

City of Keene
New Hampshire

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

Monday, January 13, 2020

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

Planning Board Members Present:

Doug Barrett, Chairman
Andrew Weglinski
Mayor George Hansel
Pamela Russell Slack
Tammy Adams, Alternate

Planning Board Members Not Present:

Chris Cusack, Vice-Chair
Michael Burke
Gary Spykman
Martha Landry

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

Councilor Kate Bosley
Councilor Phil Jones
Councilor Gladys Johnson
Councilor Mitch Greenwald
Councilor Katherine Workman

**Planning, Licenses and Development
Committee Members Not Present:**

Staff Present:

Rhett Lamb, Community Development Director
Mari Bruner, Planner
Tara Kessler, Senior Planner

1. Roll Call

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

2. December 9, 2019 Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Joint Committee accept the December 9, 2019 meeting minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Councilor Phil Jones and was unanimously approved.

3. Approval of 2020 Meeting Calendar

A motion was made by Councilor Jones to approve the 2020 meeting calendar. The motion was seconded by Pamela Russell Slack and was unanimously approved.

4. Continued Public Workshop: Ordinances – O-2019-13 and O-2019-14 – Relating to Social Service and Congregate Living Uses. Petitioner, City of Keene, proposes changes to Chapter 102 – Zoning, Chapter 46 – Licenses and Permits, Chapter 18 – Building Regulations, and Appendix B – Fee Schedule of the City Code of Ordinances. The amendments proposed include the introduction of land uses categorized broadly as Social Service and Congregate Living uses as well as a conditional use permit and City operating license for some of these uses.

Asst. City Manager/Community Development Director Rhett Lamb and Senior Planner Tara Kessler addressed the Committee. Ms. Kessler began by saying that the city's current zoning is outdated and does not contain list of uses that would be compatible with existing uses and accommodate those uses that would like to locate in Keene, such as lodging homes, residential care facilities, group homes, homeless shelters. As a result, approximately eight new uses are being introduced into the zoning code.

Ms. Kessler went on to say the ordinance before the Joint Committee today was introduced to City Council in August and the first public workshop was held on September 9 which workshops are being continued.

The uses this ordinance is focusing on are with respect to Social Service and Congregate Living will be - Homeless Shelter, Domestic Violence Shelter, Residential Drug Treatment Facility, Residential Care Facility, Group Home, and Lodging House.

With respect to Social Service, the uses being proposed are Social Service Center, Food Pantry, and Drug Treatment Clinic.

Ms. Kessler then referred to the minor amendments that have already been discussed.

- Remove abutter notice requirement for Operating License – There still will still be abutter notification required for Conditional Use Permit (CUP) – A CUP is a permit that will be provided by the Planning Board for a certain area where certain criteria will need to be met. For a CUP, abutters within 200 feet will need to be notified – this is a one-time permit and staff is proposing an annual operating license be issued administratively each year thereafter.
- Remove requirement for annual Operating License fee of \$200 – Many organizations applying for an operating license are likely to be non-profit organizations or charitable organizations and noted this license will not capture as much staff cost.
- Redefine and rename Social Service Center to “Group Resource Center” – There are still questions about how a social service center is distinguished from something like a community center or office setting hence the change to the name of group resource center.
- Place max of 16 unrelated persons on Group Home – At the present time there are an unlimited number that can live in a group home.
- Propose that only one group home be allowed per parcel
- Propose that only 1 lodging house be allowed per parcel
- Revise use locations to include proposed downtown sub-districts
- Revise Conditional Use Permit Criteria.

Ms. Kessler then went over the definition for Social Service Center. The proposed definition states as follows:

An establishment designed with the primary purpose of providing access to services related to counseling, personal care, or social well-being in a group setting. It does not include in-patient,

overnight services, or treatments normally conducted in a medical office, such as medical procedures, or medical detoxification, dispensing of drugs or medications.

Ms. Kessler explained the reason for distinguishing social service center from an office setting is to address the group meeting aspect.

Councilor Jones stated that in areas like Massachusetts there are locations for needle swap and asked whether that type of location would fit into this definition. Ms. Kessler felt this is something that would need to be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator. Councilor Workman noted there is such a program that currently exists in Keene.

Ms. Kessler then went over the different uses.

