

City of Keene
New Hampshire

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, November 25, 2024

6:30 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Harold Farrington, Chair
Mayor Jay V. Kahn
Councilor Michael Remy
Sarah Vezzani
Armando Rangel
Kenneth Kost
Michael Hoefler, Alternate
Stephon Mehu, Alternate

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner
Evan Clements, Planner
Megan Fortson, Planning Technician

Members Not Present:

Roberta Mastrogiovanni, Vice Chair
Ryan Clancy
Randyn Markelon, Alternate
Tammy Adams, Alternate

1) Call to Order

Chair Farrington called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and a roll call was taken. Mr. Mehu and Mr. Hoefler were invited to join the session as voting members.

2) Minutes of Previous Meeting – October 28, 2024

Chair Farrington offered the following corrections:

Line 8 – to note Councilor Remy joined remotely.

Line 109 – insert the word “no” before the sentence “access to water and sewer.”

Line 786 – total number of homes is 31.

Senior Planner Mari Brunner offered the following corrections:

The minutes should note that all of the votes were done by roll call at the previous meeting.

A motion was made by Kenneth Kost to approve the October 28, 2024 meeting minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Armando Rangel and was unanimously approved.

3) Final Vote on Conditional Approvals

The Chair stated this is a new, standing agenda item. 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. The Chair asked if there were any applications ready for a final vote. Ms. Brunner stated Staff did not have any applications ready for a final vote.

4) Public Hearings

- a. **PB-2024-15 – Major Site Plan – Monadnock Conservancy, 0 Ashuelot St - Applicant The Monadnock Conservancy, on behalf of owner JRR Properties LLC, proposes to construct a ~6,215-sf office building and make associated site improvements on the parcel at 0 Ashuelot St (TMP #567-001-000). The parcel is ~3.53-ac in size and is located in the Commerce District.**

A. Board Determination of Completeness

Planner Evan Clements addressed the Board and stated the Applicant has requested an exemption from submitting a traffic study, historic evaluation, screening analysis, architectural & visual appearance analysis, and other technical reports and analyses. After reviewing each exemption request, staff have determined that granting the request 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 Mayor Jay Kahn to accept Application PB-2024-15 as complete. The motion was seconded by Armando Rangel and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Ms. Liza Sargent from SVE Associates, representing Monadnock Conservancy, addressed the Board. She explained that this parcel exists at 0 Ashuelot Street. She noted that the river is on the west side, Keene Housing Authority is on the north side, and West Street is on the south side of the property. She noted the property is currently a bowl-shape with a catch basin in the center of the property and an existing city storm drain that runs with an easement through the property. She noted this property is all lawn space that used to be the area for overflow parking for the Colony Mill. She stated about four years ago, the Applicant received an Alteration of Terrain Permit to remove the asphalt.

Ms. Sargent went on to say JRR Properties is proposing to donate a portion of the property to the Monadnock Conservancy with a balance of the property going to a City Park. She stated the Public Works Director suggested replacing the existing city storm drain, which is not in great condition, and putting flood storage compensation in place by removing a certain portion of the storm drain and replacing it with an open channel. She noted because the property had an Alteration of Terrain Permit four years ago, the proposed project remains within the 10-year time period. Although they are altering less than 100,000 square feet, they still need an Alteration of Terrain Permit.

Ms. Sargent stated the storm water will be treated via an infiltration basin that runs around the perimeter of the property. There will also be a smaller infiltration basin to pick up a small amount of runoff from the access road. The property will have municipal water and sewer. There will be a landscaping buffer along the side of the parking lot abutting a residential area. This concluded her presentation.

The Mayor noted the site is currently flat and asked if the remainder of the site is buildable. Ms. Sargent noted the 100-year floodplain elevation line, represented by the bold dashed line on the plan, and explained that area needs to be elevated. Ms. Sargent explained the portion being donated to the city could also be developed, if that area is also elevated and the City undergoes the process of getting an Alteration of Terrain Permit. The Mayor asked how this area is going to be elevated. Ms. Sargent stated it would be elevated with suitable fill taken out from the storm drain area, and some fill would be brought in when needed. The Mayor asked whether the Applicant would track how many cubic yards of excavation and fill is being done to allow for a calculation to be made during potential future development of the site. Ms. Sargent stated the flood plain permit would have those calculations.

Mr. Kost clarified that this entire site at the present time is a flood zone. Ms. Sargent agreed that most of the site is a flood zone. He asked what happens to the water when it floods currently. Ms. Sargent stated that eventually the water drains into the city storm drain, which is at the low point of the site. He asked what will happen to the water when the site is potentially raised. Ms. Sargent stated it will flow into the existing drainage at the lower portion of the site and anything above would be diverted to the flood storage compensation.

Chair Farrington asked whether the parking area designated for employees is expected to flood. Ms. Sargent stated the drainage system will handle that and noted to the emergency overflow area for a 50-year storm. Ms. Sargent stated any overflow will go into the riparian swale and eventually into the city storm drain.

Staff comments were next.

Mr. Clements addressed the Board and stated the purpose of this application is to construct an approximately 6,000 square foot single story office building with associated site improvements for the future headquarters of the Monadnock Conservancy. The proposed headquarters will provide office space for 25 occupants and include a community room. The majority of the subject parcel, as discussed, is located within the 100-year floodplain; therefore, the project will require compensatory flood storage to offset the construction and site development.

The current owner of the property intends to subdivide the parcel at a future date—most likely the next planning board meeting—and donate approximately one acre in the northeastern corner of the parcel to the Monadnock Conservancy for this proposed development. The remainder of the parcel is intended to be donated to the City of Keene to provide additional green space connection along the Ashuelot River. A portion of the required compensatory flood storage will be located on the part of the parcel to be donated to the City. An agreement between the Monadnock Conservancy, the current owner, which is JRR Properties, and the City for the flood storage structures is being negotiated.

Mr. Clements stated the project will be required to obtain an Alteration of Terrain permit from the NH Department of Environmental Services as well as a Floodplain Development Permit through the city. In addition to flood storage improvements, an existing city-owned storm drain that runs through the parcel will be replaced with a riparian drainage swale that will support both stormwater and floodwater volume management.

With respect to Regional Impact – Mr. Clements stated after reviewing the application, staff have made a preliminary evaluation that the proposed site plan does not appear to have the potential for regional impact as defined in RSA 36:55. The Board will need to make a final determination as to whether the proposal, if approved, could have the potential for regional impact.

