

City of Keene
New Hampshire

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, April 22, 2024

6:30 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Harold Farrington, Chair
Roberta Mastrogiovanni, Vice Chair
Mayor Jay V. Kahn
Councilor Michael Remy
Sarah Vezzani
Armando Rangel
Ryan Clancy
Michael Hoefler, Alternate

Staff Present:

Jesse Rounds, Community Development
Director
Evan Clements, Planner

Members Not Present:

Tammy Adams, Alternate
Kenneth Kost
Randyn Markelon, Alternate

I) Call to Order – Roll Call

Vice-Chair Mastrogiovanni called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and a roll call was taken.

II) Minutes of Previous Meeting – March 25, 2024

A motion was made by Councilor Michael Remy that the Planning Board approve the March 25, 2024 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Armando Rangel and was unanimously approved.

III) Final Vote on Conditional Approvals

The Vice-Chair stated that as a matter of practice, the Board will now issue a final vote on all conditionally approved plans after all of the conditions precedent have been met. This final vote will be the final approval and will start the 30-day appeal clock. She asked if there were any applications ready for final approval at tonight's meeting.

Evan Clements, Planner, stated that site plan application, SPR-06-23, for the Roosevelt School Housing located at 438 Washington Street was ready for final approval. Mr. Clements explained that Monadnock Affordable Housing, on behalf of the owner the Community College Systems of

New Hampshire, proposes to renovate the existing 13,507-sf two-story former school building and add an 8,548-sf, two-story addition. Additionally, they are also proposing to construct a new 12,646-sf two-story building and associated site improvements to create a 60-unit multifamily housing development on the property at 438 Washington Street. He indicated that a waiver for SPR-06-23 was granted from Section 20.14.3.D of the Land Development Code regarding the requirement that all off street parking be screened and located to the side or rear of buildings.

He noted that this site is 2.4 acres in size and is located in the Low Density District. The applicant has met all precedent conditions of approval and staff is recommending that the Board grant final approval for this project.

Mayor Kahn joined the session at 6:35 PM.

A motion was made by Councilor Michael Remy that the Planning Board issue final site plan approval for SPR-06-23. The motion was seconded by Armando Rangel and carried on a unanimous vote.

IV) Extension Request

1. **CLSS-CUP-03-23 – Congregate Living & Social Services Conditional Use Permit – Keene Serenity Center, 24 Vernon St** – Applicant Keene Serenity Center, on behalf of owner the Monadnock Area Peer Support Agency, requests a first extension to the timeframe to satisfy the precedent conditions of approval for the Congregate Living & Social Services Conditional Use Permit application, CLSS-CUP-03-23, for the operation of a group resource center on the property at 24 Vernon St (TMP #568-058-000). The parcel is 0.28 ac and is located in the Downtown Core District.

Mr. Sam Lake, Executive Director of the Keene Serenity Center, addressed the Board and stated that they are requesting an extension due to permitting issues that the landlord needs to address. Jesse Rounds, the Community Development Director, stated that staff has no issues with this request.

A motion was made by Sarah Vezzani that the Planning Board approve a 180-day extension to the timeframe to satisfy the precedent conditions of approval for the Congregate Living & Social Services Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application, CLSS-CUP-03-23. The motion was seconded by Michael Remy and carried on a unanimous vote.

V) Public Hearings

1. **S-09-23, Modification #1 – Subdivision – 284 West Surry Rd** - Applicants and owners Corbet & Colline Cook, propose to modify the 3-lot subdivision, S-09-23, of their property at 284 West Surry Rd (TMP #206-025-000) that received final approval from the Planning Board in January 2024 to remove a note related to fire protection from the approved subdivision plan. The parent parcel is ~9.19 ac and the new parcels range in size from ~2 ac to ~5.16 ac. All land is located in the Rural District.

B. Board Determination of Completeness

Mr. Clements stated that the applicants have requested exemptions from submitting a location map, an existing conditions plan, a drainage report, a traffic analysis, and a soil analysis. Staff have determined that the requested exemptions 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 to accept this application as complete. The motion was seconded by Armando Rangel and was unanimously approved.

C. Public Hearing

Applicant and property owner, Corbet Cook, addressed the Board and stated his and his wife previously received approval to subdivide this property into three lots. As part of the previous approval, there was a stipulation in the building code that required that fire protection be installed in any future homes constructed on the two vacant lots. He stated their request as part of this application is to have the not related to fire protection removed from the subdivision plan.

