

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

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

**Wednesday, July 3, 2024**

**10:00 AM**

**Council Chambers,  
City Hall**

**Members Present:**

Evan Clements, Chair Pro-Tem  
Rick Wood  
Yelma Desseta  
Megan Fortson

**Other Staff Present:**

None

**1) Call to Order – Roll Call**

Evan Clements called the meeting to order at 10:06 AM. He stated that in the absence of the chair and vice chair, he nominates himself as Chair Pro-Tem for this meeting. Mr. Wood seconded the nomination, which passed by unanimous vote. Roll call was conducted.

**2) Election of Vice Chair**

This agenda item was not discussed.

**3) Minutes of Previous Meetings**

- A) Pre-Submission Meeting – June 6, 2024**
- B) Minor Project Review Committee Meeting – June 6, 2024**

Mr. Wood made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of June 6, 2024. Ms. Fortson seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Ms. Fortson asked if the motion was to approve the Pre-Submission Meeting minutes as well as the minutes of the regular MPRC meeting. Chair Clements replied yes.

**4) Final Vote on Conditional Approvals**

Ms. Fortson stated that there are no final votes on conditional approvals today.

**5) Public Hearings**

- A) **SPR-876, Modification #4 – Minor Site Plan – Ametek Addition, 44 Black Brook Rd** - Applicant SVE Associates, on behalf of owner NH Black Brook LLC, proposes to construct an ~9,045-sf addition to the existing ~61,100-sf Ametek building and make associated site modifications on the property at 44 Black Brook Rd (TMP #221-021-000). The parcel is 18.43 ac and is located in the Corporate Park District.

Chair Clements introduced SPR-876, Modification #4, and asked to hear from staff regarding the application's completeness.

Ms. Fortson stated that she has a recommended motion on completeness. She continued that the applicant has requested exemptions from submitting a traffic analysis, soil analysis, historic evaluation, screening analysis, and architectural and visual appearance analysis. Staff have determined that the requested exemptions would have no bearing on the merits of the application and recommend that the MPRC accept the application as complete.

Mr. Wood made a motion to accept the application for SPR-876, Modification #4, as complete. Mr. Desseta seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Chair Clements asked to hear from the applicant.

Liza Sargent of SVE Associates stated that she is presenting for the proposed addition at 44 Black Brook Rd. She continued that the existing building currently has parking in the front. Additional parking was proposed in 2020 as part of the initial site plan application and was partially completed. A temporary loading dock was installed near the northwestern corner of the building adjacent to additional parking at the rear of the building. The proposed changes are to the north side of the property. The existing, temporary loading dock will be modified. Of the 9,045 square feet, the addition itself is only 6,380 square feet because they are utilizing what already exists. Currently, the roof drain discharges to a structure that discharges to an existing stormwater basin. They propose putting in a drainage structure to improve the flow out of that, expanding the size of the stormwater basin.

Ms. Sargent continued that regarding landscaping, there will be proposed trees. There will be a sidewalk connecting the parking. They (Ametek) are doing a great job and need more space for their shipping department. That is why they are proposing the addition. She asked for questions or comments from the Board.

Mr. Desseta stated that the proposed basin does not show any spillway. Ms. Sargent replied that there is an existing culvert there. Mr. Desseta asked if they think that is sufficient. Ms. Sargent replied that based on the analysis for the 25 year storm, yes. Mr. Desseta asked what would happen with a 50 year storm. Ms. Sargent replied that the regulations do not require that. Mr. Desseta replied that he knows, but he is asking if they think it is necessary to have a spillway of some sort. Ms. Sargent replied that there is 30 feet of overland flow, so with the existing channel, they do not need it in the (event of the) 25 year storm. She imagines it was designed for the larger storm and

that is why it exists currently. Mr. Desseta replied that he recommends some type of Riprap slope or something similar to prevent erosion. Ms. Sargent replied that is an easy add.

Chair Clements stated that regarding the trees that were proposed to be removed, Ms. Sargent said she was going to look at the plan and discuss that with her client. He asked what alternative they have landed on for that. Ms. Sargent replied that she does not think, with the 2020 plan, that they were ever planted. Pointing to locations on the plan, she continued that she proposed putting them “here” because they would be in a nice location out of the way, but as they discussed over the phone, to relocate them to “this” island, not the other one, because of the visibility into the loading dock, and close to “these” parking spaces.

Chair Clements stated that his other comment is, as they discussed on the phone, the project did originally receive a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for an encroachment into the surface water buffer surrounding the wetlands. He continued that he believes that regarding the proposed riprap for the guardrail, that encroachment has effectively already been approved. Thus, there is no need for an update or a new CUP for that.

Ms. Fortson stated that she looked thoroughly at the application materials. She continued that everything looks like it complies with the standards. During her review of the application, she noted a few things that might need to be addressed through some recommended conditions of approval, such as the submittal of a complete lighting plan for the site, because the lighting is proposed to be expanded by over 50%; the submittal of a security to cover the cost of landscaping and erosion control; and as-built plans if engineering staff felt that would be necessary for this project. She herself does not have any specific questions for the applicant at this time.

