

City of Keene
New Hampshire

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, August 23, 2021

6:30 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Pamela Russell Slack, Chair
David Orgaz, Vice Chair
Mayor George S. Hansel
Councilor Michael Remy
Emily Lavigne-Bernier
Tammy Adams, Alternate

Staff Present:

Rhett Lamb, Community Development
Director/Assistant City Manager
Tara Kessler, Senior Planner

Members Not Present:

Andrew Weglinski
Roberta Mastrogiovanni
Gail Somers
Harold Farrington, Alternate

I) Call to Order – Roll Call

Chair Russell Slack called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and roll call was taken.

II) Minutes of Previous Meeting – May 24, 2021

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel to approve the May 24, 2021 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded Councilor Michael Remy and was unanimously approved.

III) Boundary Line Adjustment

S-04-21 – Boundary Line Adjustment – 147 & 157 Gilsum St – Applicant Monadnock Land Planning, on behalf of owners Michael Pappas and Eunice Pappas of 147 Gilsum St (TMP# 530-057-000) and Michael Pappas of 157 Gilsum St (TMP# 530-056-000), proposes a boundary line adjustment between the two properties. This adjustment would result in a transfer of 3,777 square feet (sf) from the 13,658 sf parcel located at 147 Gilsum St to the 35,817 sf parcel located at 157 Gilsum St, and a transfer of 359 sf from the 157 Gilsum St parcel to the 147 Gilsum St parcel. Both properties are located in the Low Density District.

A. Board Determination of Completeness

Senior Planner Tara Kessler recommended accepting this application as complete.

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel to recommend the Board accept Application S-04-21 as complete. The motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Mr. David Bergeron addressed the Board on behalf of the applicant and began with reference to an existing conditions plan which showed the current configuration of the lot on 147 Gilsum Street. The second plan he displayed was the boundary line adjustment and he drew attention to the proposed configuration of the lots. The small area on the rear of 147 Gilsum St will be added to 157 Gilsum Street and there will be a small portion of 157 Gilsum Street that will be added to 147 Gilsum Street.

Mr. Bergeron noted the applicant had requested a few exemptions from application submission requirements as there were no physical changes proposed to either property. At this time, the proposal is for a reconfiguration of property lines. Mr. Bergeron noted a fence that crosses over the property line of 147 Gilsum Street onto 157 Gilsum Street. The proposed adjustment would place the fence entirely on the 147 Gilsum Street property. There is some extra room being added to 157 Gilsum Street for the location of a garage that is proposed to be built sometime in the future. This concluded the applicant's comments.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Kessler provided a brief overview of the boundary line adjustment. She indicated when the abutter notices were mailed, it referenced a different amount of land area that was proposed to be transferred. She explained that the applicant submitted a revised plan after the notices were mailed. The mailed notice referenced a transfer of 1,382 sf of land, whereas the revised plan, which is before the Board this evening, references a transfer of 3,777 sf of land. Ms. Kessler noted that she consulted with the City Attorney as to whether the application should be re-noticed, and he did not think it was necessary.

Ms. Kessler noted that the proposal is in compliance with the Low Density District zoning requirements. If the adjustment is approved, both lots would be greater than 10,000 sf.

She noted that no new development is being proposed at this time, and that the owner is aware of the wetlands present on the 157 Gilsum Street property and they have been noted on the plan. If new development is proposed it would have to be in keeping with the surface water protection ordinance which calls for a 30-foot buffer from the edge of the wetlands.

The Chair asked for public comment next.

Karen Silverman and Warren Salzburg were the first to address the property from 142 Gilsum Street. She noted that they now live on Robbins Road but rent the two family home at 142 Gilsum Street. Ms. Silverman stated the surface water protection ordinance is their biggest issue. She indicated receiving a certified letter which contained mis-information is also of concern to them and felt their neighbors might not understand the extent of this adjustment because of what is outlined in the letter. The letter they received indicates 1,322 square feet which would go from

147 Gilsum Street to 157 Gilsum Street but the agenda refers to 3,777 square feet being transferred.

Ms. Silverman stated they were also under the impression that 147 Gilsum Street was .28 acres in size but the agenda has it at .31 acres.