Mayor Kahn clarified from staff that, unless the Board suspends its rules, this is a first reading. Mr. Clements explained this item is an amendment to an approved subdivision plat. It does not function like an ordinance, instead it functions like any other Planning Board application. Staff's recommendation tonight would be for final approval. This application, if approved, would be for a new subdivision plat that would be the same as the one approved by the Board previously with the exception of the note related to the installation of fire protection being removed.

The Mayor asked the applicant when the original subdivision was submitted. Mr. Cook stated the original subdivision was submitted in September 2023 and it was approved by the Board in January 2024. The Mayor asked whether this item is holding up the applicant's progress. Mr. Cook stated it was not, but noted that he would like to get all issues addressed before he applies for a building permit.

Staff comments were next. Mr. Clements stated this is a rather unique situation because this application was caught between a legislative change that the Board used to rely on. He went on to say this application is for a three-lot subdivision that was filed in September 2023. It received final approval from the Board in January of 2024. In order to meet the intent of NH RSA 674:36, the State Statute on Subdivision Regulations, and the Fire Protection and Water Supply Regulations outlined in Section 19 of the City's Land Development Code, the applicant's surveyor, Russ Huntley, added a note to the proposed subdivision plan related to fire protection and water supply. The note reads as follows, "*the installation of individual residential sprinkler systems meeting the standards of the National Fire Protection Association Regulations, NFPA 13D or NFPA 13R or another means of Fire Protection approved by the Keene Planning Board, shall be required for each lot shown on the plan.*"

Prior to the legislative change in 2023, subdivision applications were able to offer sprinkler systems as a way to meet the City's regulations. Mr. Clements added the way the statute used to read is that no Planning Board condition could force an applicant to install sprinkler systems in a

single- or two-family development, but the developer was allowed to offer sprinklers as a means to meet the local fire codes and rural water supply requirements. Unfortunately, this application could not rely on that. The surveyor offered this language; staff reviewed this language with the City Attorney's office and the Fire Department and the note was permitted to go forward.

Since then, Community Development Staff have had further conversation with the Fire Department and come to a conclusion that the Fire Department has sufficient capacity to service these types of small neighborhood lot additions. The application before the Board tonight is a request to remove this note. Mr. Clements noted that with reference to regional impact, staff does not feel that there is any regional impact; however, he stated that the Board will ultimately need to make that determination.

The Vice-Chair asked for public comment. With no comment from the public, the Vice-Chair closed the public hearing.

D. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Councilor Remy that the Planning Board approve S-09-23, Modification #1 as shown on the plan identified as, "Three Lot Minor Subdivision" prepared by Huntley Survey & Design, PLLC at a scale of 1 inch = 40 feet on August 31, 2023 and last revised on February 22, 2024 with the following conditions subsequent to final approval:

1. All of the subsequent conditions of approval for the original subdivision application, S-09-23, which received final approval from the Planning Board on January 22, 2024 remain in full force and effect.

The motion was seconded by Sarah Vezzani.

Councilor Remy agreed there is no regional impact from this application.

The Mayor stated he is pleased to see the rationale being offered and hoped it is applied generally to rural areas served by the Fire Department.

The motion made by Councilor Remy was unanimously approved.

2. **SPR-12-17, Modification #2 – Site Plan – Archway Farm, 183 Arch St - Applicant Don Scott LA Design, on behalf of owners Mark & Alona Florenz, proposes to construct an ~512-sf addition to the existing Archway Farm kitchen and store building and make associated site modifications, including the relocation of an existing curb cut, the installation of new lighting and landscaping, and the creation of additional parking on the property at 183 Arch St (TMP #107-001-000). The parcel is ~53 ac and is located in the Agriculture District.**

A. Board Determination of Completeness

Mr. Clements stated the applicant has requested exemptions from submitting a traffic analysis, soil analysis, historic evaluation, screening analysis, and architectural and visual appearance analysis. After reviewing each request, staff have determined that granting the requested exemptions 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 to accept this application as complete. The motion was seconded by Armando Rangel and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Dan Scott, a Landscape Architect, introduced the property and business owner, Mark Florenz. Mr. Florenz stated he and his wife own Archway Farm and have been in operation for ten years. He stated that they depend upon their retail sales to make their farm viable. He stated their current operation is located in what used to be a three-car garage that was renovated. Mr. Florenz explained what was limiting is their ability to expand their retail operation. He indicated they would like to change the look of the building to appear more like a farm store.