Rick Wood stated that his question is relative to the redesign of the parking lot flow. He continued that according to the sheet C1, it appears that they are not making changes to existing islands, but then there is a new island that comes out from the addition, on the south side of the catch basin. It appears to pinch in there. He asked if there is a different layout for the parking lot. Last time staff looked at this that was one of the questions they had.

Ms. Sargent replied that something she did not mention is that “these” (she gestured) parking spaces are being removed, so there will be more maneuverability so the tractor-trailers can get in and out. She asked if that answers his question. Mr. Wood replied that at the Pre-Submission Meeting, staff asked if they could get something showing the proposed layout of the parking lot. He continued that a condition (of approval) would be submitting a plan of how the parking lot will actually look, because here it looks like they have converging islands with not enough space to even pass a vehicle, so it is a little confusing.

Ms. Sargent replied that he might not have seen where this plan says, “Remove the island lighting pole, 12 spaces to be removed,” but she can certainly prepare a plan restriping the entire parking lot so they can see where the parking spaces are. Mr. Wood replied yes, that would be helpful.

Mr. Wood stated that he has one other comment, regarding the dumpster size. He continued that it appears they will remove the ramp and add a dumpster. The building and life-safety codes have requirements for a dumpster's distance from a building, based on the dumpster's size, which is something they should have in their vision. It is certainly workable.

Chair Clements asked if a dumpster enclosure currently exists, or if that will be new. Ms. Sargent replied that it would be new.

Chair Clements asked if the MPRC had any more questions or comments. Hearing none, he asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing and asked the MPRC to deliberate.

Ms. Fortson stated that she has largely already said what she thinks needs to be addressed. She continued that she thinks the proposal looks good overall, but it sounds like the MPRC wants to see an updated plan that just shows what the proposed parking layout will be, without the existing parking lot and landscaping island lines shown. She asked if engineering staff thinks the submittal of a security for the project should include as-built plans. Mr. Desseta replied yes.

Ms. Fortson stated that as she said before, she thinks the submittal of an updated photometric plan for the entire site needs to be included as a recommended condition of approval, because they are proposing to expand the lighting installation. Her only other comment is that in order to comply with Zoning, they are required to have a 75-foot side building setback, because they are adjacent to a residential zoning district, which is the Rural District in this case. She does not believe the plans have yet been updated to reflect that, so she would include that as a recommended condition of approval. In addition, in order to meet the perimeter landscaping requirements, there is already an existing wooded buffer around the building's perimeter. She recommends the plan be updated to show a 25-foot buffer to comply with the perimeter landscaping requirements.

Chair Clements stated that they can amend that precedent condition for the submittal of an updated proposed conditions plan to also clean up the sheet to show what is actually going to be proposed, as opposed to the "to be removed."

Ms. Sargent asked if they are asking for just sheet 1 to be revised. Ms. Fortson replied yes, the recommendation would be regarding the proposed conditions plan.

Chair Clements stated that he agrees with those conditions. He continued that overall, he believes the proposal meets the regulations of the Land Development Code and the intent of the Planning Board's Site Development Standards. He thanks the applicant for taking the time to come to the MPRC for this review. He asked for a motion to approve.

Mr. Wood asked clarifying questions about the wording of the motion, with the conditions the MPRC just discussed. Ms. Fortson replied that she made notes about the wording of the motion.

Ms. Fortson made a motion for the Minor Project Review Committee to approve SPR-876, Modification #4 as shown on the plan set identified as, "Modification to SPR-876, Proposed Addition for: Ametek, 44 Black Brook Road, Keene, NH 03431" prepared by SVE Associates at varying scales on June 13, 2024 and last revised on July 1, 2024, with the following conditions:

1. Prior to final approval and signature of the plans by the Minor Project Review Committee Chair, the following conditions precedent shall be met:
  - a. Owner's signature appears on the title page and proposed conditions plan.
  - b. Submittal of five (5) paper copies and a digital copy of the final plan set and elevations.
  - 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, landscaping, and as-built plans.
  - d. Submittal of an updated proposed conditions plan showing the required 75' side building setback line, a 25-foot wooded buffer around the perimeter of the building in compliance with Section 9.4.4.A.5 of the Land Development Code, and the location of all proposed parking.
  - e. Submittal of updated photometric plans for the entirety of the developed portion of the site that demonstrates compliance with the lighting standards outlined under Section 20.7 of the Land Development Code.
2. Subsequent to final approval and signature by the Minor Project Review Committee Chair, the following condition subsequent 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 this site plan and all City of Keene regulations.

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

**6) Staff Updates**

Ms. Fortson stated that there are no staff updates today. She continued that she is typically the staff liaison, but today she is here as the Community Development Director's designee. At the next MPRC meeting when a quorum of regular members is present, they will need to elect a new vice chair.

**7) New Business**

There was no new business.

**8) Upcoming Meeting Dates**

**July** - 2nd Monthly MPRC Meeting – July 18, 2024 at 10:00 am (*if needed*)

**August** - Pre-submission Meeting – August 1 2024 at 9:00 am

**August** - 1st Monthly MPRC Meeting – August 1, 2024 at 10:00 am

**August** – 2nd Monthly MPRC Meeting – August 15, 2024 at 10:00 am (*if needed*)

9) **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Clements adjourned the meeting at 10:25 AM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Britta Reida, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,  
Megan Fortson, Planner