

**City of Keene**  
**New Hampshire**

**MINOR PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**Thursday, January 26, 2023**

**10:00 AM**

**Council Chambers,  
City Hall**

**Members Present:**

Don Lussier  
Jesse Rounds, Chair  
John Rogers  
Don Farquhar  
Med Kopczynski, Vice Chair

**Other Staff Present:**

Megan Fortson, Planning Technician

**Members Not Present:**

Kürt Blomquist, Alternate  
Mari Brunner, Alternate  
Mike Hagan, Alternate  
Steve Dumont, Alternate

**1) Call to Order – Roll Call**

Mr. Rogers called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM. Roll call was conducted.

**2) Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

Mr. Rogers nominated Jesse Rounds as Chair. Mr. Lussier seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Rogers nominated Mr. Kopczynski as Vice Chair. Mr. Farquhar seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**3) Minutes of Previous Meeting – December 8, 2022**

Mr. Rogers made a motion to approve the minutes of December 8, 2022. Mr. Kopczynski seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**4) Final Vote on Conditional Approvals**

Chair Rounds asked if the committee needs to vote on any conditional approvals. Ms. Fortson replied no.

5) **Public Hearing**

- A. **SPR-204, Modification #3 – Site Plan – 216 Marlboro St. – Applicant Randall Walter, on behalf of owner, 216 Marlboro St LLC, proposes to replace the existing vinyl siding with new vertical metal siding and install rooftop equipment on the building at 216 Marlboro St. (TMP #589-016-000). The site is 0.97 acres and is located in the Neighborhood Business District.**

Chair Rounds asked if staff has a recommendation for completeness of the application. Ms. Fortson replied that the applicant has requested exemptions from providing a proposed conditions plan, an existing conditions plan, allocation map, lighting plan, landscaping plan, and all technical reports. She continued that staff recommends the committee grant the requested exemptions and accept the application as complete.

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

Chair Rounds asked the applicant to present.

Randall Walter stated that the site plan is on the screen. He explained the locations in the image. He continued that neighbors include U-Haul across the street, residential properties to the west, and the Kingsbury property and others to the east. The site is bounded by Beaver Brook on the east and north. The primary reason he ended up here today has to do with the siding. They are working on obtaining a sign permit, which will include the physical signs on the site and rooftop equipment related to the business, KEB Mechanical Systems, the primary resident of 216 Marlboro St. He explained that some signage installed about five years ago has been incorporated into this application. The building is comprised of three sections. The northern section is sided with metal siding with a blue mountain scheme that was installed in about 2015 or 2016. The new siding is well described in the application. The southernmost portion of the building has a green and white theme with trees and is preliminarily depicted here. There were some edits, but conceptually it is the same. There is a bit of remaining vinyl siding facing the neighbor. The vinyl siding was in bad condition on the front of the building, due to damage from snow plowing and things like that. It was quite architecturally inappropriate for this building. Flat roof architecture and vinyl siding are not great. They did some window replacement, again, going with a commercial window as opposed to the out-of-date Anderson product that was on it. All those are the same.

Mr. Walter continued that a theme the Committee will hear over and over is that a lot of this work is the same as what it was, and they are simply trying to make this building more friendly and appropriate and perhaps a bit colorful, to compete with the visual impact of businesses like U-Haul. U-Haul has technically over 100 signs, if you count every vehicle that has logos on all four sides. Thus, it is a very busy visual area. He thinks this the proposed building exterior is more pleasant than having something, like the car dealership that previously occupied by the building. The precedent for metal siding is strong, as it was used on the original Subaru dealership that occupied the building. Staff helped him dig out some archives from the 1970s that show that the

building was previously covered in vertical metal siding. Mr. Walter noted that no permitting was ever done when the vinyl siding was installed. They want to go back to a more sustainable, more durable, metal siding that is appropriate and consistent with the neighborhood. There is metal siding on many of the Kingsbury buildings, stretching all the way to 310 Marlboro St., so he thinks metal siding is appropriate and a better choice.

