

City of Keene
New Hampshire

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

Monday October 26, 2020

6:30 PM

Remote Meeting via Zoom

Members Present:

Douglas Barrett, Chairman
Christopher Cusack, Vice-Chair
Councilor Michael Remy
David Orgaz
Gail Sommers
Pamela Russell Slack
Andrew Weglinski
Emily Lavigne-Bernier, Alternate

Staff Present:

Rhett Lamb, Asst. City
Manager/Community Development
Director
Tara Kessler, Senior Planner
Mari Brunner, Planner

Members Not Present:

Mayor George Hansel
Michael Burke
Tammy Adams, Alternate

I. Statement of Authority to Hold Remote Meeting

Chair Barrett began the meeting by reading the following statement with respect to holding remote meetings: *“In Emergency Order #12, issued by the Governor of the State of New Hampshire pursuant to Executive Order #2020-04, certain provisions of RSA 91-A regulating the operation of public body meetings have been waived during the declared COVID-19 State of Emergency.*

Specifically:

- *The requirement that a quorum of a public body be physically present except in an emergency requiring immediate action under RSA 91-A:2, III(b);*
- *The requirement that each part of a meeting of a public body be audible or otherwise discernible to the public at the location specified in the meeting notice as the location of the meeting under RSA 91-A:2, III(c).*
- *Provided, however that the public body must:*
 - *Provide access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by 24 video or other electronic means;*
 - *Provide public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting;*
 - *Provide a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access; and*
 - *Adjourn the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting.*
- *All votes are to be taken by roll call.*

• *All board participants shall identify the location from where they are participating and who is present in the room with them.*”

Chair Barrett said the public may access the meeting online by visiting the Zoom website, www.zoom.us/join, and entering the Meeting ID, which he stated. The Meeting ID also appeared on the Agenda for the meeting. The public can listen, but not view, the meeting by calling the toll-free phone number (888) 475-4499 and entering the Meeting ID. He noted that if someone is unable to access the meeting, they should call 603-209-4697.

II. Call to order – Roll Call

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

III. Minutes of Previous Meeting – September 28, 2020

A motion was made by Councilor Michael Remy to accept the September 28, 2020 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Pamela Russell Slack and was unanimously approved.

IV. Advice & Comment: Smiths Medical Addition & Site Changes – Applicant Mike Farhm, on behalf of Smiths Medical, is requesting that the Planning Board determine that the application for a site plan review for a proposed 3,400- sf addition on the property located at 10 Bowman Drive (TMP# 221-031-000) be approved administratively.

Senior Planner Tara Kessler addressed the Board and began by saying that “Advice and Comment” is typically a time for an applicant to present on a concept or design before they move forward with full site plan review, and get preliminary comments and feedback from the Board. She noted that, in this instance, the applicant is requesting that the Board consider whether a proposed modification could be reviewed administratively rather than going before the Board for review.

Ms. Kessler noted there are certain thresholds for an application to have to go through site plan review, and the Community Development Director uses these thresholds to determine if a project needs to come before the Board or if it could go through administrative review. For example, there are thresholds related to the square footage of new construction and change of use. With this application, Smiths Medical is proposing an addition to their building which meets the threshold for a major project and would therefore go before the Planning Board for review. In this case, the scale of the addition, which is a 3,400 square foot addition to a 142,000 square foot building, is a *de minimis* impact. Due to the location of this addition and proximity to abutters, staff did not think it warranted review by the full Board.

Staff has suggested this item come before the Board to determine if it could be reviewed administratively, or whether it should come back before the Board for review. Chair Barrett asked if the Board feels this item could be handled administratively, and asked staff whether a motion would be required. Mr. Lamb stated the last time a similar

application came before the Board, a motion was made for approval. He recommended that the Board make a motion.

Mr. Mike Farhm of DEW Construction addressed the Board next. Mr. Farhm stated that Smiths Medical is expanding its operation to support a request from the State due to the Covid-19 Pandemic for the distribution of needles (125 million syringes) which will be used for a vaccine. The current delivery and installation date is set for May 2021.