Drainage - The proposed stormwater management system includes a mix of detention basins, grass swales, infiltration trenches and an emergency spillway that is directed to the larger flood compensation structure. The applicant states in their narrative that that runoff will be managed onsite with no adverse impacts to downstream abutters. This standard has been met.

Sediment & Erosion Control - The applicant states in their narrative that the site is relatively flat, which reduces concerns related to erosion control. The application proposes the installation of erosion control measures, such as silt fence, on an as-needed basis. A stabilized construction entrance is also proposed and will be maintained with best management practices. All control measures will be repaired as needed. This standard has been met.

Snow Storage & Removal – There are areas of the site near the proposed parking area that are suitable for snow storage. Any storm event that exceeds snow storage capacity on site will be removed from the site. This standard has been met.

Landscaping - The application is required to install one tree per ten parking spaces in the parking area. The applicant proposes to install five Red Maple and one Multi-Leader Birch to meet this requirement. A rhododendron is proposed to be installed next to the power transformer that will be used to feed power to the building. The proposed screening area between the parking area and the High-Density zoning district to the north will include a mix of evergreens, ornamental shrubs and natural, local grasses. This condition has been met.

Screening - The dumpster area on site will be enclosed by a 7'6" tall solid wood enclosure with an attached shed. The heat pumps that are proposed along the façade of the building will be screened with a stockade fence. This standard has been met.

Lighting – There will be seven pole-mounted parking area light fixtures and 11 canopy lights. The fixtures will be installed on 12' tall pole mounts. An additional six wall mounted lights and 15 bollard lights. All fixtures have a CRI of greater than 70 and a color temperature of 3,000K. The applicant has also submitted a reduced lighting plan for after-hours security needs that meets the City standards. This standard has been met.

Sewer & Water: As mentioned by the Applicant, the development will connect to city water and sewer with a 1 ½" water service and a 4" diameter sewer service line. There will be no fire

suppression water service as fire suppression is not required for the proposed office building. This standard has been met.

Traffic & Access Management - This proposed use will not generate a significant increase in the total vehicle trips per day. The previous use of the property was a 3.5-acre overflow parking area for a shopping center. The ITE trip generation manual estimates an additional 24 new vehicle trips during weekday peak hours. The site design includes the installation of 25 parking spaces, including two accessible parking spaces and a 24' wide drive aisle. Granite curbing is proposed as wheel stops along all parking spaces. Street access for the parking area will be located at the northeast corner of the property, to the north of the proposed office building. The parking lot also includes a turnaround and a truck turning plan has been submitted to ensure that emergency vehicles have sufficient area to navigate the site. Pedestrian access is located off Ashuelot Street with concrete walkways connecting the site to the city's sidewalk system. A bike rack is proposed to be installed by the front entrance of the office building. An existing concrete apron located at the southeast corner of the property left over from the parking lot is proposed to remain and will be on the portion being donated to the city. This standard has been met.

Filling and Excavation – Mr. Clements stated filling and excavation is planned to happen throughout the development of this site. Considering that Ashuelot Street connects directly to West Street, which connects the site right to the highway, an additional sort of traffic management plan for yard trucks that are going to be bring fill in and out is not necessary. This standard has been met.

Surface Waters & Wetlands: Mr. Clements noted the applicant states in their narrative that there will not be any work on the site that will impact the Ashuelot River. The proposed flood storage swale will require the removal of an existing 15" culvert that is part of the city's stormwater management system in the area and will be replaced with the riparian swale discussed earlier. No impacts to surface waters or natural wetlands are proposed as part of this application. This standard has been met.

Hazardous & Toxic Materials: The applicant states in their narrative that there are no known hazardous or toxic materials on site and the proposed use does not include hazardous or toxic materials. This standard has been met.

Noise: There will be no proposed noise footprint except for general office use. This standard has been met.

Architecture & Visual Appearance: The applicant states in their narrative that the proposed office building will mimic the Monadnock Conservancy's values. The submitted elevations propose a single-story office building with a standing seam metal roof with solar panels. The building façade will be sections of slate siding with accent sections of wood siding. The east elevation will face Ashuelot Street and depicts a mix of the three building façade materials, wood, slate, and metal. A wooden fence will also be located on this elevation to screen the proposed heat pumps from view of the public right-of-way.

Mr. Clements stated the Board should consider the following standards as part of the review of the city's architectural and visual appearance:

Section 21.14.2 Visual Interest:

A. *“Front facades and exterior walls shall be articulated to express an architectural identity to avoid a uniform appearance, and architectural details shall give the impression of being integral to and compatible with the overall design.”*

B. *“Structures shall have architectural features (e.g. dominant gable ends, cornices, granite sills, arched openings, large windows framed with architecturally consistent trim, etc.) and patterns that provide visual interest at the pedestrian scale, reduce massive aesthetic effects, and harmonize with the City's distinctive architectural identity, unique character, and prevailing scale.”*

Mr. Clements reviewed the recommended motion language next.

This concluded staff comments.

Councilor Remy referred to the last condition, which states *“After 1 full growing season (a minimum of 1 year), the applicant shall contact Community Development Staff to conduct a final landscaping inspection.”* And noted this is not something he has seen with other applications and asked if this was something new. Mr. Clements stated adding this condition being added as part of the approval process is relatively new, but it is in the Community Development standard and Staff is finding that this is something that is often forgotten, hence it is a reminder to the applicant.

The Chair asked what the signage would look like. Mr. Clements stated signage has not been proposed yet, but signage would be handled through a Sign Permit from the Community Development Department, which gets a zoning and building review.

Mr. Kost asked if the lighting on the site would impact the abutting residential properties. Mr. Clements stated all the lighting levels proposed are within tolerances for light trespass onto private property and the public right of way. There is additional landscaping proposed to screen that parking area that was not included when the photometric plan was conducted. Mr. Clements further states that there is another parking area on the adjacent property, which separates lighting from the residential properties.

Mr. Kost asked if the flood storage compensation would be on City property. Mr. Clements clarified that it would straddle both the proposed project site and the proposed City property. Mr. Kost asked if the City would maintain the flood storage compensation. Mr. Clements stated the City attorney and the representative from the Monadnock Conservancy would come to an agreement through negotiations. Ultimately, City Council will decide what they are comfortable with. Mr. Clements further explained that when the project comes back before the planning board for the subdivision, Staff will recommend the results of the negotiation are included with the application.

Councilor Remy clarified that the Planning Board is reviewing the application as the entire parcel. Mr. Clements answered that the Planning Board is reviewing the application only for the office building at this time.