Mr. Scott addressed the Board next with reference to a rendering. He indicated the main parcel of the property consists of 82 acres in a rural area that is well-suited for this type of use. There is another parcel across from the rail trail that is also farmland. Mr. Florenz noted the NH Protection of Forests holds a conservation easement on both parcels, hence development is limited to the exclusion zone which is right around their home (two acres). There won't be any other development and development would be confined to the central area of the property.

Mr. Scott stated the existing conditions plan that shows the original curb cut located on the eastern portion of the property and explained how it comes in at an angle. He referred to where the farm store is located as well as the septic field, the private residence, accessory barn structures on the rear portion of the site. He stated one of the things they would like to change is to relocate the curb cut, which would allow them to directly line up the central spine of travel aisle to get to the back of the property where additional farm activities are located and to allow for easier access for larger trucks.

Mr. Scott went on to say everything shown in gray on the plan is going to be reconstructed. He explained that there is already parking in front of the store and noted that most of this area is already disturbed and there is no more disturbance being proposed. There are two sections of the driveway being removed and those areas will be put back to grass and lawn. Mr. Scott further stated that in order to address surface water runoff and treatment, they are installing a vegetated treatment swale. He noted that the area in front of the barns is a fairly wet area and this is partly because of the pathway that is blocking some of the drainage from getting down to the two culverts. They are proposing to remove the pathway and add a swale that will run behind the new parking area through a culvert and then exit to the south through a catchbasin running under Arch Street. Those basins and swales provide an opportunity to collect stormwater and hold it for a period of time for infiltration.

Mr. Scott stated he has completed a stormwater management calculation. According to his calculation, only 30% of the water will end up in the swales. During a two-inch storm, the watershed would generate about 2,800 cubic feet of water. The swales and basins could hold nearly 3,000 cubic feet of water or a 3-inch storm, but a five-inch storm will run it up to about 7,000 cubic feet.

Mr. Scott stated he also completed some percolation tests and this site can infiltrate about 10,000 cubic feet of water over a 24 hour period. He stated that with this numbers, he is proving that they are not only reducing the flow of the water that exits under the road, but are creating more opportunity for infiltration of the of the stormwater on-site.

Sedimentation and Erosion Control – The applicant is proposing to install silt fence along the back of the stone wall and along the wet area to the east.

Snow Storage and Removal – Mr. Scott stated there is plenty of room for snow storage and referred to areas on the plan where snow will be stored and as it melts in the spring it will infiltrate and be treated.

Screening – Mr. Scott stated there is some screening that will be provided along the public right-of-way. The vegetative swales would have shrubs three to five feet tall as well as perennials. There will be planting beds in front of the parking area to the west. The applicant is also proposing to plant inkberry shrubs, evergreen shrubs, and a crab apple tree.

Mr. Scott pointed to a detail for a fence that will run along the parking spaces to the east to provide some separation from the retail space and the private home.

Lighting – The applicant is proposing to install four pole lights for the parking areas and three wall-mounted lights above the entry doors. There will be a light for the bathroom at the rear of the building, which will be accessible to the public. Mr. Scott noted that the lighting engineer had to demonstrate that he had an average of least one footcandle light in all areas being illuminated. The small parking area has ~1.5 footcandles up to ~2.5 footcandles of light. The driveway has a minimum of ~2.5 footcandles up to a maximum of ~4.75 footcandles. The parking spaces to the west will be illuminated by ~2.15 footcandles of light up to ~3.17 footcandles.

Traffic – Mr. Scott stated staff prepared some calculations for the applicant. Staff did not have anything in their books that would identify this site as a farm store, but they did have numbers for a variety store, which is not quite the same thing. According to staff's calculations, a variety store would generate 32.6 vehicle trips per day. The applicant indicates his existing store is receiving between 10 to 12 cars per day. The hope is that with this new retail space with a nicer presence on Arch Street that they will see a 50% increase, bringing the total number of vehicle trips to around 18 to 20 cars per day.

Mr. Scott stated that there will be no impact to any of the wetlands in the area. He also noted that a bike rack has been added to the front of the building.

Architecture and Visual Appearance – Mr. Scott showed a rendering of the proposed farm store. This concluded his presentation.

Chair Farrington joined the session at 7:10 pm.