Mr. Matt Wheaton addressed the Board first by referring to the approximately 12,000 square foot area, which is currently open office space – this area is going to be opened up to create a large clean room and converted for light manufacturing use. Eventually, this space will house two manufacturing lines and would have its own ventilation system, electrical and mechanical equipment, and other amenities and would act as a stand-alone unit. The proposed addition would be a connecting space where all the mechanical and utility systems will be located. He noted that this is necessary in order to not disrupt the existing facility and its operations. The addition will match the height of the office area, and the exterior would match the existing facility, which has beige-colored insulated metal paneling. This concluded the applicants' comments.

The Chair asked for Board comment and reminded everyone that this was not a public hearing. Ms. Kessler noted the addition will be less than 2.5% of the size of the existing building.

Chair Barrett stated he was in favor of moving this item forward, Ms. Russell Slack agreed.

Ms. Sommers asked whether this type of construction is not unique to this facility. Mr. Wheaton in response stated this type of lab is called a "clean room," which is a lower-end classification (ISO 9) because it has a very low impact. The contractor has indicated the process to make the syringes will not be giving off any type of odor or generating any sort of hazardous waste or chemicals. Ms. Sommers asked if there are other similar labs in operation at this facility; Mr. Wheaton responded in the affirmative.

A motion was made by Councilor Remy that the Planning Board approve the request of Smiths Medical to have the proposal for a 3,400-sf addition on the property located at 10 Bowman Drive (TMP# 221-031-000) to be reviewed and approved administratively as a minor site plan. The motion was seconded by Pamela Russell Slack and was unanimously approved by a roll call vote.

V. 1. Public Hearings: S-06-20, Boundary Line Adjustment – 649 & 655 Main Street – Applicant Cardinal Surveying and Land Planning, on behalf of owners Jill Batty and Daryl Stutes, proposes a boundary line adjustment between the property located at 649 Main St (TMP #120-059-000) and 655 Main St (TMP# 120-058-000). This adjustment would result in a transfer of 0.22-ac from the 0.49-ac lot located at 655 Main St to the 0.56-ac lot located at 649 Main St. Both properties are located in the Low Density District.

A. Board Determination of Completeness.

Planner Mari Brunner stated the Applicant has requested exemptions from providing a separate proposed conditions plan, grading plan, landscaping plan, lighting plan, drainage report, and traffic report. After reviewing this request, staff has determined that exempting the Applicant from submitting this information would have no bearing on the merits of the application, and recommend that the Board accept the application as complete.

A motion was made by Councilor Michael Remy that the Board accept this application as complete. The motion was seconded by Pamela Russell Slack and was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

B. Public Hearing

Ms. Wendy Pelletier of Cardinal Surveying and Land Planning representing the applicant addressed the Board and referred to a hatched area on a plan which is the rear of 655 Main Street. She said the proposal is to transfer this area to 649 Main Street to locate a solar panel array. Both lots will be in excess of the 10,000 square foot requirement. This concluded Ms. Pelletier's presentation.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Brunner stated these two properties are located in a residential district in a low density zone. The request is to transfer 0.22 acres from 655 Main Street to 649 Main Street. There were no departmental comments on this application.

With respect to developmental standards. There are no steep slopes present on either parcel and neither parcel is located in the 100-year floodplain. There are also no changes being proposed to the existing driveways for either parcel. There is an existing sidewalk on Main Street that provides pedestrian access to both sites. There are no wetlands are present on either site. The minimum lot size in the low density district is 10,000 square feet and after the adjustment both lots will meet this requirement. This concluded staff comments.

Vice-Chair Cusack asked whether staff had any comments about this being an irregular shaped lot and if this has any consideration. Ms. Brunner stated some communities have requirements for lot shape, however, Keene does not and referred the question to Mr. Lamb. Mr. Lamb agreed and stated in this case both lots are owned by the same owner, and there is no conflict with the regulations.