The Chair asked for public comment. Mr. Dan Hagen 93 Ashuelot Street addressed the Board. He noted this is a dead-end street, but the street also becomes busy with vehicles that come off School Street and travel through Ashuelot Street. He also added with the upcoming downtown reconstruction project, there are going to be more vehicles travelling via Ashuelot Street. He also expressed concern about added noise, traffic, and potential crime.

Ms. Beth Ann Barrett of 27 Ashuelot Court addressed the Board next and asked if the row of trees and fence along the rear would remain. Ms. Sargent stated the fence along the north side will be removed. Ms. Sargent explained that the green space between the existing fence and the property line will also be removed and will be replaced with a Rhododendron, Birch, Ink Berry Holly, ornamental grass. The existing trees on the north side will not be removed and are not on the property. Ms. Barrett asked for the distance between the trees and the existing fence. Ms. Sargent stated it was approximately 20 feet. It was noted this would also be a single-story building. Ms. Barrett referred to the area on the north side of the property in which tenant parking occurs, which she stated is close to the proposed screening area.

Mr. Hagen addressed the Board again and asked for the location of access to this parking area and how parking was going to be handled. Ms. Sargent noted the location of employee parking access, which is proposed to be across the street from Mr. Hagen's residence. Mr. Hagen asked if the employee parking lot would be used to access Ashuelot Park. Ms. Sargent explained that people would not be able to walk through the proposed stormwater swale to access the trails. He also asked how tall the light poles were going to be. Ms. Sargent stated the tallest ones would be 12 feet tall and light would be reduced to 50% after 10 pm.

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

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Kenneth Kost that the Planning Board approve PB-2024-15 as shown on the plan set identified as "Monadnock Conservancy Headquarters" prepared by SVE Associates at varying scales on October 18, 2024 and last revised on November 12, 2024 with the following conditions:

1. Prior to final approval and signature of the plans by the Planning Board Chair, the following conditions precedent shall be met:
 - a. Owner's signature appears on the plan.
 - b. Submittal of five paper copies and a digital copy of the final plan with the AOT permit number included as a note on the site plan.
 - c. Submittal of a security to cover the cost of sediment and erosion control, landscaping, and as-built plans in a form and amount acceptable to the City Engineer.
2. Subsequent to final approval, the following conditions shall be met:

a. Prior to the commencement of site work, a preconstruction meeting will be scheduled with Community Development Staff.

b. Prior to the commencement of site work, the erosion and sediment control measures shall be inspected by the Community Development Department to ensure compliance with this application and all City of Keene regulations.

c. Following the installation of landscaping, the applicant shall contact Community Development Staff to schedule an initial landscaping inspection.

d. After 1 full growing season (a minimum of 1 year), the applicant shall contact Community Development Staff to conduct a final landscaping inspection.

The motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy.

Councilor Remy stated he agrees with the statement around regional impact. Even though this development is close to a body of water that does flow through many regions, it does not have an impact on those regions. With reference to traffic, he does agree with the count of about 20 trips as this lot is intended for employees only. He stated most people who use the park use the Mascoma Bank parking lot. The Councilor felt this is a well written proposal and fits in well with the surrounding area.

Ms. Vezzani stated she agrees with the statement that this proposal will have no regional impact. She stated that building on that floodplain actually makes sense in this instance. Ms. Vezzani stated there will be 25 people using a single-story building and did not feel traffic would be an issue. She stated she wanted to make sure the solar fits in with the look of the roof. She stated she was comfortable with this application.

Mayor Kahn stated what is being proposed is going to be a welcome improvement to the site. The Mayor felt the Conservancy moving to Keene would be an asset. He stated the issue with the constraints being placed on any gifted land is something the City Council would need to deliberate at a later day.

Councilor Remy suggested the applicant look into the parking issue raised by Ms. Barrett.

Mr. Kost felt there is an opportunity to incorporate vegetation into some of the drainage structures. A bio retention swale could serve as an educational tool with the right kinds of plantings. He felt this could be a great asset to the park.

Mr. Hofer felt this building would fit nicely with the neighborhood.

Chair Farrington echoed what the Mayor said; Monadnock Conservancy is a great organization and fits in very nicely with the culture and charm of Keene. Having their headquarters in Keene would be a great asset for the city. He felt this was an excellent project.

The motion made by Kenneth Kost carried on a unanimous vote.

- b. PB-2024-16 – Major Site Plan – Kia, 440 Winchester St - Applicant Hutter Construction Corp, on behalf of owner 434-440 Winchester LLC, proposes to**

construct a new ~15,365- sf Kia dealership in place of the existing ~9,950-sf building and make associated site modifications on the property at 440 Winchester St (TMP #115-004-000). A Surface Water CUP is requested for temporary impacts within the 30' wetland buffer. Waivers are requested from Section 20.14.3.D, Section 21.7.3.C, and Section 21.7.4.A.1 of the LDC to allow for parking in front of the building and allowed lighting levels. The parcel is 2.23-ac in size and is located in the Commerce Limited District.

A. Board Determination of Completeness

Planner Megan Fortson addressed the Board and stated the Applicant has requested exemptions from submitting a traffic analysis, soil analysis, historic evaluation, and screening analysis. After reviewing each request, staff have made the preliminary determination 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 Mayor Jay Kahn to accept Application PB-2024-16 as complete. The motion was seconded by Stephon Mehu and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Mr. John Noonan from Fieldstone Land Consultants addressed the Board on behalf of the owner 434-440 Winchester LLC and the applicant Hunter Construction. Mr. Noonan stated the proposal is to construct a new Kia building behind the existing Kia Dealership building, which will remain operational for as long as possible.

Mr. Noonan stated there are roughly 150 existing parking spaces but noted not all spaces are striped. The existing building will be demolished in the front and a new building (15,365 square feet) constructed at the rear. Parking would then be moved to the front of the proposed building, where the existing Kia building had been. Mr. Noonan stated that a waiver was filed for parking at the front and proposes formalizing parking at the sides. There is a proposed bay area in the back with ramps. There will now be less parking at the rear than in the existing conditions of the site. There is a jurisdictional wetland that runs along the back of the building and there is a 30 foot buffer setback from this wetland. Mr. Noonan also noted there is a drainage ditch at the rear, which takes the flow of drainage from the building, front parking lot and side parking lot. This drainage ditch directs it to an outlet which ultimately ties into the tax ditch, which runs along Cromwell Drive and ends up into Ash Swamp Brook.