Mayor Kahn asked whether Archway Farm was the only local farm in the City. Mr. Florenz stated they are the only livestock farm, but noted that there is also Green Wagon Farm. The Mayor asked whether the applicant offers any classes. Mr. Florenz stated he would like to offer classes based on availability of space and parking. The Mayor noted that in visiting the store, he saw that there were products from other farms being sold here as well. Mr. Florenz stated they are cognizant of the state definition of farm stand and stated regulation calls for 30% of what you sell needs to be produced by you. He stated they are in excess of 75% at the present time.

With reference to parking, Mr. Scott stated originally they were looking to provide enough parking to meet the requirement of 4 spaces per 1000 square feet that is required for “Agricultural-Related Educational & Recreation Activity as a Business” required under the City’s Land Development Code. He explained that they are providing 13 spaces total and that as a farm stand, they are actually not required by City Code to provide a minimum number of parking spaces. The 13 spaces being offered are well in excess of the standard. Mr. Florenz added that they are not lacking in parking should there be an event requiring additional parking.

Staff comments were next. Mr. Clements addressed the Board and started his presentation on the Site Development Standards.

Drainage – Engineering has reviewed the proposal for the retention area and the two swales along with the existing 1- inch drainage pipe that is located under Arch Street and the inclusion of a new 15-inch drainage pipe. This standard appears to be met. He added it is especially a beneficial contingent considering the reduction in flow and the improvement to treatment before the water leaves the site.

Sediment and Erosion Control – As Mr. Scott explained, the developed construction area is going to be properly surrounded by silt fencing. This standard appears to be met.

Snow removal and Storage – There is plenty of room around the drive aisles and parking areas to store snow. This standard appears to be met.

Landscaping - One existing tree is proposed to be removed to the west of the farm store and eight new parking spaces will be created in its place. One crab apple tree, five inkberry shrubs, and an eight foot wide planting bed will be installed to screen the parking spaces from Arch Street. In addition to this, another crab apple tree and ten additional inkberry shrubs will be planted to screen the parking area to the east of the farm store from view from Arch Street. Mr. Clements noted the requirements for parking lots are located in the Zoning Ordinance under Section 9 of the Land Development Code, which has strict standards when it comes to screening parking areas.

He noted these standards are designed for a much more urban experience. The Zoning Ordinance allows the Planning Board to approve what is called an “alternative landscaping plan” that meets

the spirit and intent of the parking lot screening standards that are outlined in the zoning ordinance. In this case, staff feels the proposed screening is appropriate due to the rural nature of the site and the use of the property as a farm. The Board will need to determine ultimately if these parking areas are properly screened.

Lighting - Mr. Scott has stated the parking area is in compliance with the City's average foot candle ratio and uniformity ratio. The proposed lighting won't have any real hot spots or dark spots and will allow for safe vehicular movements and pedestrian traffic across those spaces. Mr. Clements asked Mr. Scott whether he had submitted an updated cut sheet for the lighting fixtures (CRI that is greater than 70). Mr. Scott answered in the affirmative and stated he also had a copy with him today – This standard appears to be met.

Sewer and Water - The property is on private well and septic and a new system was installed in 2021. Mr. Florenz stated they have two separate systems; one for the residence and one for the commercial kitchen. The one for the commercial kitchen was installed in 2021 – This standard appears to be met.

Traffic and Access Management - The existing easternmost curb cut is proposed to be removed, loamed and seeded, and relocated further to the west. The existing stone wall will then be removed to allow for the creation of the new curb cut and the excess stone will be used to fill the gap in the stonewall, where the old curb cut was located. The new parking area, with the three parking spaces, including an eight foot wide accessible space will be installed in tandem with a five foot wide access aisle, which will be delineated using an accessible parking sign. This will be located to the east of the new farm stand area.

Eight more parking spaces will be created along the 22 foot wide drive aisle adjacent to the store and two additional employee parking spaces will be added to the north of this area. In regards to the traffic generation, as was described, they are anticipating approximately 20 vehicle trips per day, which is well within the traffic standard and hence a traffic study is not required. Bicycle parking will be provided with an eight foot wide bike rack east of the entrance to the farm store and a walkway connecting the drive aisles to the west of the building will direct pedestrians to the public restroom at the rear of the kitchen. This standard appears to be met

Filling and Excavation – Mr. Clements noted the narrative states that the project will not exceed the limits of the standards outlined in the Land Development Code for filling and excavation. Hence, the need for a specific traffic plan related to large trucks is unnecessary – This standard appears to be met.