The Chairman asked for public comment. Mr. Bob Lupien of 10 Edgewood Avenue indicated this installation would face his backyard and asked whether there would be something added to make it more aesthetically pleasing. Ms. Pelletier stated she could not answer that question, but stated her understanding is that the owners intend to install the array in a manner that did not look like solar panels from the road. She indicated she wasn't sure if they were in attendance to respond to the comments raised by the abutter. The Chairman noted the Board was not reviewing the solar installation and were only

reviewing a boundary line adjustment. With no further comment, the Chairman closed the public hearing.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Councilor Michael Remy that the Planning Board Approve S-06-20, as shown on the plan identified as “Boundary Line Adjustment Plan, Lots 120-058-000 & 120-059-000, 649 & 655 Main Street, Keene, NH 03431” prepared by Cardinal Surveying and Land Planning at a scale of 1” = 20’ on September 17, 2020 with no conditions. The motion was seconded by Pamela Russell Slack and was unanimously approved by a roll call vote.

2.SPR-18-14, Modification #1, Site Plan – 166 West Street – Applicant and owner Flyboy Realty LLC proposes to renovate the former 4,000-sf Friendly’s Restaurant building and construct a two-story, 12,300-sf mixed use building on the parcel located at 166 West Street (TMP# 576-002-000). The site is 1.03 acres and is located in the Central Business Limited District, the Gilbo Avenue Design Overlay District, and the Downtown Historic Overlay District.

A. Board Determination of Completeness.

Planner Mari Brunner recommended to the Board that the Application SPR-18-14 was complete. A motion was made by Councilor Michael Remy that the Board accept this application as complete. The motion was seconded by Pamela Russell Slack and was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

B. Public Hearing

Mr. Jim Phippard of Brickstone Land Use Consultants addressed the Board. Mr. Phippard referred to an aerial image of the site and stated the property shown in yellow is the subject property that has frontage on West Street and Gilbo Avenue, and is 1.03 acres in size. This property has a wide curb cut on West Street which will be narrowed. There is a second curb cut that leads onto Gilbo Avenue.

Mr. Phippard then referred to a Demolition Plan and referred to where the curb cut will be narrowed and felt this would help slow down traffic. The speed bumps on site will remain. There will be two new landscape islands installed in the parking lot. The existing parking lot light fixtures will be replaced. The existing storm drain will be dug up and replaced with perforated pipe and crush stone to create an infiltration strip. He referred to the area towards Gilbo Avenue where additional parking spaces are going to be added to replace the ones being lost and also referred to the additional landscaping that is going to be added for the new building being proposed.

Referring to the proposed site plan, Mr. Phippard explained that with respect to the former Friendly’s building, the entry element will be moved further from West Street. The patio area next to the former ice cream window will be removed and landscaping will be added here. The dumpster area will be made smaller to help with traffic circulation; however, the existing screening will be maintained (brick wall).

Mr. Phippard explained the existing Friendly's Building is 4,000 square feet in size. This building will be converted to a single office use. Four parking spaces will be added to the left side (closer to West Street) and two landscape islands will be added to the interior of the parking lot. He referred to the shaded area on the plan which will be a new proposed building on site. This building will have a footprint of 6,136 square feet (2-story). Eight one bedroom apartments are proposed for the second story with a single office use on the first floor. The Gilbo Avenue curb cut is also going to be narrowed. Handicap parking spaces will be added and a cross walk will be added into the new building. Entry to the apartments will be on the left (south) side of the new building. There will also be an elevator access at this location to the second floor.

Mr. Phippard noted that this property is located in the Central Business Limited District and the Gilbo Avenue Design Overlay District. To his knowledge, this is the first time any application has been brought before the Board for the Gilbo Avenue Design Overlay District. Mr. Phippard stated as a result, a variance was brought before the Zoning Board to seek relief from constructing the new building under the design restrictions for this district. One of the requirements is that any new building that fronts on Gilbo Avenue have a principal façade with a public entry facing Gilbo Avenue. Although this building fronts on Gilbo Avenue, the building will be no more than five feet from the property line (this is required by zoning), the edge of the road comes right up to the property line, and there is no sidewalk on this section of road. In order to do this and to do it safely, a variance was required and the entrance was directed towards the east, away from Gilbo Avenue. The applicant felt it was too close to Gilbo Avenue for residents to enter or exit – being so close to the edge of traffic. The ZBA granted this variance and the entrance will be on the east side of the building.

Mr. Phippard noted the existing parking is non-conforming. When this property was developed in 1975 there was no pavement setback and they are too close to the property line on the east and the south sides. The existing building is less than 20 feet from the West Street property line.