Mr. Noonan stated a stormwater CUP application for impacts to the wetland buffer has since been removed from the application. He clarified the back bay of parking is exactly at the edge of the existing parking lot. The area within the buffer area would be lowered in elevation for flood compensation. Erosion control measures will be used.

There is some proposed landscaping to be provided at the front of the site. Mr. Noonan stated the proposal plans for the pavement being pulled back from the existing conditions because of the plans for extending Route 10 and Winchester Street by the State.

Mr. Noonan described the proposed flood compensation. He stated this property is in the 100-year floodplain, which would require permitting from FEMA and a city floodplain development permit, which has been reviewed preliminarily with City Staff. Ultimately, there will be a total volume compensation for flood compensation. The proposed building needs to be one foot above that flood elevation. Mr. Noonan stated the proposed floor elevation ends up being higher than the existing building. The front elevation will be lowered and the rear will be only about a foot lower than the existing elevations. Flood compensation numbers have been provided on the plan, which will be reviewed as part of the floodplain development permit.

The next is a utility plan. Mr. Noonan stated the existing transformer will need to be relocated to the rear of the lot.

Existing municipal water and sewer will be extended to the new buildings.

Lighting – There are two existing lights that fall outside the front easement line. There will be new lighting proposed along the edge of the proposed parking lot, including some on the islands, and two at the rear of the parking lot, which are pole mount lights. All fixtures are full cut off and meet the city standard. Lighting will be reduced by 50% after business hours, which will be at 10:00 PM and later. The existing fixtures on the building and the parking lot (pole mounted lights) are not full cut off. They are angled lights. The lighting being proposed for this new plan will be a vast improvement over the existing condition.

Mr. Noonan went on to say one of the waivers being requested is for lighting. The first waiver is for going over one foot candle at the right of way. The lights are coming right to the edge of the pavement, but Mr. Noonan noted this is an improvement compared to the existing condition. The second waiver was for lighting going over the northern property line (0.1 foot candle), which is allowed. He noted that drive isle is utilized by both the Kia dealership and one to the north, which are owned by the same owner; therefore, there is not any anticipated issue impacting abutters.

Landscaping – The Applicant is asking for an alternative review of the landscaping plan because the dealership does not want trees. The applicant is asking for lower shrubs to be utilized. The reason they don't want the trees is because of leaves falling on new car finishes and the attraction of birds.

Mr. Noonan stated erosion control and construction details have been provided. Sewer and water connection details have also been provided.

Architectural Details – Mr. Noonan stated Kia Corporate has provided these architectural plans. They are about a 90% plan. As the building permit process moves forward they will be submitting full architectural plans with all materials. The plan ultimately will be very similar to the GMC Dealership directly located to the north. Black aluminum panels will be used on the roof with large store front glass. The roof has a slight pitch at the rear of the building. Roof top units are set back 36 feet, and 23 feet from the front and rear.

Phasing Plan – Hutter Construction put together a phasing plan for how traffic will be handled during the demolition and operation. The Applicant is trying to operate as long as possible in the existing building. They would enter the existing building from the southern entrance. There is no curb cut to the building; they share a curb cut with the northern and southern properties.

For phase one - the dealership will be utilizing the south entrance, and construction will come in through the north entrance. There will be a gate and fence placed from the existing GMC building to the proposed building and along the southern facing section. Construction fencing will be placed around the proposed site. Once the new building is fully operational, the dealership operations will be moved into the new building. At that phase, the dealership would utilize the north entrance, and any excavation or construction vehicles would utilize the south.

Mr. Noonan stated these plans were revised on November 11th for the purpose of addressing staff comments from both the Community Development and the Department of Public Works. The City Engineer's comments have been addressed. He stated there was a letter recently submitted to them from Kevin Thatcher regarding the Alteration of Terrain and drainage. This issue has also been discussed with the City Engineer, indicating that the Applicant meets city standards for storm water management and drainage. They have also reached out to Alteration of Terrain and will be meeting with DES soon. He indicated that most of the comments in the letter were regarding Alteration of Terrain and the Applicant's opinion is that this permit is not applicable. However, they will be meeting with DES to review the plans. This concluded Mr. Noonan's presentation.

Councilor Remy noted there is an above ground storage tank where the proposed building is going to be located and asked if this tank will be removed and moved properly. Mr. Noonan stated this tank is located on the same island where the transformer is located. It is a skid tank for fuel (spill containment exists within the tank). The tank will be moved to the Mitsubishi Dealership site. The sheds and the containers at the rear of the site would also be moved from the site.

The Mayor noted the frontage along Winchester Street and the consistency of that frontage. There is a building that is going to be moving back further on the lot, giving more visibility to vehicles on the site. The Mayor addressed the consistency of building setbacks. He asked what would be the consistent approach and appearance for Winchester Street; for example, would consistency be to encourage that dealership structures sit to the front of the lot or to the rear of the lot. Mr. Noonan stated there is a mix; for example, the Mitsubishi Dealership sits back and has parking up front. This site would have parking at the front and the rear. The GMC Dealership has a minimum amount of parking to the front and the rest is to the rear and side. He added the proposal would create conditions in which the Mitsubishi Dealership and the proposed building will be closer to lining up.

Mr. Chad Brannon, Civil Engineer with Fieldstone Land Consultants addressed the Board. Mr. Brannon stated one of the key components is that the existing Kia Dealership finished floor elevation does not have the one foot of free board to the 100-year floodplain elevation. When the Applicant looked at developing the site initially, they looked at remodeling and options to utilize the existing building. Mr. Brannon stated that in discussions with City Staff regarding floodplain

requirements and conditions for addressing the existing building, the review ultimately revealed there was a need to create a new building. A new, detached building would allow for the finished floor elevation. He added for this investment in this improvement to happen, the process has to happen while allowing an existing business to operate.

Chair Farrington stated during the site visit there was concern raised about the 30-foot buffer and asked whether the buffer would be disturbed during construction. Mr. Noonan stated there will be grading in that area. There will be a silt fence that would cut into the buffer. Once the grading is complete, the area will be loamed and seeded.

Mr. Kost asked where the pervious pavement would be located. Mr. Noonan noted the rear of the building. Mr. Noonan continued and stated there will be porous asphalt at the rear, which was done to reduce the impervious area.

The Mayor addressed the letter from Mr. Thatcher in which the issue of porous asphalt had been raised and clarified these concerns will be addressed with Staff. Mr. Noonan stated they have discussed the letter with the City Engineer and will be meeting with Alteration of Terrain as well.