Surface Waters and Wetlands - As was indicated, no surface waters or wetlands will be impacted with this proposal. This standard appears to be met.

Hazardous or Toxic Materials – The project narrative states there will not be any hazardous or toxic materials on the property. This standard has been met.

Noise - The project narrative states the proposal will not increase the amount of noise generated on the site. This standard appears to be met.

Architecture and Visual Appearance – Mr. Clements indicated the renderings included in the staff report show that the farm stand will have a corrugated metal roof and forest green finish with rough sawn pine barn board siding in a weathered gray finish. Braces and doors will be finished in a barn red color and windows will be white. This will match the finish of the existing tractor shed that was constructed on the property within the last few years. The Board will need to make a determination as to whether the proposed exterior building materials comply with the Architectural and Visual appearance standards.

Mr. Clements stated staff's preliminary interpretation of the application indicates that this application does not rise to the threshold of having regional impact. He then went over the proposed motion. This concluded staff comments.

The Vice Chair then asked for public comment. Mr. Clancy asked whether staff is aware of any plans for updates to signage at the intersection of Felt Road, Whitcombs Mill Road and Arch Street. Mr. Clements stated he was not aware of any proposed work at this intersection.

With no further public comment, the Chair closed the public hearing.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Councilor Remy that the Planning Board approve SPR-12-17, Modification #2, as shown on the plan set identified as "Archway Farm Store, March 2024, 183 Arch St / Keene NH 03431, Site Permit Plan Set" prepared by Don Scott, RLA at varying scales on April 8, 2024 with the following conditions:

1. Prior to final approval and signature by the Planning Board Chair, the following conditions precedent shall be met:
 - a. Owners' signatures appear on the title page and the proposed conditions plan on Sheet L-2 of the plan set.
 - b. Submittal of five paper copies and a digital copy of the final plan set.
 - c. Submittal of a security in a form and amount acceptable to the Community Development Director and City Engineer to cover the cost of sediment and erosion control and landscaping.
2. Subsequent to final approval and signature by the Planning Board Chair, the following condition shall be met:
 - a. Prior to the commencement of site work, the Community Development Department shall be notified when all erosion control measures are installed and the Community Development Director, or their designee, shall inspect the erosion control measures to ensure compliance with the approved site plan and all City of Keene regulations.

The motion was seconded by Mayor Jay Kahn. Councilor Remy stated he did not see any regional impact from this application. He felt the proposed plan looks much better than the three-bay garage. He stated he also likes the plantings compared to a fence.

The motion was unanimously approved.

VI) Changes to Planning Board Application Fee Schedule: The City of Keene Community Development Department proposes to amend sections of Article 25, “Application 1 of 61 Procedures” of the Land Development Code and Chapter 100 of Appendix B of the City Code of Ordinances to change the certified mailing requirement to a “Certificate of Mailing”; create a fee for Cottage Court Overlay Conditional Use Permit applications; and establish fees for Earth Excavation Permit applications.

Community Development Director, Jesse Rounds, addressed the Board and stated that there was a public hearing conducted last month on this item. What the City is trying to accomplish with this item is to normalize some of its fees and save applicants money on mailings. The biggest item is a change to the language in the Land Development Code from “certified mail” to a “certificate of mailing”. It reflects what is in the State Statute and the products offered by the Postal Service.

With respect to the Cottage Court Overlay Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application process, a \$100 application fee is proposed to be added to the schedule.

Mr. Clements stated this item was discussed last month. The manner in which the City Clerk addresses the fee schedule is that it is handled like they are a Rules of Procedure change. He indicated that the Cottage Court CUP application fee is in line with the majority of the other Conditional Use Permit application fees. With reference to the Earth Excavation permit application fees, State Statute says that municipalities can’t charge more than \$50 for an Earth Excavation Permit. That item is also being changed on the fee schedule to include an application fee to review an Earth Excavation application, which is proposed to be \$250, in line with the fees for Site Plan applications.

Councilor Remy stated the City ran into an issue recently with respect to the term “fire permit” and asked with respect to Earth Excavation Application Fee whether the word “permit” should be deleted from that line. He pointed out that there is permit fee and then a permit application fee and asked whether the word permit should be deleted from that line or from each of the lines after that. Mr. Clements agreed it should be. It was agreed that the first line will still read “Earth Excavation Permit Fee” and the four lines after that would remove the word “permit.” The Mayor asked for clarification.

