The Chairman stated the options the Board has are: (1) approve what it presented, (2) vote on the proposal and not approve it, or (3) continue the public hearing.

Mr. Spykman stated if the applicant cannot construct what was originally approved, he doesn't feel comfortable asking the applicant to find another way to achieve the approved plan.

Councilor Hansel stated that although standard 19 is subjective, what is being proposed barely meets the standard and it would be preferable if the applicant provided a way to break up the green expanse to get as close to the original plan as possible.

Mayor Lane asked whether there was any land area between the property line and the building where landscaping could be added to break up the façade. Board members recalled this area being paved.

Ms. Russell-Slack stated she would like to move this forward and agrees with what Mr. Spykman said and hoped staff would be comfortable approving an alternative the applicant might bring forward. Mr. Lamb stated he would like some clarity as to what he might approve and added he does want to be responsive to the Board.

Mr. Spykman pointed out if this project is approved, it will be constructed with the green material, if it is not approved the applicant will be required to go back to what the Board approved and questioned what happens if the applicant is unable to find the material they need.

Mayor Lane stated the contract is out there at the present time and continuing this for another month is not really an option. He felt the only solutions the Board has is to either approve what is presented tonight or provide the Community Development Director with sufficient direction to approved this item administratively.

Ms. Landry stated she is not inclined to approve what is before the Board without knowing what other options are available to the applicant.

Dr. Cusack asked what happens if the motion was denied versus if the item was continued.

Mr. Lamb explained if the request was denied, the applicant will still have their original approval that they received in October. If the Board makes a motion to continue this item, the current modification will be continued giving the applicant time to come back with answers to the questions that the Board has raised. Mr. Lamb added the Board also has the option of holding a special meeting if there is a concern about prolonging the timeline too long; it could be a 5:30 pm meeting prior to the Joint Committee session in early April.

Mr. Burke questioned how much effort was put into making this project look like the way it was originally approved. He added he just had siding put on his house and there are a lot of J Channels on his house and he does not understand why this cannot happen here as well.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Martha Landry that the Planning Board continue this public hearing. The motion was seconded by Michael Burke.

Mr. Weglinski asked whether it makes sense to vote it down, giving the applicant the opportunity to look for a product and come back before the Board. The Chairman explained the Board needs to first vote on the motion on the floor regarding continuance.

With agreement from the Board, Martha Landry revised her prior motion to continue this public hearing to a special meeting on April 8 at 5:30 pm. The motion was seconded by Michael Burke.

The motion failed 3-6 vote with Martha Landry, Chris Cusack and Michael Burke voting in favor.

Mr. Lamb pointed out what the Board is asking him to approve is whether or not the construction material is available to construct the project as was approved in October. He added anything beyond that places him in a position to approve a new plan or a revised plan which is not subject to review by the Board.

Mr. Spykman stated he agrees the default is what the applicant asked for unless the material is not available and this is what he would approve. Dr. Cusack stated he agrees with this and was not ready to make a rush decision today.

Chair Barrett stated if there is no material, something between what was approved and what has been suggested tonight is something he could agree with.

Ms. Landry asked Mr. Lamb whether the extent of his authority would be to approve what is before the Board today or what was approved in October. Mr. Lamb indicated the language in the motion he suggests would read as follows: *“subject to the applicant providing sufficient information to the Community Development Director to determine that the design approved on October 22, 2018 is infeasible due to unavailability of construction materials consistent with that plan.”*

The Mayor stated he would support either the approved plan or the modified plan with landscaping to break up the mass of the green siding. Councilor Hansel verified there would be curbing around any new landscaping to protect it from salt and damage from plows during winter months.

Mr. Spykman asked whether or not the Board should be hearing from the applicant as to whether they are willing to plant trees, which was never part of the plan. He felt if this was going to be part of the motion, he felt the Board should be hearing from the applicant.