Domestic Violence Shelter: "A facility that provides temporary shelter, protection & support for those escaping domestic violence..."

Ms. Kessler stated this use would be allowed by right and a CUP and annual operating license will not be required. It will be permitted in the Downtown (DT) – Core, DT – Growth, DT – Edge, DT – Limited, Medium Density, High Density and Commerce.

Neighborhoods that fall under these districts are - Downtown core, neighborhoods between Court and Washington Streets to the north, and south of Route 101

Ms. Russell asked how far up Court Street does this travel to. Ms. Kessler stated the upper boundary of medium density would be up to North Street to the north.

The next use Ms. Kessler referred to was as follows:

Food pantry – A non-profit organization that provides food directly to those in need. May receive, buy, store, & distribute food and may also prepare meals to be served at no cost to those who receive them.

Ms. Kessler noted this is another use that would not be required to go through the review process prior to being allowed.

This use is being proposed to be allowed in Downtown (DT) – Core, DT – Growth, DT – Edge, DT – Limited and Commerce.

She referred to this use on a map – South of 101, Roundabout by Winchester Street, Central Square to the south

Ms. Kessler then talked about:

Residential Care Facility - A licensed facility that provides 24-hour medical and/or non-medical care to persons in need of personal care services, supervision, or assistance essential for sustaining the activities of daily living, or for the protection of the individual.

May include nursing care, assisted living, hospice care, & continuum of care facilities. Continuum of care facilities may also include independent living facilities as part of the continuum. Do not include a residential drug/alcohol treatment facility.

Ms. Kessler stated this use would require a CUP and would also require an annual operating license. She noted the reason for requiring CUP to allow for more flexibility where these uses could occur and to make sure the use is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

This use is being proposed to be allowed in Downtown (DT) – Core, DT – Growth, DT – Edge, DT – Limited and Commerce, Business, Growth, Reuse, Neighborhood Business, Regional Health Care, High Density and High Density 1.

Using a map Ms. Kessler went over where this use would be located – Old Walpole Road, Downtown, South of 101 along Route 12, Winchester Street roundabout to the south and west, Central Square and Main Street.

The next use Ms. Kessler addressed was:

Residential Drug/Alcohol Treatment Facility – A licensed facility that provides 24-hour in house supervision for medical and/or non-medical /therapeutic care of persons seeking rehabilitation from a drug and/or alcohol addiction. May include medical detoxification.

This use would require a CUP and would also require an annual operating license.

This use is being proposed to be allowed in Downtown (DT) – Core, DT – Growth, DT – Edge, DT – Limited, Commerce, Regional Health Care.

These uses are proposed to be located on Route 9 and 12, Downtown core, south of 101 by Route 12.

Drug Treatment Clinic - A non-residential facility authorized by the state to provide treatment and licensed drugs to persons....

This use would require a CUP and would also require an annual operating license.

This use is being proposed to be allowed in DT – Growth, Commerce, and Regional Health Care.

These uses are proposed to be located outside of the downtown – Gilbo Avenue where it meets West Street, Route 101, Route 12, Route 101 Winchester Street roundabout, Court Street end close to Old Walpole Road.

Ms. Kessler referred to the next use:

Group Resource Center used to be known as Social Service Center – definition was previously listed.

This use would require a CUP to be allowed and would also require an annual operating license.

This use is being proposed to be allowed in Downtown (DT) – Core, DT – Growth, DT – Edge, DT – Limited, Commerce, and Regional Health Care Districts.

These uses are being proposed to be located in downtown, Central Square, South of Route 101 along Route 12, Winchester Street roundabout.

Lodging House - Any dwelling for more than four unrelated persons, which provides separate rooms for sleeping for a fee, without personal care services and without separate cooking facilities for individual occupants. Shall not include a hotel or motel. Shall include fraternity and/or sorority house.

This use would require a CUP and would also require an annual operating license.

Ms. Kessler noted at the present time for this use an annual operating license is required and is issued by the City Council.

This use is being proposed to be allowed in Downtown (DT) – Core, DT – Growth, DT – Edge, DT – Limited, DT – Transition, Office, High Density, and Medium Density.

The proposal is for one lodging house per parcel to control density on a lot.