Mr. Brannon noted that the porous pavement meets and exceeds all the design requirements for City standards, and ultimately the letter is trying to impose State standards. He stated the Applicant and Mr. Thatcher have a difference of opinion as to whether this project qualifies for an Alteration of Terrain permit and invite dialogue with the Alteration of Terrain Bureau. Fieldstone plans on meeting with Alteration of Terrain soon.

Mr. Brannon went on to say the porous pavement as depicted within the plan set meets standard engineering practices and guidelines. It does not meet Alteration of Terrain requirements as it relates to larger storm frequencies. Ultimately, any storm water that goes into that area, as Mr. Noonan stated, flows into an under drain design that ties into the floodplain mitigation and ultimately into that tax ditch. He stressed this is an improvement to the existing site from a drainage standpoint; for example, the Applicant is reducing impervious cover and providing additional storm water mitigation. He felt this letter was unfortunate because Fieldstone has worked with the Alteration and Terrain Bureau and their reviewers for well over 25 years. They encourage and engage in dialogue all the time and that is why they have reached out to them today. Fieldstone has asked the supervisors to meet with them to get some clarification on this. He noted if a State permit is required, as with any other project, the proposed project would be updated to their standards. Mr. Brannon stated he hoped the Board would consider any conditional approval to be subject to any State permits as applicable.

Staff comments were next.

Ms. Fortson addressed the Board. She indicated this property is located to the south of Route 101 and Winchester Street (Route 10) intersection. The car dealerships to the north and south are owned by the same property owner, and the properties across the street are a mix of residential and commercial uses on Wetmore Street and Fairbanks Street.

Ms. Fortson stated the parcel is 2.23-ac in size and has 134 feet of frontage along Winchester Street. Access to the site is not on the subject parcel, but rather from the two properties to the south.

As part of this proposal, the applicant proposes to demolish the existing 9,950 square foot building and construct a new 15,365 square foot building behind the existing building. Because the entire site is located within the floodplain, the applicant is proposing to lower the grading of the site in the area where the existing building is located near the front as well as at the rear adjacent to the 30' surface water buffer.

Ms. Fortson stated the applicant has requested waivers from Article 20.14 of the LDC to allow for parking in front of the new building. The Applicant has also requested a waiver from two sections of Article 21 to allow for lighting levels above the required maximums at the property line, public right of way line, and average parking lot levels.

After reviewing the application, staff have made a preliminary evaluation that the proposed site plan does not appear to have the potential for regional impact. The Board will need to make a final determination as to whether the proposal, if approved, could have the potential for regional impact.

In reference to departmental comments, Code Enforcement staff would like to reiterate that the Building Permit and Floodplain Development Permit applications will need to be submitted for the proposed site redevelopment.

Zoning staff would like to see a detailed maintenance plan for the porous pavement to ensure that this area of the site does not become impervious. Staff want to make sure that the applicant was prepared to discuss alternative interior parking lot landscape design requirements for parking lots with 50+ spaces outlined under Article 9.4 of the LDC.

After the initial review of the application, staff also received the letter from Mr. Thatcher, who raised concerns about the storm water design. Mr. Noonan noted the issue has been discussed with city staff; initially, engineering did not provide any concerns about the proposed storm water drainage design, but later agreed with Mr. Thatcher that the project could require an Alteration of Terrain permit. Ms. Fortson stated Mr. Thatcher has some experience working with Alteration of Terrain permits; however, the Board's purview is not State level drainage review. The City Engineer felt the applicant's design meets city drainage standards. As a result, Staff has amended the recommended conditions subsequent to include the submittal of an Alteration of Terrain Permit if it is required.

Ms. Fortson continued with the application analysis.

Drainage and Storm Water Management: The project narrative states that the applicant is proposing to use the existing drainage structures on the northern portion of the site that outlet into an existing drainage ditch near the rear of the site. Zoning Staff requested that the applicant submit a detailed maintenance plan for the porous pavement at the rear of the site. The applicant has submitted an inspection and maintenance manual, which is included as an attachment to this

staff report. The second page of the manual recommends that inspections be performed every couple of weeks and after large storm events and within the first year following construction to ensure that the site and slopes remain stabilized. Planning Staff recommend that the Board include a condition of approval that all inspection reports be submitted to the Community Development Department for review and approval by the City Engineer's Office one year after the completion of construction. Staff also recommend that the Board require the submittal of a security to cover the cost of performing all inspections during the first year as a condition of approval. Another recommended condition of approval for drainage is a submittal of an updated grading plan with a note added stating that an annual inspection and maintenance report for the porous pavement on the site shall be submitted to the Community Development Department. This standard appears to be met.

Sediment & Erosion Control: The project narrative states that the proposed sediment and erosion control measures include the installation of silt fencing, catch basin silt socks, and rip rap aprons, which are shown on Sheet 4 of the plan set. This plan shows a double row of silt fencing within the 30' surface water buffer at the rear of the site. The installation of erosion control measures within the surface water buffer would normally require the submittal of a Surface Water CUP; however, because this is being done in conjunction with compensatory flood storage, it is allowed under Article 11 of the LDC. Staff does recommend that during construction there will be flagging and inspection of the 30' buffer by Community Development staff to ensure erosion control measures are adequate. Additionally, the submittal of a security for the installation and maintenance of the erosion control measures during construction. This standard appears to be met.

Snow Storage & Removal: The proposed conditions plan shows a snow storage area near the northeastern corner of the parcel and states that snow will not be stored within the wetlands or surface water buffer and will be hauled off the site, if needed. This standard appears to be met.

Landscaping: The landscaping plan on Sheet 7 of the plan set shows the installation of rhododendron, winterberry, and nannyberry viburnum shrubs in landscaping islands on the western portion of the site. Article 9.4 of the LDC outlines the design standards for perimeter and internal parking lot landscaping areas that have 50 or more parking spaces. The applicant is requesting an alternative from the Board under the authority granted to the Board under these standards. The standard gives the Planning Board the authority to approve an alternative landscaping plan, if they feel the plan has met the intent of the standard. Staff recommend that a security be submitted to cover the cost of the landscaping and a condition regarding the performance of an initial inspection once the landscaping is installed and a final landscaping inspection after a year.

Screening: The project narrative states that the mechanical equipment will be set back 10' from the edge of the roof and that the proposed building design incorporates a roof parapet that will range from 8" tall at the front of the building to 40" tall at the rear of the building as shown in the elevations. This standard appears to be met.

Lighting: The proposed fixtures meet the color temperature 3,500 K or less and a color rendering index greater than 70 and requirement that they are full cut off. Item 6 on the photometric plan

states that the average illumination levels will not exceed an average of 1 foot candle between the hours of 10:00 pm and 6:00 am. This standard appears to be met.

Ms. Fortson noted the applicant has requested two waivers from lighting. One is related to light trespass levels. Ms. Fortson noted as Mr. Noonan mentioned you can only have a trespass level of 0.1-foot candle between properties and then at the right of way line you can have one foot candle. The applicant is going to be slightly above those levels in both locations. The second waiver, in the new parking lot display spaces, will have lighting that will be above the 3 1/2-foot candle maximum. Ms. Fortson called the Board's attention to the waiver criteria outlined in the staff report.

Sewer & Water: The City's GIS Database shows that the site is currently served by city water and sewer utilities. The project narrative states that the new building will require extensions of the water and sewer lines on the site, which will be coordinated during the demolition process of the existing building. This standard appears to be met.

Traffic & Access Management: Ms. Fortson stated Mr. Noonan has explained the phasing of the project. Staff would like to make sure a security is submitted to make sure the temporary stabilized construction areas are maintained during construction. Ms. Fortson went on to say the sites to the north and south are currently owned by the same property owner. If either of those sites were to change ownership in the future, access easements and utility easements and other legal instruments may need to be in place. Hence, staff would like to see draft language submitted that would be reviewed by the City Attorney's office as a condition of approval. In regard to traffic and access management, that standard appears to be met.

Filling & Excavation: The entire site falls within the 100-year flood plain and would require flood plain permit. The permit would be reviewed by the community development department. If the proposal does meet the threshold for an Alteration of Terrain permit, meaning that over 100,000 square feet of land was disturbed, then a revised recommended condition of approval has been submitted. The revised recommended condition of approval indicates if an Alteration of Terrain permit is required once the Applicant meets with DES, staff would like to review a copy of that.

Surface Waters & Wetlands: All work done within the surface water buffer is permitted as part of the flood compensation storage work. This standard appears to be met.

Hazardous & Toxic Materials: The project narrative states that items considered toxic, including oils, lubricants, brake fluid, etc., will be stored inside the building and handled according to State regulations. This standard appears to be met.

Noise: The narrative states that there will no increase in noise generated on the site. This standard appears to be met.

Architecture & Visual Appearance: Ms. Fortson noted the proposed building is going to look very similar to the GMC dealership to the north. The proposed building will have aluminum finish paneling with a black and silver color scheme compared to black and white. She indicated the Board will need to discuss whether or not they feel the proposed design meets with the Board's

architecture and visual appearance standards. A waiver has been requested from this section of the code to allow for that extra parking in front of the building.

Ms. Fortson next reviewed the recommended conditions of approval.

Ms. Brunner noted for condition c. “drainage inspections” will not need to be included. She explained under the Board’s regulations they can require security for erosion and sediment control, landscaping, and as-built plans. Drainage inspections are not something that is typically requested for an Applicant to complete; therefore, Ms. Brunner stated the security could not be required for it.

Chair Farrington referred to 2. e. and asked if the language should be more specific with respect to maintenance and inspection. Ms. Fortson suggested perhaps language that states *annual inspection shall be performed of the pervious pavement at the rear of the site.*

Ms. Brunner noted 2. a. states:

Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall

- i. *Schedule a pre-construction meeting with City Staff to review the project.*

She indicated that should say *Prior to the commencement of site work.*

Councilor Remy asked if the Applicant has seen the draft motion and had any concerns. Ms. Fortson stated that this language within the recommended conditions of approval was included in the agenda packet that went out to the Applicant. Mr. Brannon stated they have no issues with the annual inspection requirement.

Councilor Remy suggested striking 2. a. ii because it was already covered. Then, 2. a. i. moves to 2. b. Then, the rest are renumbered to make numerical sense.

This concludes Staff comments. The Chair asked for public comments, and with no comment from the public, the Chair closed the public hearing.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Kenneth Kost that the Planning Board approve PB-2024-16 as shown on the plan set identified as “Site Redevelopment Plans, Fairfield Kia of Keene” prepared by Fieldstone Land Consultants PLLC, at varying scales on October 18, 2024 and last revised on November 11, 2024 with the following conditions:

1. Prior to final approval and signature of the plans by the Planning Board 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 paper copies and a digital copy of the final plan set and elevations.
- c. Submittal of a security to cover the cost of sediment and erosion control measures, landscaping, and as-built plans in a form and amount acceptable to the Community Development Director and City Engineer.

d. Submittal of an updated grading plan with a note added stating that annual drainage inspections shall be performed, and documentation of such shall be submitted to the Community Development Department.

e. Submittal of draft easement language and any other legal instruments required for this application to the Community Development Department for review by the City Attorney's Office.

2. Subsequent to final approval and signature of the plans, the following conditions shall be met:

a. i. Schedule a pre-construction meeting with City Staff to review the project.

ii. Submit an approved flood plain development permit.

iii. Flag the 30-foot surface water buffer and contact planning staff to inspect to ensure compliance with the approved site plan and all City of Keene Regulations.

b. Submittal of an approved Alteration of Terrain Permit from the NH Department of Environmental Services, if deemed necessary.

c. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the new building, the applicant shall submit recorded copies of all necessary easements to the Community Development Department.

d. One year after the completion of construction, copies of all drainage reports and inspection materials shall be submitted to the Community Development Department.

e. Annual maintenance inspections of pervious pavement shall be performed, and documentation of such shall be submitted to the Community Development Department.

f. After landscaping has been installed, the applicant shall schedule an initial landscaping inspection with the Community Development Staff.

g. After 1 full growing season (a minimum of 1 year), Community Development Staff shall be contacted to schedule a final landscaping inspection.

The motion was seconded by Councilor Remy with clarifications.

Mayor Kahn stated it is good to see the property owner is interested in making this improvement. He felt this improvement follows a business plan that has been executed fairly well. The Mayor stated the landscaping exception is one item that was addressed well enough by staff and the Applicant. Mayor Kahn stated he does not see any problem with that issue. He went on to say he also does not see an issue with the extra parking at the front of the building. With reference to the pervious surface, stated he has been involved with this type of pavement construction in the past and it does not hold up over time and agreed with the need for inspection. The Mayor stated he was ready to vote in favor of the application but was interested in comments regarding the lighting issue.

The Chair asked whether the motion needs to be tabled to vote on the waivers. Ms. Fortson advised that the Board take a separate vote on each Waiver.

A motion was made by Councilor Remy to amend the motion to include a Waiver from Article 20.14.3.D of the LDC to allow parking in front of the new building. The motion was second by Sarah Vezzani.

Councilor Remy felt the intent of this language is targeted for parking. He noted this is a showroom for a car dealership and would place a hardship on the Applicant to have to hide their vehicles when their purpose is to sell cars.

The amendment carried on a unanimous vote.

The Chair stated the amendment to include parking in front of the building has now been included in the original motion.

A motion was made by Councilor Remy to amend the motion to include an approval of the Waiver from Section 21.7.3.C to allow for lighting levels above 0.1-foot candle at the property line and 1 foot candle at the public right of way. The motion was seconded by Mayor Kahn.

Mr. Kost asked whether the purpose of this waiver was for security. Ms. Brunner stated what is unique about this property is that the properties to the north and south used to all be one site. It was then subdivided in the 80s in which the property lines got drawn right down the middle of travel aisles. Those travel aisles still exist today and are proposed to be maintained. Part of the request is because cars will be traveling down the property line, and in order to keep the parking lot lighting safe and usable, lighting needs to cross the property line. With reference to the public right of way, the travel easement is along the front of the property, and the access for this property is actually from the property to the south. Therefore, a person would have to cross another property to get to this site. Because of where the pavement is and where the parking is in the front—consistent with the two properties on either side—is why the lighting would cross onto the public right of way.

The motion to allow for lighting levels above 0.1-foot candle at the property line and 1 foot candle at the public right of way line carried on a unanimous vote.

The Chair stated the amendment to allow for lighting levels above 0.1-foot candle at the property line and 1 foot candle at the public right of way has now been included in the original motion.

A motion was made by Councilor Remy to amend the motion to include language granting the approval of a Waiver Request from 21.7.4.1 Lighting Parking Lots related to exceeding 3.5 foot candles. The motion was seconded by Stephon Mehu.

The Chair asked for rationale for this waiver request. The Mayor asked what level is being exceeded. Ms. Brunner explained the Board has lighting standards for parking lots specifically, and has standards related to the average illumination; a lot cannot exceed 3.5-foot candles. There is also a uniformity ratio of 5:1. What the parking lot light level standard is trying to get at is not creating a situation where you have bright spots and dark spots. The regulations are geared towards creating a uniform light level across the city. The regulations keep light levels that are consistent with each other and are dark skies compliant. This specific standard is the 3.5 average

level. Presumably, the proposal meets the 5:1 uniformity ratio, just not the maximum average. She added the Applicant must submit a photometric plan that shows on a grid what the different light levels are in foot candles and use a software to calculate the average, which can't exceed 3.5.

The Chair reopened the public hearing.

Mr. Noonan addressed the Board and added the provided lighting plan photometrics has outlines of what each fixture is and is dependent on the type of fixture. The areas they are exceeding the most are areas that have overlapped between pole mounted lights and other fixtures. The ones that are on the right of way have a four throw, which have full cut-off fixture but nothing shines back towards Winchester Street; therefore, you end up with more of a condensed amount of light. The other area where the light exceeds is where customer parking is located near the building.

Mr. Noonan stated in working with the Corporate architect, they asked for higher levels as much as possible because they want security and higher display lighting. It has been noted that those lights would reduce by 50% after 10:00 PM.

Mr. Hoefler clarified that it is 11.8 foot candles at the front area. Mr. Noonan agreed and added the next highest would be near the building at 6.8 feet.

Chair Farrington asked for the overall average. Mr. Noonan stated it is broken down into areas: The front area (the display adjacent to the roadway), customer parking, and display at the front of the building and rear parking lot. The average at the front is 7.8. The average at the main parking lot display is 3.25. The average for the rear area is 1.65. The overall average would be around 4.0.

Mr. Kost clarified from staff what the Board's standard would allow for very bright lights. For example, if bright lights are in the middle of a parking lot, and the rest of the area is low with the average calculating to 3.5, it would be acceptable. Ms. Brunner stated there are two aspects that control the light level. The first is the maximum average; furthermore, in a photometric plan, if there are different parking areas the average will be calculated separately for each parking area. You calculate the average light levels and then the ratio of the average to the minimum light level gives you your uniformity ratio. Those together are what control the overall light levels. If there is a very bright light, it would be very hard to meet the rest of the standard.

Mr. Clements added the average has calculated at 4.2 instead of the required 3.5.

The Chair asked for public comment again. With no comment, the Chair closed the public hearing.

The Mayor noted at different times of the day and during different times of the year, the lighting would have a greater impact. He asked whether the motion should reflect that the Applicant would comply with the average foot candle from 10 pm on.

Mr. Clements stated if the reduced lighting plan is compliant with the reduced standards, that issue has been addressed. The reduced lighting plan would be complying with the requirement. It is just during the Applicant's operational window that the Applicant is seeking the relief from it. The Mayor stated he will feel better that the Board is approving an exception during a certain period of time of operation to assist the business. The Mayor stated the Board is taking into consideration the concerns of the neighborhood. Ms. Fortson stated the Applicant did not submit a reduced lighting plan, but as the Applicant noted on the plan that lighting will be reduced to 50% between 10 pm and 6 am.

Ms. Brunner added that this is the standard and the Applicant would be held to it even if it was not a note on the plan. She indicated the standard is already covered, but if the Board wanted to memorialize it in the motion it would be just another reminder for the Applicant that this is a requirement. The Mayor stated the exception is for a specific time of day, which is what the Applicant has requested. Mr. Clements clarified from the Mayor that the increased light levels is only during daytime operation until 10 pm. Mr. Clements continued by stating the light levels the Board regulations normally require during the overnight hours is that 50% reduction. He asked whether the Mayor was looking for a clarification in the waiver language to note the regulation that light levels must be reduced by 50% between 6:00 AM to 10:00 PM. The Mayor answered in the affirmative.

Councilor Remy asked whether the language in the motion could be amended to add language indicating light levels must be reduced between 6:00 AM to 10:00 PM in the waiver. Ms. Vezzani, the person who seconded the motion, agreed to adding this language.

Mr. Hoefler asked whether there should also be a maximum level included in the motion. Mr. Clements suggested adding not to exceed 4.5 average level. Councilor Remy felt the Applicant must be held to the light level they submitted.

The Board voted unanimously to approve the amended motion made by Councilor Remy and seconded by Ms. Vezzani.

The Board deliberated the overall motion.

With reference to regional impact, Councilor Remy stated even though this proposal is close to the property line for the city, he did not feel there was regional impact from this application. He added he also agrees to the alternative landscape plan as he felt requiring the Applicant to add trees at a car dealership would be an undue burden for the Applicant. He stated he is also glad to see easement language outlined on paper. He stated he is glad the Board is addressing the possible need for an Alteration of Terrain Permit based on Mr. Thatcher's letter.

Chair Farrington asked if anyone wanted to comment on the alternative landscape plan. With no comments from the board, Chair Farrington continued and asked if anyone wanted to weigh in on the visual appearance. Mr. Kost noted this is a commercial area with other car dealerships. It is an intense commercial area with lots of paving, and the building resembles the other buildings. He stated the building fits into that environment well.

The Chair noted Mr. Thatcher's letter, and stated the Board received the letter ten minutes prior to the meeting, which has been difficult to digest.

Mr. Hoefler stated, as a lay person, he would like comments from staff on this very technical letter. He continued, asking if most of the concerns in the letter been addressed. He asked if there are concerns in this letter that would need to be addressed. He asked if the Alteration of Terrain Permit would follow another process that would address these comments.

Ms. Vezzani stated she was comfortable adding language in the motion to indicate if an Alteration of Terrain Permit is deemed necessary it would be obtained. She raised the issue with the fuel storage tank. She stated if the tank is being moved and the Applicant would need to comply with proper regulations to do so, she is comfortable that it will be addressed based on the language in the motion already.

Mr. Kost stated he heard earlier that this item has been shared with the City engineer and other technical individuals. He expects that experts will be looking into this. He stated the Board was given this letter 10 minutes before the meeting, which is not sufficient time to digest contents of the letter. He added he cannot do much with this information and questioned if this is part of the package that is then being reviewed and will be incorporated at the level of experts.

Ms. Fortson responded by saying when engineering staff, specifically the City Engineer, are reviewing applications, they are reviewing them for compliance with the public infrastructure standards that are outlined under Article 23 of the Land Development Code. They are also looking for compliance with site development standards. They are not reviewing the proposal for compliance with Alteration of Terrain or any other DES State level permits that might be required. If that is necessary, that is at the State level the Applicant would be working at. This is not something that is under the purview of the Planning Board or the City Engineering Staff.

She went on to say when planning staff spoke to the City Engineer, he felt this proposal met the local regulations and the local site development standards. He did think that it could potentially require an Alteration of Terrain Permit, but he indicated he did not have the authority to say yes or no. If one is required, State Statute requires that the Community Development Department be included in that review process.

Ms. Brunner noted Mr. Thatcher, who wrote this letter, also met with the City Engineer to go over his comments. Hence, the City Engineer had plenty of time to digest these comments and understand them. They mostly relate to the Alteration of Terrain Permitting process. If one is required, the site would have to be reviewed again and re-designed.

Mayor Kahn sought to clarify that the Alteration of Terrain review would incorporate the number of comments that have to do with parking surfaces from Mr. Thatcher's letter.

Mr. Brannon stated it is very uncommon to receive a review letter of this nature at a local level. He stated in the last couple of days he has been discussing this issue with City Staff on how to move forward with this project. He stated he has also been addressing this issue with State Commissioners and Alteration of Terrain Personnel who he has been working with for well over

20 years. He felt this letter was unsolicited and unprecedented. He stated he, on behalf of Fieldstone Land Consultants, believe this project does not trigger an Alteration of Terrain Permit. However, if the project does require the permit, they will be happy to submit an application to the State. It is not their intention, ever, to avoid State permits.

Mr. Brannon stated this is a complicated site and would touch on a few aspects of the site. First, it is under the 100,000 square foot threshold. There is a 10 year look back and the 10 year look back pertains to properties. They have separate properties that break the 10 year look back. There is a redevelopment component. Mr. Brannon stated he does not believe the project falls under the redevelopment component because the properties have never been permitted or developed together. Mr. Brannon added it could very well be a difference of opinion at the State level, but they didn't feel like it was necessary to be debated this evening. He stated they would have welcomed Mr. Thatcher to their office to have a professional conversation with their engineering department. He stated they are not taking this issue lightly and believe the plan that they have designed meets all the City criteria and the City Engineer has supported that.

Mr. Brannon stated the timing of this project is critical. If they don't receive approval for this project prior to the end of the year, they don't qualify for corporate funding. He stressed, again, that they take the contents of the letter seriously and hope to have a productive conversation in the near future with the State. This concluded Mr. Brannon's comments.

Mayor Kahn clarified that there is a path forward on addressing concerns that have been raised late in the process. He clarified that Staff and the Applicant's engineering firm both agree that there is a pathway for a discussion of these items, and he is satisfied that this can be addressed in the future.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

The motion carried on a unanimous vote by the Board.

5) Master Plan Update (<https://keenemasterplan.com/>)

Ms. Brunner stated at the last Planning Board meeting she provided a recap of the Future Summit that was held on October 5th. There hasn't been a Master Plan Steering Committee meeting since then. The next meeting is going to be next week on Tuesday.

They have a couple of online discussion boards that have gone live. One is on housing, and the other is on the economy. There will be four more that will be launched soon. The hope is to get residents, people who visit Keene, people who work in Keene that may not live in Keene, and others to contribute with ideas. The plan is to take those comment and include them into the implementation section of the Master Plan.

Ms. Brunner stated they are also planning for office hours at the Public Library on December 11th, 12th and 13th for members of the public that are interested in talking about the project one-on-one with a staff person. There will be a TV screen to bring up the online discussion boards for those who may not have a computer at home or would like assistance navigating the online

discussion boards. Task forces for each of the six pillars have been formed and Staff will be holding an introduction meeting soon. Each of the task forces will be meeting three times throughout January and March 2025. Next, the results from those task force meetings will be fed back to the Master Plan Steering Committee for the Committee to consider building into the final plan.

The date for the second future summit has been scheduled for the first Tuesday in June. This would be the conclusion of the project before it starts the adoption process.

6) Training on Site Development Standards – Snow Storage, Screening, & Landscaping

Not Discussed

7) Staff Updates

Ms. Brunner stated that Emily Duseau is the new Planning Technician. She joined the department about three weeks ago.

Southwest Regional Planning Commission is holding a roundtable for citizen planners on December 5th.

8) New Business

None

9) Upcoming Dates of Interest

- Joint Committee of the Planning Board and PLD – December 9th, 6:30 PM
- Planning Board Steering Committee – December 3rd, 11:00 AM
- Planning Board Site Visit –December 11th, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed
- Planning Board Meeting – December 16th, 6:30 PM

10) Adjournment

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:11 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Emily Duseau, Planning Technician