A motion was made by Mayor Kendall Lane that the Planning Board approve SPR-11-18, Modification #1, as shown on the plan set entitled “Knotty Pine Antiques & Self Storage 96 Dunbar Street Keene, NH 03431, Tax Map Parcel 585-007” prepared by Brickstone Land Use Consultants, LLC on March 6, 2018, subject to the applicant providing sufficient information to the Community Development Director to determine that the design approved on October 22, 2018 is infeasible due to unavailability of construction materials consistent with that plan. In the event that the plan approved in Modification #1 is constructed, the applicant shall install landscaping along the east façade of the building to break up the façade of the building, location to be determined by the Community Development Director.

The motion was seconded by Councilor George Hansel.

Councilor Hansel stated the motion indicates staff is going to determine the location of landscaping and verify that it would be the same as what the Board would require with site plan applications. The Board agreed they would.

The Chairman reopened the public hearing to hear from Mr. Bergeron. Mr. Bergeron stated he was concerned about the number and type of landscaping the Board was looking for. Mayor Lane stated the applicant should work with staff and noted what they are looking for is something to break up the façade. Mr. Bergeron stated if there is room outside of the paved area, away from the building they could locate a few trees about 20 feet apart. Mr. Spykman stated he wanted to make sure the applicant was comfortable with what is being required of them with reference to landscaping. Mr. Bergeron stated the applicant is anxious to get this project moving forward.

The motion made by the Mayor carried on a unanimous vote.

#### IV. **Planning Board Discussion**

##### 1. **Building Better Together: Subdivision Standards Discussion**

Ms. Brunner stated the correct version of this document is on the Board's tables tonight. Ms. Brunner stated staff started this discussion with the Board in June 2018 and this is a continued discussion.

Ms. Brunner outlined the definition for Subdivision as *"any division of a lot tract or parcel of land into 2 or more lots, plats, sites, units or other divisions of land for the purpose, whether immediate or future, of sale, rent, lease, condominium conveyance or building development"*.

She noted the purpose of subdivision review as outlined in RSA 674:35 *"To provide against such scattered or premature subdivision on land as would involve danger or injury to health, safety or prosperity by reason of lack of water supply, drainage, transportation schools, fire protection or other public services."*

Ms. Brunner stated that in Keene, subdivisions must comply with what is outlined in the site plan and subdivision regulations, which are combined into one document. Street standards are outlined in a separate section and the Board's standards are outlined in another document.

Staff is proposing to create a separate section for Subdivision Regulation with standards for review. The proposed standards for review would be lot configuration, documentation an applicant needs to provide, special flood hazard areas, fire protection and water supply, and utilities. Other items, such as street standards and driveway siting would be referenced out to other sections.

The other change staff is proposing is to create a separate process for minor and major subdivisions. Minor subdivision would be a subdivision of land into three lots or fewer for building development purposes, with no potential for re-subdivision on an existing street, and which does not involve the creation of new streets, utilities or municipal improvements. Conversely, a major subdivision would be a subdivision of land into four lots or more, or a subdivision which involves the construction of a new street, utilities, or municipal improvements.

The proposal is to create a more, simple and streamlined review process for minor subdivisions. Ms. Brunner noted they would still have to meet the same standards but the review process could be simplified.

Ms. Brunner asked for comments on what she had just presented.

Mr. Spykman referred to major subdivisions and asked whether the proposal to create a separate process would discourage someone who is subdividing from putting in streets and utilities in order to avoid having to abide by a greater number of standards.

Ms. Brunner stated a minor subdivision or a major subdivision would have to follow the same set of standards. With a major subdivision, however, there would be a higher level of review; in the application process they would have to supply more information.

Ms. Brunner continued the presentation and stated there are some questions staff would like to bring to the Board such as: Should subdivision regulations apply to condominiums?

She explained a *condominium is a system of real property ownership that includes individually owned units and areas owned in common by the unit owner.*

Ms. Brunner said this is a system of ownership. NH RSA 356-B gives the Board the flexibility of regulating or not regulating condominiums.

Mr. Lamb stated at this point staff is proposing not to regulate condominiums as subdivisions. In most cases, a residential condominium is going to be reviewed as a site plan because there are usually more than three units involved.