Councilor Jones asked whether the present licensing system would continue for lodging houses. Ms. Kessler stated staff is proposing all these uses be approved administratively but noted this is an issue the committee should discuss further. The Councilor noted a while back this issue did come up where it was proposed lodging house license be approved administratively but the PLD Committee asked it be approved by City Council as the Council wants the opportunity to add conditions into these licenses. Mr. Lamb stated staff is aware this is an issue that would require added discussion. Councilor Jones asked whether staff is proposing to eliminate fees for building inspection and fire inspection. Ms. Kessler stated the proposal is to eliminate the fees across the board to keep it easier, but this again is something this Committee can suggest changes to.

Councilor Greenwald stated he is opposed to eliminating fees for inspections. The Councilor asked how parking requirements fit into this discussion. Ms. Kessler stated outside of the proposed downtown the parking requirements will still apply for any of these uses. This is outlined in the zoning ordinance based on the number of units and square footage calculations. Mr. Lamb noted the central business district does not require on-site parking at the present time and the form-based zoning will preserve some of those requirements.

Ms. Kessler went back to the item of lodging houses – this use is proposed to be located in Central Square, West Street where it connects to Park Avenue, Maple Avenue, North Street, west along Gilbo Avenue where it meets West Street.

Group Home – a use allowed under the current zoning ordinance, definition has been amended and a few changes are being proposed.

New definition is as follows - *A facility in a residential dwelling, providing living accommodations and care for between 5 and 16 unrelated persons who are in need of personal care services and/or are in need of supervision. May include non-medical drug and alcohol rehabilitation.*

Ms. Kessler noted 16 is where the number would switch from residential to institutional code. Staff feels the maximum number will help control density in neighborhood settings and the proposal is to allow only one per parcel.

This use would require a CUP and would also require an annual operating license. It is proposed to be allowed in the DT – Transition, Office, High Density and Medium Density districts – districts that allow for single family homes today and multifamily homes and are in residential setting.

The areas being proposed are north of downtown, North Lincoln Street to the east, Court Street to Old Walpole Road, 9, 10, 12 connector and Route 101.

Councilor Workman noted similar to the maximum number of people proposed for the group home, could a number be placed for lodging houses as well or whether this is something that would be discussed during the CUP process. Councilor Jones stated the Fire Department is the entity that places a number for lodging homes.

Mr. Lamb addressed the Conditional Use Permit and how staff is proposing to set it up. He explained the CUP allows some uses to be permitted in certain areas under certain criteria reviewed by the Planning Board. At the present time telecommunication use requires a CUP approved by the Planning Board, surface water and hillside ordinances also require a CUP.

Councilor Johnson asked for clarification of domestic violence shelters – is it a place where people would stay or is it for offices which would facilitate where people stay. Ms. Kessler stated it is for a residential facility. Councilor Johnson asked whether there is a cap for number of people this facility could accommodate. Ms. Kessler stated staff has not placed a cap on the number. She further stated the number would depend on the organization and the reason staff is proposing these facilities be allowed by right is to ensure discretion as to where these facilities are located and not have them go through the public review process to protect the privacy of those who would use these facilities.

Ms. Kessler stated all but two of the uses she mentioned (food pantry and domestic violence shelter) would require a CUP as well as an annual operating license agreement. The requirement for the annual operating license is to ensure there is an annual inspection for life safety, fire and adherence to building codes. The proposal is to have these licenses approved and issued administratively rather than through the City Council. Mr. Lamb noted most likely the issuance of the CUP will be contemporaneous with the issuance of the licensing agreement. He added to obtain a CUP the applicant would have gone through the public hearing process in front of the Planning Board so the operating license will follow immediately after the issuance of a CUP.

Ms. Russell Slack asked how many lodging houses the city currently has. Mr. Lamb stated the city currently has four lodging houses. Ms. Russell Slack asked whether there would be any appeal process that an entity could take to the Council. Ms. Kessler stated the appeal for the license will go to the City Manager.

Ms. Kessler then went over the criteria the Planning Board would use to approve a CUP.