Councilor Remy explained that his suggestion is in the first line to refer to an Excavation Permit fee of \$50.00 because the State Statute caps a permit fee of \$50.00. The Earth excavation application fee is not regulated by State Statute and would be \$250. The next three lines would be the same thing: the Amendment Application fee, Minor Amendment Application fee, and Renewal Application fee would not be permit-related, and in that spirit he would also recommend changing the header in this category to read as “Earth Excavation Fees.”

Mr. Clancy suggested a “/” between the words “Permit” and “Application.”

Councilor Remy clarified his intention is not to avoid State Statute requirements, but to be clear in what the City is charging.

Mayor Kahn asked whether these prices would be an increase to applicants. Mr. Clements stated the prices would actually be less because the application fees are not changing. There will be a new Conditional Use Permit application fee for Cottage Court Applications. This ordinance is currently going through the City Council review process and will eventually be added to this fee schedule. The proposed \$100 application fee aligns with the other existing Conditional Use Permit application fees. The Earth Excavation Permit is the same, but it has to be split out to identify the permit cost, which under State Statute can be no more than \$50.00. He indicated where the savings is coming in is through the proposed reduction in mailed notice costs.

At the present time, the City is charging approximately \$5.04 per abutter, which is the current rate for the Postal Service for mailing a certified letter. By changing from using the Certified Mailing Rate to a Certificate of Mailing (which is a different product offered by the US Postal Service), the cost would be reduced to around \$2.00 to \$3.00 per abutter. The Mayor asked for additional clarification for the entire excavation process. Mr. Rounds stated the initial permit fee is \$50 and the application fee is \$250 which he indicated is in line with what the City charges for a site plan application.

Any subsequent amendment to the initial Earth Excavation Permit, if it is a Major Amendment it would be another \$250 application fee and a Minor Amendment would be \$125 (in line with the Major & Minor Site Plan application fees). Mr. Hoefler asked how often Earth Excavation Permits are applied for. Mr. Clements stated there is one operation happening in Surry for which a permit was applied for last year. They are looking to do a phased operation of their site; however, this is not a common occurrence and the City has strict regulations as it pertains to gravel pits.

Councilor Remy clarified that fees for zoning variances are also increasing. Mr. Clements confirmed that they are, but noted this Board is not the Zoning Board of Adjustment. He added that the Zoning Board of Adjustment has not increased their fees in a long time and they did complete a very elaborate analysis before they decided to increase fees.

A motion was made by Councilor Michael Remy that the Planning Board adopt the proposed fee changes as Rules of Procedures Changes. The motion was seconded by Mayor Jay Kahn and was unanimously approved.

VII) Discussion Topic
None

VIII) Master Plan Upgrade

a. Project Updates

Mr. Rounds stated that a name has been chosen for this process. The Steering Committee has chosen “Vision Keene 20 Forward” as the project name with the tagline, “Learn from the Past & Plan for the Future”. This name and tagline will appear on all official documents going forward. He encouraged the Board to look at the recent survey that was sent out. Mr. Rounds they are organizing a Think Tank event, which will be coming up at the end of May. Staff has asked the

Steering Committee to come up with names of individuals to attend this session. He indicated the idea of this Think Tank is to set in motion the vision discussion that will then drive the planning process; it is the first big public engagement session and the plan is to have about 85 people attend.

Mr. Rangel asked whether the Think Tank is an ongoing commitment or a one-time event. Mr. Rounds stated it is a one-time event. He added that the hope is that those who get involved would stay involved, as there will be similar sessions in the future. Mr. Clements added that the Think Tank is for residents and it is very much a strategic visioning and scenario planning session (What happens if the population increases by 50%? What happens if the population shrinks by 50%? What are people's goals for the city? How do we achieve those targets?). The other smaller subset is stakeholder interviews. These interview won't necessarily be with residents of the City, but with people who are stakeholders who have major engagement in the City (employers, people in the arts, social service sector, etc.).

IX. Staff Updates

None

X. New Business

None

XI. Upcoming Dates of Interest

- Joint Committee of the Planning Board and PLD – May 13th, 6:30 PM
- Planning Board Steering Committee – May 7th, 11:00 AM
- Planning Board Site Visit – May 15th, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed
- Planning Board Meeting – May 20th, 6:30 PM

There being no further business, Vice-Chair Mastrogiovanni adjourned the meeting at 8:02 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Megan Fortson, Planning Technician