The Mayor noted the Wright Estate was a major condominium development in the City which went through the subdivision process. The Mayor expressed concern over the Board giving up regulation of condominiums, he felt there could be large houses with two units that could end up as condominiums. Mr. Lamb stated staff could continue to look at this, and noted that what is being proposed tonight is not final. He added a project like the Wright Estate under today's standard would be reviewed as a site plan because it consists of more than three units.

The next question for the Board: should surface waters and hillsides be excluded from minimum lot size calculations?

Ms. Bruner stated Section 102-1494(a) of the Zoning Ordinance states that: *"for purposes of calculating the minimum lot size for the subdivision of land, areas of surface water resources as defined in this article shall be excluded from the area used to calculate the minimum lot size."*

In addition, Section III.C.6. of Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations states that for all proposed subdivision of parcels greater than 15 acres in size (other than CRD applications):

- All prohibitive slopes shall be excluded in the calculation of minimum lot size for each new lot, and
- 50% of precautionary slopes shall be excluded in the calculation of minimum lot size for each new lot.



Ms. Brunner noted some of the Board members questioned the reason for the exclusion at the June 2018 meeting. Following that discussion, staff explored the option of removing these exclusions from the minimum lot size calculations – what would happen if the exclusions were taken out? According to today's standard, if surface water or hillsides are impacted during a development of a site, a conditional use permit would be required.

Councilor Hansel felt minimum lot size is really for the purpose of establishing density of the houses within the zoning district and asked if there was another reason for minimum lot size. Mr. Lamb stated density is the main issue when talking about lot size. The next question is whether the land is developable. With the ordinance that is currently in place, it defines how some of these lots with steep slopes and surface water are developed.

The third discussion item is whether or not the Board should prohibit or discourage irregular lot configurations, often referred to as "flag lots."

Ms. Brunner referred to lots on Old Walpole Road and Stearns Road that have an irregular shape. These lots meet the minimum lot size requirements for the zoning district they are in; these irregular shapes allow for more flexibility in developing land.

Currently these lots are not discouraged or prohibited, but there are communities that require new lots to have a regular shape. What staff noticed is these lots are predominantly located in districts where there are discrepancies between what is required for frontage and what is required for minimum lot width at building line, especially in rural, conservation and agricultural districts.

Ms. Brunner stated if the Board is interested in discouraging these types of lots there are other options to encourage regular lot sizes. Mr. Lamb referred to these renderings and questioned where a driveway could be located; the frontage has to provide access to the buildable part of the lot but if the frontage has wetlands or hillsides then there are permitting issues that would need to be dealt with.

The Mayor questioned why a driveway has to be at the frontage – he felt in a scenario like that it would be shorter to have a shared driveway with the neighbor. Mr. Lamb stated this plan is acceptable but in Keene an applicant of a subdivision has to show that frontage actually works. Mr. Lamb added if a frontage doesn't actually work to get from the road to where a house is going to be built, it is a fundamental problem, but added he couldn't think of a reason why a flag lot would not work if the driveway can be located. Mr. Spykman asked if a property owner has access to get to their home via a neighbor's property, is there a need to have a frontage requirement? He felt access is more important than frontage. Mr. Lamb stated staff could look further into this and added there are assumptions when you own home on a Class V street you have the availability for utilities and emergency service response which might not be guaranteed with a gated access or shared driveway. He went on to say with common driveways there are also issues with neighbors not getting along and then this becomes an issue for future owners of the property who weren't part of the original agreements.

Ms. Brunner stated staff is going to take the comments from today and bring back a draft at a future meeting on the site plan subdivision regulations. Staff is also working on the CRD Regulations as well as Infill Development.