- *The proposed use is compatible with the character of the surrounding area in terms of operational characteristics including the following.*
 - *Proposed hours of operations.*
 - *Outdoor lighting, which shall comply with the Planning Board's Lighting Standard.*
 - *Proposed noise levels*
 - *Anticipated traffic generation*
- *The proposed use is located in proximity to pedestrian facilities (e.g. multiuse trails and sidewalks) and public transportation.* Ms. Kessler stated this condition is to make sure the individuals being served have access to adequate transportation options.
- *All development, redevelopment, additions, and renovations in a residential zoning district shall maintain the look and feel of a residential zone or area.*
- *No parking and/or paving, except driveways, is permitted in the front setback or the area from the front lot line to the building front, whichever is greater. All parking areas shall be adequately screened from adjacent properties and public rights of way.* Ms. Kessler stated this

standard is consistent with the current Planning Board standards to indicate parking is located to the side or rear of a building and that they are appropriately screened.

- *When a use is located directly adjacent to a residential zoning district there shall be:*
 - *A building setback of 50' from property line(s) directly abutting residential zoning districts, unless an alternative solution is approved by the Planning Board.*
- *The Planning Board may impose conditions to the extent the Board concludes such conditions are necessary to minimize any adverse effect of the proposed use on adjoining properties, and to preserve the intent of the Board's Regulations and the Keene Zoning Ordinance.* Ms. Kessler stated this condition gives the Board flexibility to add conditions to protect the site plan/subdivision regulations and the zoning ordinance.

Councilor Jones asked staff for the next time to provide a better definition for non profit organizations as the tax office has two different definitions they use.

Mr. Lamb then went over Next Steps. He indicated when this ordinance started quite a few months ago the plan was to have it adopted and integrate it into the existing zoning. However, staff is unable to meet those deadlines. As a result, drafting the unified development ordinance and form based zoning ordinance has become concurrent. Hence, the only way to move forward on this ordinance is to integrate the text the Joint Committee has in front of it today into the unified development ordinance as it is introduced in the next couple of months. He added the ordinance as it is drafted refers to the old zoning map. He suggested the committee take public comment, have staff work on the next set of revisions and continue the public hearing into the future when these two ordinances effectively will be wrapped into one. The date staff is proposing is June 8, 2020. Ms. Kessler added the unified development ordinance (UDO) could be introduced sooner than June 8, take public comment and continue same. She explained the purpose of the UDO is to combine all the land use regulations into one document – there are a few outstanding items that need to be addressed and hope to have a draft ready in the next month. The draft of the UDO will come before the Joint Committee first where public comment will be taken. From the Joint Committee the document then gets forwarded onto City Council, which will also have several public hearings and then be forwarded on to the PLD Committee for their recommendation and back to City Council for their adoption. Ms. Kessler added it is difficult to predict how many sessions it will take for a final document to be approved.

Mr. Lamb noted if the Committee was to move forward just on the document before it tonight and put it forward to the public hearing for Council adoption – there are going to be uses created in zoning districts which is likely not going to exist six months from now. He felt this would create a lot more confusion.

Councilor Greenwald asked this item to be moved forward and once the UDO is adopted make the necessary changes to this document at that time.

Councilor Johnson asked what timeline staff had in mind for this process. Ms. Kessler stated for the Social Service and Congregate Living Ordinance the process started in January 2019 and at that time staff did not realize how close these two projects would overlap.

Councilor Bosley asked whether the proposal is to see the first draft of UDO in March. Ms. Kessler stated this was staff's plan even though there are a few items that are outside of staff's control such as consulting contracts – but noted staff is very close to having a draft ready. The Councilor

clarified the Social Service and Congregate Living Ordinance that would go into the UDO would have what is in front of the Joint Committee with some zoning alterations based on the new sub-districts in the downtown. Ms. Kessler stated that was staff's understanding coming into today's meeting unless they hear otherwise from the committee. The Councilor suggested addressing some of the proposed edits from tonight and introduce those changes in March and address the UDO at the same time. Mr. Lamb stated this was a reasonable way to proceed – continue this item to the March Joint Committee session.

Chair Barrett asked for public comment next.

Mr. Carl Jacobs of 376 Chapman Road addressed the Committee. He noted the map referred to shows all districts but the chart staff presented tonight does not have all districts outlined.

Mr. Jacobs asked for clarification on the term medical detoxification. Ms. Kessler stated it is staff's understanding this term refers to the use of drugs or other medical treatments to help in the process of detoxification. Staff agreed to come back with clarification on this term.