Mr. Walter continued that regarding other topics that are part of this, the first coat of paving was completed last summer. That was done identical to what was there previously. There will be a topcoat this year but no proposed changes to the parking configuration. After that, it will be striped according to the site plan sketch that they applied, but he would call it more of a “site diagram” than a “site plan.” It is not a survey. It is an accurate representation of the building and the placement of the building. They do not have a boundary survey for this property, so that has been imposed from satellite images. He believes that the satellite images they look at are different from what the committee has access to, which may lead to some conversation about whether it is closer to a neighboring building. However, at this point, there are no changes. It will be re-striped to all of the standards for ADA and the way it was before. The two curb cuts are staying the same. There are no other changes proposed.

Chair Rounds thanked the applicant and asked if the committee had any clarifying questions.

Mr. Rogers stated that he has a question about the site diagram, which is very different from what he has seen on site and what he has seen from the 2015 aerials, in terms of pavement. He continued that one of his concerns is that the impervious surface the applicants have listed is much higher than what is allowed in this district. He did a calculation based off the 2015 aerials. He is showing a little over 25,000 square feet of impervious surface, whereas the applicants’ diagram says over 32,000 square feet.

Mr. Walter replied that they were simply trying to measure what is on the drawing. Mr. Rogers replied that is part of his concern, too – the applicants’ drawing shows a good grass belt on the back of the building, which appears to have been, slowly over the years, converted into outdoor storage. Gravel was placed there. It appears to have been paved as well. He is concerned about the amount of impervious surface that has been done on this lot, especially near the brook, without possibly any sort of attention to stormwater issues.

Mr. Walter replied that their intention is to simply represent that the same amount was paved. He continued that they are here regarding siding. They did not get a boundary survey. He imagines that given the shape, different mathematical numbers would come up. He simply did it as a percentage of the lot size. They can compare notes at some point if Mr. Rogers wants. He thinks the more impactful thing is that the paving that was just done, which will be top-coated this year, is the same as what it was. [He does not know] how it got there, in other incremental steps from – he does not know what the reference would be. He does not know when the last time was when they had an impervious number for that site. He has not been given anything. He did not know that this site was on record as having X. The only reason he is bringing it up is because they were

asked to bring it up, and he is saying, the amount of impervious surface has remained the same. They were doing a siding project, and [impervious surface] was added to the list he was asked to comment on.

Mr. Lussier asked, if the site has evolved over the years, would the existing condition that the committee looks at for impervious surface be the previously approved site plan from whenever this was done? He continued that he is looking at the approved site plan for SPR-204, which is in the packet. It looks like (it is from) 1978. It looks like on the eastern side the pavement extends closer to the brook than it does today. He is questioning whether that is the established baseline, or if the baseline is 2015, or how they decide that.

Mr. Rogers replied that that is a good question and he defers to the Chair. He continued that he is not sure. The applicant is stating that they are before the committee today for the siding of the building. The overall lot coverage and such is an issue they might have to take up outside of this application. There are some concerns there. Even going back to the 2015 plan, and the 2015 aerials, it is not consistent with the site plan Mr. Lussier just referenced, so obviously some changes have been done to this site without going through the site plan process. At this point in time, he would just take the applicant's comment that they are here today regarding the siding. However, he wants the applicant to be aware that they might need to discuss the [impervious surface] possibly outside of this committee.

Mr. Kopczynski stated that they know that buildings and sites are sometimes changed without any sort of approval from the City. He continued that they assume, but do not know, that the site was constructed to the site plan. They do not know how carefully the paving contractor followed the plan at the time. However, he does take note that today's application is for siding. It has nothing to do with the site plan. Chair Rounds replied yes, he thinks that is fair to say. He continued that as Mr. Rogers noted, they want to focus on the siding. However, they do need to address the impervious surface, especially close to the brook. They will need to have a discussion in the future. For now, they will stick to the topic of siding. He asked if there were any other comments or questions about the plan.

Mr. Rogers stated that he knows they talked about the rooftop units being looked at as signage. He asked the applicant if they have gotten to a point of doing any calculations yet on that, for a sign permit. Mr. Walter replied that his understanding was that they need to have this committee's blessing that they can count the rooftop units as signage, and then they will work backwards from the existing signage. He continued that he wants to clarify with this committee that it is his understanding that they are taking the surface area of one side, the primary face, of the rooftop units. They are three-dimensional objects. They are not counting their volume or anything like that. Their goal is to take the allowable signage, and they will work backwards from that number, deducting existing signage to remain. Those will be in the secondary calculation for the face area of those five rooftop units. Then, any balance will be used in some window art, which will also be signage. He thought they needed to agree that those would be allowed to go that way, before they would submit for a sign permit.