## 2. Proposed revisions to Development Standard #6 regarding art installations

Mr. Lamb stated this item is in reference to the request Councilor Jacobs brought before the Board at the February 2019 meeting. He noted staff has amended development standard #6 as shown on page 29 of the agenda packet. There are three areas where language was inserted into the document:

1. In the first paragraph, second line (after the word “shrubs”) language has been inserted which states “as well as art installations”
2. In section C, “Location,” language has been inserted after the word “landscaping” which reads “or art installations.” This is to ensure that art installations are located so as to not impede visibility or safety.
3. At the end of standard #6, a new section H was added with respect to public art installations. This section states “Any art installations which are on public or City-owned property shall meet the provisions of Resolution R-2018-22 relating to the acceptance and placement of public art by the Keene City Council.”

What the Board had indicated to Councilor Jacobs is that staff would come up with language which encourages art but does not require it. Mr. Lamb felt the language being proposed does what the Councilor was looking for.

Mr. Spykman asked whether what is being proposed is to be added to the Board’s standards and added the Board does not regulate anything on public or City-owned property. Mr. Lamb stated the City does to the degree it complies with its own standards and used the Fire Station and the Library as examples. Mr. Spykman stated those items came before the Board on a volunteer basis. Ms. Brunner stated it is City policy to follow its own rules and understands what Mr. Spykman is saying. She added the Board had requested that staff make reference to the Resolution which is geared toward public art, and this is the only manner in which staff could address installation of public art that made sense. Mr. Spykman felt it was unnecessary.

Ms. Russell-Slack thought the reason Councilor Jacobs raised this issue is because of the Wall Dogs project. Mr. Lamb stated the Wall Dogs project would not come before the Planning Board as it is regulated through the Historic District. He noted that this Resolution would not apply to the Wall Dogs as most of this project is on private property except for one wall of City Hall.

Councilor Hansel stated that public art is already regulated through a separate process with City Council. The Councilor agreed with Mr. Spykman that this language is not needed in the Planning Board development standards, which apply to private property.

Mr. Lamb stated if the Board wanted to move ahead with this item, a public hearing would be scheduled next. The Board agreed with the public hearing as the next step.

## **V. Nomination**

### **Southwest Region Planning Commission**

Chair Barrett stated it is the role of the Planning Board to nominate individuals to serve on the Southwest Region Planning Commission’s Board and it is the role of the Mayor to approve the nomination. The Mayor recused himself from this process.

Mr. Lamb stated there is an individual who had indicated his willingness to serve in this capacity.

A motion was made by Chair Barrett to nominate Gary Spykman to serve on the Board of Commissioners for Southwest Region Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Councilor George Hansel.

Mayor Lane noted there are three vacancies.

Mr. Burke asked for an overview of the duties of this role. Mr. Lamb explained this position represents the City of Keene on the Southwest Region Planning Commission Board. The Commission represents over 30 towns and their work is closely connected to transportation – they work with the state DOT – and there is also a Brownfield Advisory Body. They work closely with state and federal agencies. The Board of Directors are annually selected from the Commissioners. The Board of Directors meets monthly, and the Commissioners meet quarterly.

The motion made by the Chairman carried on a unanimous vote.

A motion was made by Councilor Hansel to accept Dick Berry's resignation from the Southwest Region Planning Commission's Board. The motion was seconded by Chair Barrett and was unanimously approved.

#### **VI. Community Development Director Report**

Ms. Brunner stated staff was recently made aware of a new deadline to submit legal advertisements to the Keene Sentinel. This change has a bearing on the date and time for the Steering Committee. The plan is to keep the normal time for the April 9 meeting at 11 am and suggested finding a new time and date for future meetings.

The reason for this change is that the Steering Committee meets before the Planning Board legal ad goes out; The Sentinel has changed the hour of the day when the advertisement has to be submitted from 4 pm on Tuesday to 10 am on Tuesday.

#### **VIII. Upcoming Dates of Interest – April 2019**

Planning Board Meeting – April 22, 6:30 PM

Planning Board Steering Committee – April 9, 11:00 AM

Joint PB/PLD Committee – April 8, 6:30 PM

Planning Board Site Visits – April 17, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Krishni Pahl  
Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by Mari Brunner, Acting Planner