Mr. Jacobs then addressed the issue with reference to administrative approval versus Council approval – he felt for the first instance the item should be approved by the Council.

Mindy Cambiar of 100 Nights Shelter noted there was no mention of Homeless Shelters in staff's presentation. Ms. Kessler stated this was an oversight. Ms. Cambiar stated her biggest concern is the decision for location of 100 Nights – she noted they have missed the January cycle for funding and does not seem like they would meet the March deadline either. She asked whether applying for a variance might be the best way to proceed. She stated she would like to have some practical advice. Ms. Cambiar went on to say they are at 49 beds every night, the shelter has four families, and have helped more families than they have any time in the past.

Ann Savastano of 75 Winter Street addressed the Committee next. Ms. Savastano agreed the licensing permit and the CUP should initially go to the City Council. She questioned why group homes will only be allowed in the DT-Transitional District. She applauded the social services Keene has to offer but raised concern of these services being concentrated to the downtown and stated she has heard comments from downtown businesses and college students who have raised concern about individuals with special needs frequenting businesses downtown. Ms. Savastano stated this is not a compassion issue but more about a nervousness issue. Councilor Jones in response stated there are three zones being proposed for group homes – medium density, high density, and office.

Ms. Slack clarified when the maps are put together and the streets are labeled whether this information will be available to the public. Ms. Kessler agreed and stated they would be available on the Joint Committee's page on the city website (Boards and Commissions Page).

Mr. Richard Newton of 318 Hurricane Road asked for the timeline for getting the social service ordinance approved versus incorporating it into the UDO. Ms. Kessler in response stated once this committee is ready to vote to adopt this ordinance, it will go to the City Council for the Mayor to set a public hearing. That date could be as soon as a month from when the ordinance leaves this committee. After the public hearing it will then get moved on to the PLD Committee – two to three weeks after that time. From the PLD Committee it goes back to City Council for final adoption. Ms. Kessler stated the time period in front of each committee depends on how long a particular

committee wants to spend on the ordinance – the fastest period for adoption will be two to three months.

Chair Barrett asked for the timeline if this ordinance was to wait for the UDO to be completed. Ms. Kessler stated it would be the same process but a longer process because of the volume of material for the committees to review – it will take longer than May for the UDO to get adopted. Mr. Newton asked whether it also could mean it might not be adopted this year. Mr. Lamb stated this would not be staff's intention. Mr. Newton stated he would like to reiterate Ms. Cambiar's concern; the need for a new homeless shelter would relieve the stress on 100 Nights and getting a new facility depends on funding, and their funding cycle starts in January

Mayor Hansel clarified if this item was to be moved forward before the newly adopted map it could open up more areas in the downtown than was discussed tonight. Ms. Kessler stated if there were going to be new zoning districts impacted when it is time for the public hearing phase the notices will have to be amended and it could bring in members of the public who have not been able to follow along.

Director Economic Development and Special Projects, Med Kopczynski stated the original proposal for this item was limited and was based on the existing zoning map and this map does not provide for much opportunity for homeless shelters. If that map was to be amended, the city will need to change its notification and some of the districts 100 Nights is looking at are not in the districts outlined today. Mr. Kopczynski stated even though there might be a delay, it will provide for much more flexibility and might not achieve the goals 100 Nights is trying to achieve.

Ms. Kessler addressed the item Homeless Shelter, which was previously overlooked. She noted the definition has not changed from the original ordinance.

A facility that provides temporary shelter without a fee to persons who are homeless. The facility shall be managed by a public or non-profit agency with in-house supervision provided during operation.

This use would require a CUP and would also require an annual operating license. It is proposed to be allowed in the DT –Growth and Commerce.

The areas being proposed are Main Street, Central Square, Roundabout at Old Walpole Road, 9, 10, 12 and West Street connection, Route 101 roundabout, Route 12 south of 101. Downtown would be up to East of Community Way where it meets Grove Street and Water Street, West of Main Street where Gilbo Avenue meets West Street.

With no further comments, the Chairman closed the public workshop.

Mayor Hansel felt if this ordinance was to be rushed through, it would allow homeless shelters to be located in central business because of the way the downtown map exists at the present time –it is not broken up. He felt this would be challenging to get through the public process.