The existing site drains into a series of catch basins and grassy areas on the property and has not been an issue for the city. He referred to the drainage areas which are explained in the drainage report. The soils on the property are excellent for drainage and a percolation test has been completed. Mr. Phippard explained the post development drainage plan; on the Gilbo Avenue side is where the new runoff would occur and the increase in runoff from a 25-year storm event would be *de minimis* and Public Works staff agrees with this assessment. Mr. Phippard indicated it is their determination there will be no increase in runoff.

With respect to the driveway entrance on West Street, the curb cut will be narrowed, an existing island will be taken out, and parking spaces will be added. Mr. Phippard referred to an area shown in blue on the plan which will be identified as a stabilized construction entrance. Silt fence will be added along the perimeter of the property along construction.

The top right corner of the site adjacent to Gilbo Avenue (shown on the plan) will be identified as the area for snow storage and any excess snow will be removed from the site.

Next, Mr. Phippard reviewed the proposed Landscape Plan. He referred to the two mature maple trees planted in 1975 – these will be removed for construction of the new building. These trees will be replaced with five new trees. There will be additional shrub plantings along the new building façade and the Gilbo Avenue façade.

There will be ten ground mounted HVAC units and a transformer will be installed to the west of the new building for the new uses. They will be well screened by the existing vegetation along the west side of the site, and a row of arbor vitae is also being proposed to be added. This came out of the discussion at the Historic District Commission meeting. The dumpster is enclosed and will be screened from public view.

The existing lights are flood light type fixtures, they are going to be replaced with LED full cut off fixtures. There will be wall mounted fixtures on the north and south end of the property. The lighting level will be 1.93 foot candles which complies with the Board lighting standard.

Mr. Phippard then went over the cut sheets for light fixtures. The fixtures will be full cut off, energy efficient fixtures. The wall mounted fixtures will be similar in style, they will be mounted at a nine foot height. He then explained the reduced lighting plan – he noted the light levels will be 50% reduced at an average of 0.97-fc, but staff pointed out with a reduced light level, average lighting levels should not be more than 0.5 foot candles and the applicant has agreed to this as a condition of approval.

With respect to utilities, the existing building is serviced by city water and sewer and there is also a gas main that services this building. There will be a new utility line extended from the existing transformer (underground) to the new building for their electrical needs. There will be a new sewer line installed from West Street to service the new building. There will also be a water line extended to the new building from Gilbo Avenue as well as new gas line from the existing gas line. Mr. Phippard went on to say there will be a new sewer main constructed on West Street. As there is no sewer line on Gilbo Avenue, the line will be connected to the new building through a forced main. There will be a sewer pump station on the site, as shown on the plan. Staff has reviewed this and have no concerns.

Mr. Phippard then referred to the proposed site plan for the new building. A concrete sidewalk will be constructed around the building, except for the west side. He referred to where the new bicycle rack will be located on the northwest corner of the building. With respect to the site plan for the existing building, the window on the existing building that faces the bank will be removed and replaced.

Mr. Phippard then went over the elevation renderings. He noted the Historic District Commission (HDC) has reviewed this proposal and have issued a Certificate of

Appropriateness approving these changes. On the north elevation, the cupola and the dormers are being removed from the top of the existing building. The roofing material in this section is being changed from asphalt shingles to a standing seam metal roofing. Some of the windows on this elevation are being changed as well. The east elevation will have a new entry element. Vinyl siding in the roof gable end will be replaced with vertical steel siding. The building will no longer be painted white; it is going to be restored to the red brick. The windows on this façade are also being replaced. The west and south elevations with also have red brick and vertical steel siding.

Mr. Phippard then referred to the new building. The entry to the office area will be located in the center of the east elevation and will have a brick façade on the ground level. The south elevation will be covered by a porch roof that will run along most of this façade. The second floor will consist of vinyl siding, which was also approved by the HDC, in a sandstone color. The north elevation will include the entry to the apartments that would lead to the elevator lobby. The west elevation will consist of vinyl siding, provides for pedestrian scale and the window element will allow for much natural light for the apartments and office area. This concluded Mr. Phippard's presentation.

Chair Barrett asked how the infiltration strip would appear on the surface of the parking lot. Mr. Phippard stated it is not visible from the surface; they plan on utilizing the existing catch basins on the site – they will also be taking advantage of the good soil and the low groundwater table that exists on this site. The perforated pipe is going to be replaced and surrounded by crushed stone and filter fabric. Instead of passing through a closed pipe it will now infiltrate into the sandy area. Chair Barrett referred to the sewer pump station and asked what happens if there is a power failure. Mr. Phippard stated the state requires a minimum of 24 hour of storage capacity within a chamber. There are two pumps in case one fails. During a power failure, if it lasts longer than 24 hours, the pumps would be operated manually with the use of generator.

Mr. Weglinski noted the HDC approved this project with conditional circumstances and said asked that the final details of this application be reviewed by staff. He referred to the trees being cut down and questioned how these trees were going to be replaced. Mr. Phippard referred to the landscape plan and noted the two new trees being removed are being replaced with five trees (2 red maples within the parking lot, one along Gilbo Avenue and one near West Street). These will all be three inch caliper trees and will get to 35 feet high at maturity and felt this will be a good replacement for the ones being taken down. Mr. Weglinski noted there is not much vegetation at this site right now and questioned where trees are going to be located in the Gilbo Avenue area. He encouraged the Planning Board to give this some thought.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Brunner stated this item did go before the HDC and they did vote to approve this project with conditions. One of the conditions of the HDC was test a patch in an unobtrusive location prior to sand blasting of masonry and stated this condition has already been met. The other two conditions include staff approval of screening for the HVAC units that face West Street on the mixed used building as well as staff approval of architectural elevations to show the final window arrangement for the

former Friendly's Restaurant building, as well as exterior finishes and roof detail. Ms. Brunner noted the screening for the HVAC units is a requirement under the Gilbo Avenue Overlay District. The applicant did not propose specific screening at the HDC meeting, which is why this was given as a task for staff. Tonight, the applicant has indicated there will be a row of arborvitae to screen the HVAC units. Ms. Brunner said the presenter for the HDC meeting was Dan Bartlett, who noted there may be some modifications to what has been shown for the former Friendly's Restaurant building and hence the HDC felt the final design should be reviewed by staff.

Ms. Brunner stated there was also much discussion as was stated by Mr. Weglinski around landscaping.

Ms. Brunner stated departmental comments were received and have been included in the Board packet. They have all been addressed by the applicant.

With respect to the Planning Board Development Standards, there will be a slight increase of 0.15 acres in impervious surfaces, but to offset this the applicant has proposed a couple of different solutions such as, stone "drip strips" are proposed along the east and west edges of the proposed new building. Even though the Hydro Cad model indicated this would cause an increase of 0.06 cubic feet per second into the Gilbo Avenue storm water system (for a 24-year storm event), staff felt this was within the margin of error for hydrocad software.

With respect to Sedimentation and Erosion Control, the applicant proposes to install silt fencing around the site as well as a stabilized construction entrance at the West Street curb entrance.

There are no steep slopes present on this site.

A location for snow storage has been shown on the site plan, and as there are no extra spaces for snow storage, anything extra is being proposed to be removed off site.

This site is not located in the 100-year floodplain.

The applicant is proposing to remove two mature maple trees and did receive a waiver from the HDC to remove these trees. These trees fall within the footprint of the proposed new building and this is the reason for removal. The applicant is proposing to replace them with four red maple trees, one flowering crab tree, and a mix of 21 shrubs. The other trees on-site will be protected during construction with construction fencing placed outside the dripline of the trees. The landscaping standard requires a ratio of one tree per ten parking spaces for parking lots of 10 or more spaces. The proposal to install 5 trees, in addition to preserving four existing mature trees, which meets this standard. In addition, there is an additional standard for parking lots of 50 spaces or more regarding landscape coverage, visual relief, width of planting areas, and landscape buffers. The applicant is proposing to install two parking lot landscape islands, each with a red maple tree, which meets the requirement to include landscaping that covers not less than 10

percent of the total area of parking spaces. In addition, the landscape islands serve to break up the visual expansiveness of the lot and meet the requirement that planning areas shall be at least 8 feet wide with curbs to prevent damage from vehicles. Finally, the applicant is proposing to provide landscaping along 75% of the length of the right of way for Gilbo Avenue and 76% of the right of way for West Street in order to provide a landscape buffer between the parking lot and adjacent sidewalks and public roads.

Ground-level HVAC units are not permitted in the Gilbo Avenue Design Overlay District unless they are fully screened, the HDC did make this a condition of approval. There is an existing dumpster that is currently screened with a brick wall and will continued to be screened.

With respect to lighting, the applicant is proposing to install six, 20-foot tall pole mounted lights in the parking area and wall-mounted lights above egress doors on the north and south facades of the new building. With the reduced lighting plan, the average illumination would be 0.97-foot candles. Per sub-section C.6.a. of this standard, the average illumination levels between 10:00 pm and 6:00 am shall not exceed 0.5-foot candles. The applicant is aware of this issue, and indicated to staff that a revised plan will be submitted which complies with this standard. Staff recommend that the submission of this be a condition of approval.

Engineering staff have reviewed the water and sewer line connections and had initially asked for sewer discharge calculations. This was provided by the applicant and staff do not have any concerns about the capacity of the existing sewer line on West Street.

With respect to traffic, in the project narrative, the applicant states that the existing traffic generated on the site includes 500 vehicle trip ends per day, 51 during the am peak hour, and 44 during the pm peak hour. With the proposed use of this site, the applicant states there will be 180 vehicle trips per day associated with the office uses on the site, and 80 vehicle trips per day associated with the apartment uses for a total of 260 vehicle trips per day. The peak hour traffic generation for the proposed uses is estimated to be 51 trips for the am peak hour and 51 trips for the pm peak hour. Based on these traffic generation estimates, the proposed uses will not result in an increase in traffic generation to the site. This standard states that all development shall comply with the parking requirements of the Zoning ordinance. The Zoning Administrator has determined that 60 spaces are required by zoning, which is the number of parking spaces proposed on the site plan. In addition, the Applicant proposes to install a bicycle rack on the north end of the new building.

With respect to Comprehensive Access Management, there are two existing curb cuts which provide vehicle access from both West Street and Gilbo Avenue. The applicant is proposing to narrow both of these curb cuts. The one on West Street will be narrowed from 35 feet to 24 and the one on Gilbo Avenue from 25 feet to 22 feet.

With respect to accessibility, the applicant proposes to install a pedestrian crosswalk to provide an accessible path of travel from the ADA parking spaces to the main entrances

of the new building and the existing building. There is an existing walkway that connects the former Friendly's Restaurant building to the sidewalk on West Street. A bicycle rack is provided on site for the proposed new building.

With respect to Filling and Excavation, the applicant states in the project narrative that the truck route for hauling excess material from the site will be from Gilbo Avenue to West Street to Route 12. There is no excavation or fill proposed in areas which involve the floodplain, wetlands, or steep slopes.

There are no wetlands or other surface waters present on this site.

With respect to Architecture and Visual Appearance, this property is located in the Downtown Historic District and the proposed activity requires the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic District Commission (HDC). Per Section III.B.4 of the Planning Board Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations, *development on property located within the Downtown Historic District shall not be subject to the requirements of Planning Board Development Standard 19 – Architecture and Visual Appearance.*

Ms. Brunner then addressed the City's driveway standards. Since this request would modify two existing curb cuts, it does require a review under the driveway criteria listed in Section 70-135 subsection (e) of City Code:

Standard 1 states as follows: *If the installation of a driveway requires disrupting an existing sidewalk, the sidewalk must be restored or replaced in compliance with section 70-127.* The applicant is proposing to narrow the curb opening on West Street. Ms. Brunner noted the Board may want to ask the applicant for clarification how the disturbed portion will be restored.

Standard 2 states as follows: *Driveways must be placed so as to ensure that vehicles entering and exiting the driveway have an all season safe sight distance in all directions not only of the road, but also of bicycle and pedestrian traffic on the sidewalk – 200 feet.* The proposal is to narrow two existing curb cuts; no new curb cuts are proposed at this time. Hence, this standard does not apply.

Standard 6 states as follows: *Driveways must not block the flow of drainage in gutters or drainage ditches or pipes.* Engineering staff have reviewed this application and did not note any concerns related to drainage for the existing curb cuts.