Mr. Rogers replied that is fine; he just wanted to make sure the applicants were looking down that path. Mr. Walter replied that they are asking this committee to understand the unique circumstance – the mechanical equipment is the product, no different from how a U-Haul truck is the product. They would like those to not have to be screened for the purposes of recognizing the signage. They are state of the art, with green technology. This is an all-electric product. Bergeron Mechanical has focused on this technology to move away from fossil fuels. They need the product to be visible. It is useful, in the same way that it is useful to U-Haul to have all those trucks, trailers, and equipment (visible). They are fairly benign in this location. He has seen less attractive versions, ground-mounted in front of a building. To be clear, there is a sign, a big arrow on the roof saying, ‘this is what we’re selling,’ which they will count in the sign permit calculation that they submit. They are looking for this committee to say, ‘yes, that is okay,’ and then they will look back in a different process to get their sign permit.

Chair Rounds asked if there was any public comment. Seeing no members of the public present, he closed the public hearing and asked the committee to deliberate.

Mr. Lussier made a motion to approve SPR-204, Modification #3, as presented. Mr. Farquhar seconded the motion.

Mr. Rogers stated that regarding the rooftop units and signage, as the Zoning Official, he and his staff have looked at this. He continued that while roof signage is prohibited under the Zoning Code, this building is unique in that there are different tiers to the roofing system. These rooftop units are on the lower tier, so as a backdrop they have another vertical plane of the other building behind them, so he does not look at these as “rooftop.” On that portion of the building, you would be able to attach signage there. The visual of these units are that it appears that they are sitting in front of that vertical plane. The Sign Code sits in the Zoning Code, and as the Zoning Administrator, he has made the determination that these could be considered signage. They will have to meet the square footage requirements, and as has been mentioned, it would be just the front side of these units that would be included in the calculations. That is the normal calculation - whether it be a free-standing sign or projecting sign, the measurement is that one side. If the calculations determine that not all of these units can be considered part of the signage, screening is needed for whichever units would not be able to be part of that calculation. That is a recommendation he would like added to the motion.

Mr. Kopczynski stated that he thanks Mr. Rogers for the clarification, because he would have objected to this committee being asked to make an interpretation of the Zoning Code. He continued that this committee has no authority to do that.

Mr. Lussier asked if the motion to approve would be conditioned upon application for and approval of a sign permit. Mr. Rogers replied yes, they have a recommended motion from staff, and they will have to add some conditions if this committee were inclined to approve. A condition of an approved sign permit as part of the motion would cover that. They might want to discuss the

possibility of screening one or more of the units, and screening material, just so the applicant would not have to come back to this committee if it was determined that some screening had to be done. That would be his only caution there.

Mr. Kopczynski stated that A) that is in the background notes, and he thinks the applicant understands that, and B) for Mr. Rogers to issue a permit it has to be in conformance with the Zoning Code as he determines it, so he does not see that issue. He continued that his objection would have been this committee being asked to interpret the Zoning Code.

Mr. Lussier asked what happens if it is determined that in order to get the sign permit the applicants have to screen. He continued that normally, this committee would have to approve the screening materials and aesthetics. He asked if the Department would be able to approve the screening materials and aesthetics administratively. Chair Rounds replied that he is not sure. He asked Ms. Fortson for thoughts. Ms. Fortson replied that the recommended motion includes “...*either documentation demonstrating that the rooftop condensers are permitted under the Sign Code or screened in accordance with Section 20.6 of the Land Development Code,*” which addresses the screening standards. She thinks that if the committee decided it was appropriate to include a condition like that, it would address both the Sign Code and, if there were units that were not included as part of the sign calculation, they would need to be screened. If the committee is comfortable leaving that up to the purview of staff, they could sign off on the condition as long as it met the screening requirements.

Mr. Lussier replied that to be clear, he is just trying to make sure the applicants do not need to return to this committee for that. Ms. Fortson replied yes, if they included that in the condition, staff would make sure the screening was done.

Mr. Rogers stated that they might want to clarify the applicant’s comments about the site diagram and their understanding that this is not a site plan. He continued that the actual site plan for this property would still be the one from 1978. Even though this site diagram is being referenced as a site plan or proposed condition plan, that is not the intent of the document. This site diagram is not part of the modification being done to the overall site plan. Chair Rounds replied that that makes sense. He continued that he thinks one of the proposed conditions, if the committee chooses to approve this, is in reference to impervious surface, and that gets at that point of how this is not a site plan, but rather a modification of an existing site plan.

Mr. Kopczynski asked if it is enough to go back to the original application, which is to change the siding. He continued that everything else is peripheral. Chair Rounds replied that they do need to address it in this situation, with respect to the signs, with respect to the impervious surface, and so on and so forth. Mr. Kopczynski replied that this has nothing to do with the impervious surface; the applicants are changing the siding. Chair Rounds replied that it is up to the committee. If Mr. Kopczynski wants to take it out, he is welcome to do so. Mr. Kopczynski replied that that is up to the person who made the motion.

Mr. Lussier stated that the applicants have an approved site plan from 197[8]. He continued that if the Community Development Department finds that the applicants are not in compliance with that site plan, he thinks that would be a separate matter they could then address with the applicant. Chair Rounds replied that is correct. Mr. Lussier asked if they can then leave it out of this matter. Chair Rounds replied yes.

Mr. Lussier made a motion for the Minor Project Review Committee to approve SPR-204, Modification #3, for changes to architectural and visual appearance as shown on the site plan and identified as Permit Set 216 Marlboro St., Keene, NH 03431, Parcel ID 589-016-000-000, prepared by Randall Walter at a scale of 1"=40' on January 24, 2023 and on the elevations identified as existing conditions 216 Marlboro St., Keene, NH 03431, Parcel ID 589-016-000-000, prepared by Randall Walter at a scale of 1/8"=1' on August 8, 2022, with the following conditions precedent prior to signature by the Minor Project Review Committee Chair:

- 1) Property owner's signature appears on the site plan.
- 2) Submittal of five full-size copies and one digital copy of the site plan and color elevations.
- 3) Submittal of a revised site plan showing the extent of the impervious area on the site, the zoning district, the lot coverage calculations, the location of the access aisle for the accessible parking space, site features, and the location of five rooftop condenser units on the building.
- 4) Submittal of documentation to demonstrate that the proposed rooftop condensers are either permitted under the Sign Code or screened in accordance with Section 20.6 of the Land Development Code.

Mr. Rogers stated that he recommends that 3) be reduced to remove the 'impervious area on the site' language. He continued that they still would need to see the correct zoning district, because this plan shows this property as being in the Business Growth and Reuse District and it is actually in the Neighborhood Business District. Showing the accessible parking and the rooftop condensers would be fine.

Mr. Lussier agreed to Mr. Rogers' change to the motion, to read as follows:

"motion for the Minor Project Review Committee to approve SPR-204, Modification #3, for changes to architectural and visual appearance as shown on the site plan and identified as Permit Set 216 Marlboro St., Keene, NH 03431, Parcel ID 589-016-000-000, prepared by Randall Walter at a scale of 1"=40' on January 24, 2023 and on the elevations identified as existing conditions 216 Marlboro St., Keene, NH 03431, Parcel ID 589-016-000-000, prepared by Randall Walter at a scale of 1/8"=1' on August 8, 2022, with the following conditions precedent prior to signature by the Minor Project Review Committee Chair:

- 1) Property owner's signature appears on the site plan.
- 2) Submittal of five full-size copies and one digital copy of the site plan and color elevations.

- 3) Submittal of a revised site plan showing the zoning district, the lot coverage calculations, the location of the access aisle for the accessible parking space, site features, and the location of five rooftop condenser units on the building.
- 4) Submittal of documentation to demonstrate that the proposed rooftop condensers are either permitted under the Sign Code or screened in accordance with Section 20.6 of the Land Development Code.”

Mr. Rogers seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

6) **Adoption of Amended 2023 Meeting Schedule**

Chair Rounds stated that they had to make a change to the MPRC’s meeting schedule. He continued that currently, they have two monthly meetings, generally holding the second meeting on an as-needed basis. However, closer reading of the LDC revealed that through the creation of the MPRC, the pre-submission meeting that is required of all applicants for site plans falls under the MPRC’s purview and is therefore a public meeting. The pre-submission meeting needs to be noticed to the public and needs to have a minute-taker and [follow the guidelines for public meetings]. Currently it is one Wednesday morning per month. Staff proposes bringing that pre-submission meeting into the MPRC’s current meeting schedule. Thus, twice a month, people who have pre-submission applications would come to the MPRC meeting and the MPRC would have their discussion with them at that meeting.

Mr. Rogers stated that the number of people he sees sitting at this table, and the number of people he sees at a pre-submission meeting, are not the same. He asked if the additional staff would be invited when there is a pre-submission application on the MPRC’s agenda. For example, staff from Police, Public Works, or other Community Development staff who are not MPRC members, speaking as staff from the audience. Chair Rounds replied yes, he thinks that is how it would work. He continued that since both of these meetings will happen every month, it means that such staff members who are members of pre-submission meetings but not members of the MPRC will have to make this a standing meeting on their schedules. He had not contemplated that until Mr. Rogers brought it up.

Ms. Fortson stated that the first MPRC meeting of each month allows people to walk in and receive advice and comment from the committee, since it is a responsibility of the committee. She continued that the second meeting of the month is not a given, and will be held only if the MPRC has a continued public hearing or if someone has requested specifically to come to the meeting for advice and comment. That is, the first is for walk-ins, and the second is for scheduled pre-submission inquiries only. Chair Rounds replied that that is very helpful.

Mr. Lussier stated that he thinks the benefit and value of the pre-submission meeting is that it is, by definition, an informal opportunity for applicants to talk to staff as they are preparing their applications before they submit them. He continued that even though he is all for transparency, he thinks that essentially turning it into a public hearing in front of a formal committee where



minutes are kept, and so on and so forth, will result in losing the value of the pre-submission meeting. Chair Rounds replied point taken, but with the way the LDC is written, because the members of the pre-submission meeting are either members of this committee or alternate members, a public body is created when they meet/create quorum. Brief discussion ensued about who the alternate members are and the circumstances under which a quorum is created. Mr. Rogers stated that this may be something to think about and it may require the reorganization of the pre-submission team, although they need to be careful with who the alternates are from certain departments so they do not lose the needed expertise in the meetings. Mr. Lussier replied that they could still have up to three members of the MPRC in the pre-submission meetings, but no more, since four is a quorum.

Chair Rounds stated that he spoke with the City Attorney. He continued that if they head down a path where they are skirting the rules just to avoid making it a public meeting that could be problematic. That said, they could explore the idea of ensuring that no one who sits in the pre-submission meetings is either an alternate or designee. For example, he as the Community Development Director has a designee, and Mr. Rogers as the Building and Health Official has a designee, but if, for example, Mr. Rogers and his designee are both unavailable, he can have an alternate sit in for him in the MPRC. As Mr. Rogers said, they start working down the ladder of responsibility.

Mr. Kopczynski stated that he thinks Mr. Lussier is right. Chair Rounds replied that he hears him but disagrees. He continued that the other problem is that the LDC explicitly says that the pre-submission meeting is the responsibility of the MPRC. They are tied together; the pre-submission meeting is created as an extension of this committee. They can leave this open to more discussion, but currently they are in a bit of peril with respect to the purpose of the pre-submission meeting and whether they are taking notes. They have absolutely discussed that the point of the pre-submission meeting is to be informal, and this is not that space.

Mr. Lussier stated that today Randall Walter was here, and he is an experienced applicant who knows the City's system. He continued that he could tell that when Mr. Walter walked in, he was surprised by the formality. It is a different context. He thinks they are losing something.

Mr. Rogers stated that maybe this is a conversation to have with the City Attorney, but he wonders if it could be like having two different meetings in one. He continued that for actual applications, they could go through the format as they did today, and then if they move into a pre-submission inquiry, they could change the format to make it more informal. He agrees that being a little more informal tends to put people at ease. Some people are already nervous walking through the doors to speak with them to begin with and adding that anxiety could be problematic at times.

Chair Rounds replied that he does not see why they could not do it that way. He continued that he is not sure why they have to meet in this room at all; they could use a different room. Mr. Rogers replied that the main reason they use this room is for the Minute-taker, who is remote and using the recording. Ms. Fortson replied that it is also because of the meeting recordings since this

committee was created by the Planning Board. She continued that the intent is to have the meeting recordings posted on the City website, because any decisions made by this committee are appealable. Having that transparency to the public [is good]. The conference room does not have the same recording capabilities/set-up as here in Council Chambers. Chair Rounds replied that he thinks they could come up with a way to make this space less formal.

Mr. Lussier asked if there is an opportunity to correct the underlying problem where the LDC makes the pre-submission meeting an appendage of this committee. Chair Rounds replied that they could look into that. It would require modifying the LDC, which would take time. The question is what to do in the meantime. Ms. Fortson stated that they had discussed in the past making this a correction to the LDC, striking through the section that gives the MPRC the responsibility of reviewing pre-submission inquiries. She continued that it comes down to the issue of the fact that they would still have a quorum of MPRC members if it were handled as a separate meeting. Chair Rounds stated that he thinks the only real solution is to enshrine the members of the pre-submission meeting and try to make sure they are not at all related to the MPRC members. He continued that that is the only way he sees to keep the two separate. Mr. Lussier replied that that would work for the Public Works representative, but it may be more difficult for Code Enforcement, Fire, or Police.

Mr. Kopczynski stated that one of the advantages of the informal meeting is that it is not all about the planning process. He continued that the MPRC is a substitute to the Planning Board. It (the pre-submission meeting) gives the Fire Chief time to talk about Fire Code requirements; it gives Mr. Rogers an opportunity to talk about what is needed for a building permit, [and so on and so forth]. It is less targeted, which is why it is so informal. It is recognizing that someone has an idea for a project in mind and getting informal advice on how to advance that project. Chair Rounds replied that he understands. He continued that there is the intent, and then the reality of operating in NH. He recognizes the concern, and agrees, and his reaction was the same as Mr. Kopczynski's at first. He thinks they can direct staff to go back and see if there is a way to identify a way forward by codifying who is in the pre-submission meeting.

Mr. Lussier stated that the agenda item they are discussing is the meeting schedule, regardless of whether the pre-submission meeting is part of this committee's purview. He asked if they could approve this meeting schedule and ask that the Chair continue conversations with the City Attorney regarding finding a better alternative to the MPRC being responsible for the pre-submission meetings. Chair Rounds replied that he thinks they can.

Chair Rounds asked if it is correct that the meeting schedule in the agenda packet is the same as before, except for the asterisk note at the bottom. Ms. Fortson replied yes, it is the same schedule, just on the first and third Thursdays of the month instead of the second and fourth. She continued that they were going to handle the pre-submission portion by adding it as a standing agenda item. Adopting the calendar will not affect the question of whether they include the pre-submission as part of the meeting. Mr. Lussier stated that the dates are different from the ones the committee

previously approved, switching from the second and fourth Thursdays to the first and third. Ms. Fortson replied that is correct.

Mr. Rogers made a motion to approve the amended 2023 meeting schedule of the MPRC. Mr. Lussier seconded the motion.

Mr. Kopczynski asked what happens if they do not approve it. Mr. Lussier replied that their next meeting would be February 9 instead of February 2. Chair Rounds replied that if they do not approve it, they just go on with the schedule as it is now.

Mr. Rogers stated that he thinks the change to the dates was to align better and give people more time, possibly, from pre-submission to application deadlines. This gives more wiggle room. Thus, regardless of where they land with this question of the pre-submission meetings, the changes to the meeting dates are beneficial to both staff and applicants.

Mr. Lussier stated that to be clear, he has no issue with changing the meeting schedule. He continued that his concern is about turning MPRC meetings into pre-submission meetings.

Chair Rounds stated that a point of clarification is that approving this motion does not mean the MPRC is approving the pre-submission meetings as part of the MPRC meetings.

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

7) **Upcoming Meeting Dates**

- **February 2, 2023 at 10:00 AM**
- **February 16, 2023 at 10:00 AM** (*if needed due to continued public hearing or pre-submission inquiries*)

Chair Rounds stated that the next meeting is a week from today, Feb. 2. Mr. Kopczynski replied that he is unavailable. Chair Rounds replied that the City Manager will have to appoint someone to attend in Mr. Kopczynski's place. He continued that the following meeting is Feb. 16, if needed due to continued public hearing or pre-submission inquiries, although the latter is up for debate. He will move forward with that discussion and let the committee know how it goes.

8) **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Rounds adjourned the meeting at 10:52 AM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Britta Reida, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,  
Megan Fortson, Planning Technician