Councilor Jones stated he does not like the idea of waiving the fee for non-profits. He used a fraternity house as an example and did not feel taxpayers should have to bare this cost. He also felt the more issues that can be put forward before elected officials the better – he indicated it is elected officials individuals call when they have problems in their neighborhood. He felt this process needs to be changed.

Ms. Russell Slack stated there has to be some step that takes the item back to Council. She questioned under the Homeless Shelter there is reference to temporary shelter and asked for clarification; she asked what the average stay was and what number the city has for the homeless population. She noted that 100 Nights not only serves the City of Keene, but the County, the State and stated there is a crisis across the state when it comes to homeless shelters in general. She felt the city was fortunate it has four shelters. Ms. Kessler stated not just for homeless shelters but any transient facilities would have a maximum of a 30-day stay. Mr. Lamb added the city would rely on the individuals who run these facilities for that type of information.

Councilor Bosley stated this data does exist and there are New Hampshire Systems that collect such data and did not feel it would be difficult to have a resource make a presentation for the Council on this topic.

Councilor Greenwald stated he too would like to see initial licenses go through City Council.

Mayor Hansel stated he has concern about the lodging house definition; he felt the intent is to group fraternities and sororities in the lodging house definition. He noted there is a trend to create work force housing, which would fall under lodging house and suggested keeping fraternities and sororities separate from this use. Mr. Lamb stated staff will look at this issue. He further stated there seems to be a consensus regarding the licenses at the first instant to go before City Council as well as wanting to charge a fee for licenses. He added the lodging house licenses are quite a few and this could be a workload for the PLD and wanted the committee to be aware of it.

Chair Barrett stated he was in agreement with the initial approval for license going before the PLD Committee. However, should the workload be more than was anticipated, he asked whether the ordinance would need to be amended and go through the public hearing process. Mr. Lamb answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Kopczynski clarified the license issue is not a zoning code change; it is an ordinance change, hence the ability to change it would be much easier.

Councilor Johnson with reference to what the Mayor had stated asked which areas were being referred to and what that would look like. The Mayor asked staff to explain if the homeless shelter definition was to be applied to the current map what that would look like. Mr. Lamb explained because the definition did not exist when this ordinance was being drafted, the existing zoning district in the downtown was to be used and the logic was to apply it to central business limited and commerce. It does not front Main Street or is it directly in the downtown - central business is larger than the downtown core. Ms. Kessler added there is a site in mind for 100 Nights, this site is in the Business Growth and Reuse District and staff does not recommend adding a homeless shelter to this area, which is concentrated around the Kingsbury property and south of Water Street.

Chair Barrett asked staff with the Congregate Living Ordinance could be fast tracked and have it approved before the UDO is complete and the second scenario would be to wait for the UDO to be complete – keeping those two scenarios in mind if this item was to be continued to the March meeting to make the specific changes as was discussed tonight, would there be any difference in what staff does to bring the committee to that point for the March meeting.

Ms. Kessler stated this would mean staff is working on the new sub districts and not focusing on the existing zoning – this would place more demands on staff.

Councilor Bosley clarified this discussion is focusing on one entity and their one proposed site which would not be allowed under the current ordinance and fast tracking this item will not really help the applicant – staff agreed.

Ms. Adams felt there should be a mechanism to waive the license fee as there were many groups early in the process who indicated this would be burdensome for them. Mr. Lamb stated at the present time under chapter 14 of the ordinance there is no mechanism to waive the fee, but there is that option under Planning Board fees. Councilor Greenwald asked whether the council has the option to waive the fee. Mr. Lamb stated language would need to be added to the ordinance. Mr. Kopczyński reiterated what was stated by staff and added staff will get back to the committee on this item. As far as location, this ordinance opens up more opportunities than has existed in the past.

Chair Barrett asked regardless of which scenario the committee went with whether staff sees a benefit in continuing this item to March and not extend it through June. Mr. Lamb agreed with March and added what staff is trying to do is to avoid the confusion as to which workshop the public should attend.

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel to continue this public workshop for O-2019-13 and O-2019-14 to the March 9, 2020 meeting. The motion was seconded by Tammy Adams and was unanimously approved.

5. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker