



City of Keene Minor Project Review Committee

AGENDA

Thursday, March 16, 2023

10:30 AM

City Hall, 2nd Floor Council Chambers

- I. **Call to Order** – Roll Call
- II. **Minutes of Previous Meetings** – March 2, 2023
- III. **Final Vote on Conditional Approvals**
- IV. **Continued Public Hearing**
 - a. **SPR-06-19, Modification #1 – Site Plan – 20 Manchester St** - Applicant and owner 560 Main Street LLC, proposes to lease a portion of the Froling site at 20 Manchester St (TMP #114-012-000) to Phil's Tree Service for equipment and truck storage, create a second open yard rental space, construct an addition ~3,750 sf in size to an already approved 10,000 sf building, and make minor modifications to the landscaping and parking. The property is 9.88 ac and is located in the Industrial District.
- V. **Staff Updates**
- VI. **New Business**
- VII. **Upcoming Meeting Dates**
 - Pre-submission Meeting – April 6, 2023 at 9:00 am
 - 1st Monthly MPRC Meeting – April 6, 2023 at 10:00 am
 - 2nd Monthly MPRC Meeting – April 20, 2023 at 10:00 am (*If needed*)

1 City of Keene
2 New Hampshire

3
4
5 MINOR PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE
6 MEETING MINUTES
7

Thursday, March 2, 2023

8:30 AM

2nd Floor Conference Room,
City Hall

Members Present:

Don Lussier
Jesse Rounds
Med Kopczynski
Don Farquhar
Mike Hagan, Alternate
Steve Dumont, Alternate

Staff Present:

Megan Fortson, Planning Technician
Evan Clements, Planner
Bob Burns, Permit Technician

Members Not Present:

John Rogers
Mari Brunner, Alternate
Kürt Blomquist, Alternate

8
9 **1) Call to Order – Roll Call**

10
11 Chair Rounds called the meeting to order at 8:38 AM. Roll call was conducted.
12

13 **2) Scheduled Pre-submission Inquiries**

- 14
15 **A) 2-lot Subdivision – 630 Court St** – Proposed 2-lot subdivision of the property at 630
16 Court St (TMP #514-017-000), owned by Christopher M. Minkler. The parcel is 1.16
17 ac and is located in the Low Density District.
18

19 Evan Clements, Planner, announced that there were no representatives present to discuss this
20 project and that it had been removed from the agenda prior to the meeting by the property owner.
21

- 22 **B) CRD – 315 Old Walpole Rd** – Proposed Conservation Residential Development
23 (CRD) subdivision of the property at 315 Old Walpole Rd (TMP #210-027-000),
24 owned by Fernand J. Cyr Sr. and Marguerite E. Cyr. The parcel is 10.7 ac and is
25 located in the Rural District.
26

27 There were no representatives present to discuss this project, so the next inquiry was brought up
28 for discussion.
29
30

31 **C) Site Plan – 438 Washington St** – Proposed conversion of the former Roosevelt
32 School, owned by the Community College System of NH, into a 30 unit building and
33 the construction of a new 13,000 sf building at the rear of the property containing an
34 additional 30 living units. The property is 2.4 ac and is located at 438 Washington St
35 (TMP #531-054-000) in the Low Density District.
36

37 Jonathan Halle from Warrenstreet Architects described the proposed redevelopment of the former
38 Roosevelt School building on the property at 438 Washington St. He was joined in his presentation
39 by Josh Meehan from Keene Housing and Chris Nadeau from Norbis Group. The group spoke
40 with City Staff regarding the applications that were submitted for the upcoming Zoning Board of
41 Adjustment meeting, as well as the items that would need to be submitted as part of a complete
42 Planning Board application.
43

44 **D) Apartments – 104 Emerald St** – Proposed addition of 9 apartments on the second
45 and third floors of the former KIPCO building located at 104 Emerald St (TMP #584-
46 069-000), owned by RK Parisi Enterprises Inc. The property is 0.62 ac and is located
47 in the Downtown Growth District.
48

49 Mr. Robert Parisi of RK Parisi Enterprises Inc. and owner of the property at 104 Emerald St (TMP
50 #584-069-000), explained the proposal. He was joined by Todd Rogers of RK Parisi Enterprises.
51 The group discussed Historic District Commission and Planning Board requirements. Mr. Parisi
52 then consulted with City Staff about various potential ideas for the proposed project.
53

54 **3) Walk-In Pre-submission Inquiries**
55

56 There were no walk-in Pre-submission inquiries.
57

58 **4) Upcoming Meeting Dates**

- 59 • Pre-submission Meeting – April 6, 2023 at 9:00 am
 - 60 • 1st Monthly MPRC Meeting – April 6, 2023 at 10:00 am
 - 61 • 2nd Monthly MPRC Meeting – April 20, 2023 at 10:00 am *(If needed)*
- 62

63 **5) Adjournment**
64

65 There being no further business, Chair Rounds adjourned the meeting at 9:50 AM.
66

67 Respectfully submitted by,
68 Megan Fortson, Planning Technician
69

70 Reviewed and edited by,
71 Mari Brunner, Senior Planner
72

1 **City of Keene**
2 **New Hampshire**

3
4
5 **MINOR PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE**
6 **MEETING MINUTES**
7

Thursday, March 2, 2023

10:00 AM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Don Lussier
Jesse Rounds, Chair
Don Farquhar
Med Kopczynski, Vice Chair
Mari Brunner, Alternate
Mike Hagan, Alternate

Other Staff Present:

Megan Fortson, Planning Technician

Members Not Present:

Steve Dumont, Alternate
John Rogers
Kürt Blomquist, Alternate

8
9 **I. Call to Order – Roll call**

10
11 Chair Rounds called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM. Roll call was conducted. Ms. Brunner
12 stated that since she and Mr. Hagan are both alternates, one should be a voting member today, and
13 she suggests Mr. Hagan as a replacement for John Rogers. Chair Rounds agreed and stated that
14 Mr. Hagan is a voting member today.

15
16 **II. Minutes of Previous Meetings – January 26, 2023 and February 2, 2023**

17
18 Mr. Kopczynski made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of January 26, 2023 and February
19 2, 2023. Mr. Hagan seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

20
21 **III. Final Vote on Conditional Approvals**

22
23 Ms. Fortson stated that there are no final votes on conditional approvals for today's meeting.

24
25 **IV. Public Hearing**

- 26
27 1. **SPR-06-19, Modification #1 – Site Plan – 20 Manchester St. – Applicant and owner**
28 **560 Main Street LLC proposes to lease a portion of the Froling site at 20 Manchester**
29 **St. (TMP #114-012-000) to Phil's Tree Service for equipment and truck storage,**

30 **create a second open yard rental space, construct an addition ~3,750 sf in size to an**
31 **already approved 10,000 sf of building, and make minor modifications to the**
32 **landscaping and parking. The property is 9.88 ac and is located in the Industrial**
33 **District.**

34

35 Chair Rounds introduced SPR-06-19. He asked staff to report on the application's completeness.

36

37 Ms. Fortson stated that the applicant has not requested any exemptions as part of this application.
38 She continued that staff recommends the committee accept the application as complete.

39

40 Mr. Farquhar made a motion to accept the application as complete. Mr. Hagan seconded the
41 motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

42

43 Chair Rounds asked to hear from the applicant.

44

45 Ethen Waterman of Froling Energy stated that Froling Energy is looking to improve and move
46 forward with Phase 2 of their project. He explained that this phase will consist of constructing the
47 smaller office/truck shop building on the southwestern portion of the site, which was already
48 approved as part of the original site plan application for this property. He explained that they are
49 looking to add a three-sided lean-to on one side of the building to house their indoor wood
50 processing equipment. The building itself will still have the same layout. One side will be a truck
51 shop and one side will be an office. They will switch those left to right to make the office more
52 centrally located, but it is the same size as before. The drainage in the layout has been adjusted to
53 accommodate that addition. In addition to this, a couple planting species and planting locations
54 have changed. They will put rhododendrons in to make it more hedge-like. Previously firs were
55 proposed to be installed in the front area of the building toward the right to provide more cover.
56 Tom Weller would be the architect on record. On the other side of the street, the other change that
57 Froling is looking for relates to parking. Their parking was going to be parallel to the curb on the
58 left side of the building, and they are looking to make those head-on parking spaces instead, for
59 ease of access.

60

61 Mr. Waterman continued that he believes that is all he has for changes. He asked what the
62 committee wants to know.

63

64 Ms. Brunner stated that Mr. Waterman mentioned rhododendrons. She continued that the plan the
65 committee has in its agenda packet shows emerald green arborvitae which have a mature height of
66 10-15'. She asked Mr. Waterman to clarify what Froling proposes putting in for screening. She
67 clarified that she is asking about the new landscaping, not the previous landscaping that the
68 Planning Board (PB) approved. Mr. Waterman replied that he believes it would be a mix of both;
69 he has to look. He continued that on the right front side of the proposed new building they will
70 put in some more rhododendron cover. Chair Rounds stated that the previous conversation was
71 about the arborvitae on the west side of the old building. Mr. Waterman replied that there is still
72 some going there as well.

73

74 Ms. Brunner stated that she has no concerns about the addition and thinks it fits in well with the
75 architecture of the building that was approved by the PB. She continued that she thinks the change
76 to the screening around the old building makes a lot of sense. Balsam fir was proposed before,
77 and she thinks the change to arborvitae would actually provide a better screening for the residential
78 area on Manchester St. She is in favor of those changes.

79

80 Ms. Brunner continued that she would like to hear more information about the proposed rental
81 areas. One is proposed to be used by Phil's Tree Service and the other one does not have a user
82 identified yet. She asked if that is correct. Mr. Waterman replied yes. Ms. Brunner asked what they
83 expect the impervious surface coverage to be for those areas. Do they expect any, or minimal?
84 Will they put temporary structures there? Mr. Waterman replied that the only temporary structure
85 they would be asking for is another 12'x20' shed or something of a similar size, like a trailer, for
86 something that cannot be stored outside. He continued that like Ms. Brunner said, Froling is not
87 sure yet what would be in that (second rental area). It would probably be something similar to
88 Phil's Tree Service or someone with trucks and equipment and it would be an open land use,
89 somewhere to put the more valuable (equipment) that cannot be left out in the elements. Mr.
90 Lussier asked if that is what is shown as an allowance for a 12'x20' office structure. Mr. Waterman
91 replied yes. Mr. Lussier asked if they understand that if they wanted to do any paving or permanent
92 structures, Froling would have to come back to the City for that. Mr. Waterman replied yes.

93

94 Ms. Brunner asked if Froling anticipates that any of the uses proposed in the rental areas would
95 need any sort of lighting, or if they would generate some sort of noise that might impact
96 surrounding (areas). Mr. Waterman replied that he does not think they propose anything that
97 would generate excessive noise beyond what is already normal for the area with the trucks from
98 the City, Phil's Tree Service, and Froling already going by.

99

100 Chair Rounds stated that he has a process question. He continued that regarding the proposed
101 conditions plan, he notes that neither the Phil's Tree Services rental area nor the proposed rental
102 area are drawn on it. He asked if they should be. Ms. Brunner replied that one of the plan sheets
103 is the rental area exhibit. She continued that it is not on the overall site plan. It makes sense, to
104 her, for that to be included on the overall site plan. That is a simple condition of approval they
105 could place.

106

107 Mr. Lussier stated that he sees where SVE circled the areas that are changed and put in revision
108 comments, which was very helpful. He continued that however, the utility plan, sheet C-5, appears
109 to show that the sewer line will all be re-laid as part of this project. He asked if Mr. Waterman
110 can confirm or deny that the sewer included for Phase One needs to be replaced. Mr. Waterman
111 replied that he cannot confirm or deny that today, but he can get that information. Mr. Lussier
112 replied that would be great.

113

114 Mr. Lussier continued that the second issue is that the water line for Phase One and Phase 2 shows
115 that they have the domestic service coming off of the fire service. That is not allowed. On the

116 Phase One side, the two-inch domestic goes back to the main, which is in the City's right-of-way.
117 The same thing will have to happen for Phase Two; the domestic service will need to be completely
118 separate from the fire service. He would like to see the utility plans updated to reflect that. Mr.
119 Waterman agreed.

120

121 Mr. Lussier asked if it is correct that (this area) will be a vehicle maintenance garage. Mr.
122 Waterman replied yes. Mr. Lussier replied that he sees they already have the oil and water
123 separator. He reminded Mr. Waterman that Froling will need to talk to the City's Industrial
124 Pretreatment Coordinator to get a permit for the new discharge, because it does need to go through
125 the treatment process.

126

127 Mr. Lussier stated that the City's records show that the sewer line was stubbed out for the future
128 Phase 2 expansion. He continued that if that is the case, then the utility plan should show
129 something coming into that stub, not replacing the whole thing. This question is more for SVE to
130 answer, but it is not clear to him in his reading of the regulations, whether this would qualify as a
131 sewer connection that requires a State permit. The State requires review by the NH Department
132 of Environmental Services (NHDES), if they need to connect to the existing system at a sewer
133 manhole. He does not know if the State will consider this a new connection at a sewer manhole
134 and thinks this should be discussed with SVE. Mr. Waterman agreed.

135

136 Mr. Hagan asked if Froling will be installing curbing or wheel stops at the head of the parking
137 spaces in front of the building. He continued by stating that they previously showed curbing with
138 a sidewalk and now they are just showing parking in front of the building and will need to provide
139 curb stops. Mr. Waterman asked if he means on the left side. Mr. Hagan replied on the Phase 2
140 building. Mr. Waterman replied that he does not believe there will be any curbing there. Mr.
141 Hagan replied that they need to update the plans to provide a vehicle stop barrier of some sort. Mr.
142 Waterman replied yes.

143

144 Mr. Hagan asked what the overall height of the building is. Mr. Waterman replied that he does not
145 know. Mr. Hagan replied that that comes into play with Fire Department access and ladder truck
146 size and so on and so forth. The size of the building, and depending upon the use of that wood
147 storage area, will also require a sprinkler system with Fire Department access on the front. Thus,
148 they should think about where they are putting that in. Typically, a site plan shows that. The
149 MPRC needs to see that information on the site plan.

150

151 Mr. Hagan stated that his other question is about how this has changed from what it was to what it
152 is being used for now. Before, it was just vehicles to support the use of Froling. He asked if this
153 is a separate entity, or if this is Froling headquarters. Mr. Waterman replied this is just Froling
154 headquarters. Mr. Hagan replied that the floor plan shows a "showroom area." He asked what that
155 is. Mr. Waterman replied there would probably be a couple boilers in there; the boilers Froling
156 sells are large. He continued that they would not be running. Mr. Hagan asked if Froling would
157 have people coming in and out for retail purchases. Mr. Waterman replied that they do such little
158 retail that it would be more likely that a commercial person could come in and see a set-up. Yes,

159 there would be some in-and-out of the public, but he does not know if it would be completely open
160 to the public or by appointment. He does not foresee people just coming in off the street to look
161 at the showroom, but he cannot say for sure.

162
163 Mr. Hagan replied that in order to make sure Froling is falling within the permitted uses in that
164 zone and that it is an accessory use to the main, the committee definitely wants a letter or
165 description of what the intended uses are. He continued that they could do this after the fact, but
166 something to think about now is that depending on the area and size, they might need a second
167 means of egress off the second floor. In order to determine that, the City needs to know the overall
168 use, so Froling is not coming back to the committee later on to add that. They could probably add
169 it somewhere, but the current floor plan that Froling provided causes him to question – you cannot
170 exit from the second floor through the retail area, so getting directly to the outside, with the layout
171 Froling is currently proposing, is something he cautions them about.

172
173 Mr. Kopczynski stated that getting a letter to clarify the intended uses in the building is probably
174 not problematic in any way. It is his understanding that Froling services larger scale industrial
175 clients, including schools, banks, and so on and so forth. He continued that he does not see this as
176 being retail by any means, and probably not even for residential consumers, but there is the
177 possibility that Froling could change their product line. Mr. Waterman replied that Froling does
178 some residential sales, but on a very minimal scale.

179
180 Mr. Hagan replied that the City has issued a bunch of residential boiler permits. That is why he
181 asks (whether there could be) someone wanting to come in and change out their boiler, and if this
182 is going to become a more intense use. It can be accessory to the main, but they have to limit the
183 size on that, through the zoning, and that is why clarification would be helpful. Mr. Waterman
184 agreed and stated that Froling can get that clarification to them.

185
186 Mr. Farquhar asked if Froling’s wood processing involves taking raw trees and making them into
187 solid fuel. Mr. Waterman replied yes. Mr. Farquhar replied that is important, because that
188 manufacturing/processing of trees into solid fuel invokes Fire Code, as far as dust control. Those
189 type of processes are part of the H-2 Hazard Class. The committee needs to have a good
190 understanding of exactly the scale of the operation and what the process would look like, to make
191 sure that at the time of the building permit application, the application properly contemplates and
192 addresses the unique hazard class of that process. Mr. Waterman agreed.

193
194 Mr. Lussier stated that he wants to put something on the record that he does not think is an issue
195 in any way but is something everyone should be aware of: access to this site is across an easement
196 on the Cheshire Tire property. Mr. Waterman replied yes. Mr. Lussier replied that the City had
197 this easement and Froling bought it as part of buying the property. He does not know, not being a
198 lawyer, but Froling might want to check to make sure that easement allows not just Froling’s
199 operations and workers to pass and re-pass, but also third party people to do the same.

200

201 Ms. Brunner replied that Planning staff asked for documentation about that, and she believes that
202 Mr. Froling has documented to the satisfaction of City staff that they do have the right to have
203 assignees pass and re-pass over that easement. She continued that in her understanding, this issue
204 is fully addressed.

205

206 Chair Rounds asked if committee members had further questions. Hearing none, he asked if any
207 members of the public wished to speak.

208

209 Toby Tousley of 500 Washington St. stated that he does not object to this project at all, and thinks
210 it is a good use of what is down there. He continued that he has questions about the process and
211 the method of doing this. If he were involved in this project, he would be looking at the
212 requirements, and what he sees is that this would tip the scale and (need to) go in front of the full
213 Planning Board. He is not trying to stop the process, just asking questions about how the level of
214 planning review required for a project is determined. To back up, he thinks that Keene has a history
215 of not working with businesses very well, and he thinks this is a great way to work with this project
216 here. He thinks the City has made some good moves with this and should continue. But if he were
217 involved with this project, he would read the requirements [of the Land Development Code, Article
218 25.12, Site Plan Review] and think that he would have to go to the PB, based on the percentage.
219 The requirements say [“*Major site plan review is required for any proposal with... additions to*
220 *existing buildings or structures that are greater than*] 15% of [*the gfa of the existing principal*
221 *building.*]” This is 37% of a building addition, which tips the scales. How would an applicant
222 know how far they could bend those rules?

223

224 Ms. Brunner replied that the way that that threshold is written is as a percentage of the principal
225 building on the site. She continued that thus, when looking at whether this application met the
226 threshold for going to the PB, they looked at the additional size as a percentage of the principal
227 building on the site, which is the wood processing facility. She cannot remember the exact
228 percentage, but it did not meet the 15% threshold.

229

230 Mr. Tousley asked [about a potential project he heard about at the pre-submission meeting this
231 morning]. Chair Rounds explained that pre-submission meetings are part of the Minor Project
232 Review Committee process but are held separately, and a time for staff to just have conversations
233 with people who are considering submitting applications.

234

235 Mr. Tousley asked how an applicant would know that s/he could possibly “bend the rules by double
236 or even triple,” or know that they could even ask. He continued that he would just assume he had
237 to go directly to the PB and would not even consider asking. Part of the process of making this
238 friendly for businesses means projecting this out. And how do they make sure it does not look like
239 the MPRC is favoring somebody for doing that over someone else?

240

241 Chair Rounds replied that someone would have to go to a pre-submission meeting, and at that
242 meeting, staff begins to make a determination as to whether a project is big enough that it has to

243 go to the PB or if it can go through another process because it is smaller in scale. That
244 investigation/inquiry is built into the process.

245
246 Chair Rounds asked if anyone else from the public wished to speak. Hearing none, he closed the
247 public hearing and asked the committee to deliberate.

248
249 Mr. Lussier stated that he would like to include a condition in whatever motion the committee
250 makes that the applicant submit updated utility plans to reflect the comments they have had today.

251
252 Ms. Brunner stated that although she is not a voting member today, she thinks this project is ready
253 to approve. She continued that she did not see any red flags come up during the discussion. As
254 she attempted to think through all of the different standards, she did not see anything that was not
255 met. Froling has some issues to work through at the building permit phase. A potential condition
256 of approval would be the addition of the wheel stops that Mr. Hagan brought up; potentially a letter
257 clarifying the use of the showroom, although that may be handled through the building permit
258 process; the updated utility plans; and updating the overall site plan to include the rental spaces.
259 She is fine with all of those conditions but wants to hear people's thoughts on whether that letter
260 makes sense to include as a condition with this application or if it makes more sense with the
261 building permit process.

262
263 Mr. Lussier replied that the question is whether it would affect this body's decision on the
264 application, in terms of what use and what fire load they end up having. He continued that he
265 thinks it would just affect requirements of the construction, whether there is a certain fire wall
266 between them. Mr. Farquhar replied that it would also affect access. He continued that there is
267 some concern there. Mr. Lussier replied that potentially driveways around the building would
268 have to be modified, depending on what that is. Mr. Farquhar replied yes, and depending on the
269 scale or the processes – if it is in that H-2 classification there need to be explosion distances, which
270 is important. Mr. Lussier replied in that case, to answer Ms. Brunner's question, he thinks it would
271 affect the MPRC's vote and probably means it needs to get resolved before the MPRC can make
272 a final approval.

273
274 Chair Rounds asked if the MPRC wants the letter clarifying the uses to be for the whole building,
275 not just the showroom. Mr. Hagan replied yes. He continued that Froling added on this additional
276 use to the building. Before, it was just going to be office and truck repair. Now they are adding
277 another industrial process to the building, and kiln dryers, processing, dust, exhausting, and the
278 explosion distance for an H-2 use significantly impact the need for additional access as well as
279 distance to property lines. The City does not know what is going on in there other than wood
280 processing. Maybe it is nothing, maybe it is more, but it requires additional review prior to
281 approval, in his opinion.

282
283 Mr. Farquhar stated that he aligns his comments with Mr. Hagan's.

284

285 Chair Rounds asked Ms. Brunner, in terms of his question about the leased spaces, whether that
286 would be covered under a general submittal of a revised site plan, or if they should enumerate
287 exactly what they want to see on that revised site plan. Ms. Brunner replied that she thinks it is
288 always better for the applicant if the MPRC is very clear about exactly what they are asking for.
289 She continued that staff has given the MPRC recommended language for a motion, and part of it
290 says “*submittal of a revised site plan showing the location where Phil’s Tree Service will be*
291 *operating on the site.*” She would amend that to say “*submittal of a revised site plan showing the*
292 *rental locations on the overall site plan.*” That way the rental locations will be shown on the site
293 plan that gets signed by the Minor Project Review Committee chair and marked as final.
294

295 Ms. Brunner stated that after hearing Mr. Hagan and Mr. Farquhar’s comments, she wonders if it
296 would make more sense for the MPRC to continue this until the next meeting. She continued that
297 during the two-week interval they could hopefully figure out this issue. Mr. Hagan replied yes,
298 his motion was going to be to continue this with more information. He continued that they can
299 work with the applicant to make an informed decision and help Froling work through the process,
300 if there are any additional things (to address). One more addition to the conditions is the need for
301 a floodplain permit, because they are doing work in the floodplain.
302

303 Mr. Lussier asked if passing a motion to continue means the MPRC is not giving Froling
304 conditional approval. He asked what the difference is, process-wise, between a continuance and
305 giving a conditional approval with a final approval at the next meeting. Ms. Brunner replied that
306 if they issue a conditional approval, all of the conditions they place have to be non-discretionary.
307 She continued that basically, staff have to be able to look at it and be able to check off yes or no.
308 Mr. Lussier stated that if there are site plan changes as a result of explosion differences and
309 whatnot, that will be hard to enumerate in detail. Ms. Brunner replied yes. Mr. Lussier replied that
310 it sounds like they will be continuing. Ms. Brunner replied that she should amend her statement
311 slightly – they could make conditions of approval that are discretionary, but then they would have
312 to hold a second public hearing, which requires a second notice, which is not something they
313 encourage. Mr. Kopczynski replied that it is not business-friendly. Ms. Brunner replied yes, it is
314 more hassle for everyone.
315

316 Mr. Kopczynski stated that he assumes they will be making a motion to continue until a date
317 certain. Ms. Brunner replied that she suggests asking the applicant if they are able to attend the
318 MPRC’s next meeting, March 16 at 10:00 AM. Mr. Waterman replied yes. Mr. Lussier asked if
319 that will give the applicant enough time to resolve these questions. Mr. Waterman replied that as
320 far as the wood processing plant, the kiln dryer, and so on and so forth, the kiln dryer will be the
321 same. It will be an additional kiln but on the other side. He continued that he thinks he can come
322 up with most of the answers, unless the explosion distances and such require new plans, if he
323 understands that correctly.
324

325 Mr. Farquhar replied yes, the Fire Department and the Community Development Department can
326 meet with Mr. Waterman in the interim. He continued that they want to make sure they can get
327 him all squared away in the two week period. Mr. Waterman replied that as long as they do not

328 have to redesign the plans, he does not see any problem with that. Mr. Farquhar replied that he
329 agrees; he thinks it is about a deeper understanding of the exact use and the processes. Once they
330 have that, they can frame out what they need to get to the next step.

331
332 Mr. Hagan made a motion to continue this hearing until the next regularly scheduled meeting on
333 March 16, 2023 at 10:00 on the second floor of City Hall, pending further information from the
334 applicant. Mr. Lussier seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

335

336 **V. Upcoming Meeting Dates**

- 337 • Pre-submission Meeting – March 2, 2023 at 9:00 AM
- 338 • 1st Monthly MPRC Meeting – March 2, 2023 at 10:00 AM
- 339 • 2nd Monthly MPRC Meeting – March 16, 2023 at 10:00 AM (*if needed*)

340
341 Chair Rounds stated that the next meeting is March 16 at 10:00 AM. Ms. Fortson stated that the
342 next MPRC meeting after that is April 6 at 10:00 AM, with the pre-submission meeting at 9:00
343 AM, unless it needs to be pushed to 8:30 AM if they have enough inquiries that come forward.
344 She continued that the second MPRC meeting of the month will be April 20.

345

346 There being no further business, Chair Rounds adjourned the meeting at 10:35 AM.

347

348 Respectfully submitted by,
349 Britta Reida, Minute Taker

350

351 Reviewed and edited by,
352 Megan Fortson, Planning Technician

CITY OF KEENE
NEW HAMPSHIRE

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Minor Project Review Committee

FROM: Megan Fortson, Planning Technician

DATE: March 15, 2023

SUBJECT: **SPR-06-19, Modification #1 – Site Plan – 20 Manchester St** - Applicant and owner 560 Main Street LLC, proposes to lease a portion of the Froling site at 20 Manchester St (TMP #114-012-000) to Phil’s Tree Service for equipment and truck storage, create a second open yard rental space, construct an addition ~3,750 sf in size to an already approved 10,000 sf building, and make minor modifications to the landscaping and parking. The property is 9.88 ac and is located in the Industrial District.

Recommendation:

That the Minor Project Review Committee vote to continue the public hearing for the Minor Project application, SPR-06-19 Modification #1, to the April 6, 2023 Minor Project Review Committee meeting at 10:00 am.

Background:

Mark Froling, the property owner & project applicant, has requested that this application be continued to the Minor Project Review Committee meeting on April 6, 2023 at 10:00 am. The original application materials for this project can be found in the Minor Project Review Committee agenda packet from the March 2, 2023 meeting.