Standard 7 states as follows: *Driveways must not direct stormwater across sidewalks or onto city streets, except that the portion of a driveway within the public right of way may drain towards the street.* This site is relatively flat and gradually slopes to the south. Stormwater runoff that sheet flows toward the Gilbo Avenue will be directed into a drainage grate before it can reach the public right of way. Hence, this standard appears to be met.

Standard 9 states as follows: *Industrial, commercial, agricultural, multifamily residential or temporary driveways shall not be more than 25 feet wide at the property line and 50 feet wide at the curblines, unless additional width or lanes are required as the result of a traffic study and/or geometric analysis prepared by an engineer licensed in the State of New Hampshire.* The applicant is proposing to narrow both existing curb cuts, and bring them into compliance with this criteria. This standard appears to be met.

Standard 11 states as follows: *Driveways on opposite sides of the street shall be aligned or offset sufficiently, so as to avoid turning conflicts.* The proposal is to narrow two existing curb cuts and not to be moved. Hence, this standard does not apply.

Standard 13 states as follows: *All driveways shall be constructed to standards approved by the city engineer. Portions of a driveways lying outside of the public right-of-way shall additionally comply with the design standards described in section 102-794.* Section 102-794, "Parking lot and parking space requirements," discusses the acceptable standards for parking lots, including acceptable materials (concrete, gravel, or paving). The applicant does not propose any changes to surface materials, which are currently paved asphalt. This standard appears to be met.

This concluded staff comments.

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

Mr. Weglinski stated his concern is with landscaping and hoped someone else from the Board would add to these comments. He noted this area is an island and the applicant has met the requirements, but questioned when the city is going to require better standards.

Vice-Chair Cusack stated he is glad to see this project go forward and is glad to see this derelict site being put to use and added he heard Mr. Weglinski's comments and more greenery would be nice along Gilbo Avenue. However, these are the Board standards and for the vote tonight, it meets the Board's requirements. He agreed this is something that should be looked at in the future.

Chair Barrett stated he agrees with Vice-Chair Cusack and Mr. Weglinski and indicated Gilbo Avenue does have a lot of asphalt and hoped this could be improved in the future. However, the applicant has met the Board's current standards and felt this proposal will be good for the city and will improve the streetscape. Mr. Weglinski stated he appreciates the Chairman's comments and agrees that the landscape standards have been met. However, he expressed frustration with the lack of green space on Gilbo Avenue and stressed the importance of changes to the standards and hopes it comes to fruition.

Ms. Lavigne-Bernier agreed with what has been said and would vote in favor of this project, but as stated by Mr. Weglinski, she drives by this site and more trees along the West Street and Gilbo Avenue area would be a pleasant change.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Councilor Michael Remy that the Planning Board approve SPR-18-14, Modification #1 for renovations to the existing building and the construction of a two story, 12,272-sf mixed-use building on the property located at 166 West Street (TMP# 576-002-000), as presented on the site plan identified as “166 West Street Redevelopment, Keene, NH” prepared by SVE Associates at varying scales on September 18, 2020 and last revised on October 16, 2020, with the following conditions prior to signature by Planning Board Chair:

1. Submittal of a revised “Reduced Lighting Plan” which demonstrates that average illumination levels on the site will not exceed 0.5-fc between the hours 10:00 pm and 6:00 am.
2. Owner’s signature appears on plan.

The motion was seconded by Pamela Russell Slack and was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

VI. Community Development Director Report

Mr. Lamb stated that the NH Municipal Association and NH Office of Strategic Initiatives is holding a virtual conference on October 31 from 8:45 am to 3 pm. It is a land use conference and there is an associated fee which the Department would cover. He encouraged those interested to contact staff.

VII. New Business

No new business was brought forward.

VIII. Upcoming Dates of Interest – November 2020

- Joint PB/PLD Committee – November 9 & November 16, 6:30 PM
- Planning Board Steering Committee – November 10, 11:00 AM
- Planning Board Site Visits – November 18, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed
- Planning Board Meeting – November 23, 6:30 PM

The Chairman referred to the two Joint Committee sessions in November.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by Mari Brunner, Planner