She noted they were against this adjustment because of the surface water protection ordinance that will go into effect on September 1, 2021 – the property being transferred from 147 Gilsum Street to 157 Gilsum Street will allow for a building behind 147 Gilsum Street which would not be permitted prior to September 1, 2021. She recalled the owners being denied zoning to construct in the past and felt this was a way to get around that.

Ms. Silverman stated they do not believe the transfer is to construct a garage rather to construct a residential rental unit behind 147 Gilsum Street.

Chair Russell Slack asked for staff comments on the surface water protection ordinance. Ms. Kessler stated as of September 1 when the Land Development Code goes into effect the surface water protection ordinance as it exists today will continue to exist, except today all surface waters are to be excluded from the minimum lot size calculation. After September 1, this is no longer a requirement. Ms. Kessler noted what is before the Board today is a boundary line adjustment not a subdivision. If the property is to be subdivided, there would need to be adequate road frontage as well as minimum lot size. The current land area is over 30,000 square feet which meets the minimum lot size, but there could be additional dimensional restrictions for future a subdivision but this review would be for a different hearing.

With respect to the notice issue, staff did discuss this issue with the City Attorney, while there is a difference between the land area proposed to change in the notice and from what was included on the agenda for the meeting, the notice provided to abutters is to advise abutters that there is a matter before the Planning Board and it is up to the abutters to follow the application as it goes through the course. The Attorney did not feel it was a substantial difference to cause a re-notice.

As to whether another residential dwelling unit would be permitted on either on these lots – the answer would be in the negative. The owner would need to seek a variance from the Zoning Board to allow for any additional units. If there was to be another lot proposed in the future that would be subject to a subdivision and at that time the Board would review a subdivision application which would also be a public hearing.

Ms. Silverman addressed the Board again and stated they agree with everything staff just stated. She felt abutters are being disadvantaged because the applicant had indicated they would like to place some sort of building on the adjacent lot.

She felt the applicants were good landlords but they do have some concerns but stated they would not like to see a sprawling apartment complex with multiple buildings etc.

Mr. Lamb in response stated there could be an additional structure on 157 Gilsum Street but it won't be a dwelling unit; it could be a garage or out building, which would not through Planning Board review – it would go through the zoning and building permit process.

Ms. Silverman asked whether the applicants would be permitted to construct an accessory dwelling unit on 157 Gilsum Street after the boundary line adjustment. Mr. Lamb stated it could

not be a free standing building. Ms. Silverman noted the applicants have indicated they would like to construct a garage but there is already a garage on 157 Gilsum Street.

Mr. Bergeron added the applicant is aware this property is zoned low density and will require a variance from the zoning board if additional units are to be located. They are also aware the frontage on 157 Gilsum Street is about 95 feet and the low density zone requires 60 feet and to subdivide the lot that requirement would be 120 feet (which does not exist) and hence a variance from the zoning board would be required. Mr. Bergeron added the reason for this adjustment is to locate a garage not to construct a second unit

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

Mayor Hansel stated he did not want the public to have the impression the Planning Board is not listening but the Board has to look at what is directly in front of them not future intentions.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board approve S-04-21, as shown on the plan entitled “Boundary Line Adjustment of Map/Lots Map-530 Lots-56 & 576, 147 & 157 Gilsum Street, Keene, NH” prepared by Graz Engineering, LLC at a scale of 1 inch = 30 feet on July 14, 2021 and last revised on August 12, 2021, with the following condition prior to signature by Planning Board Chair:

1. Owners’ signatures appear on plan

The motion was second by Councilor Michael Remy and was unanimously approved.

IV) Public Hearing

SPR-04-21 – Site Plan – 122 & 124 Water St – Applicant Hundred Nights Inc., on behalf of owner Green Diamond Group LLC, proposes to construct a 15,000-sf building for use as a homeless shelter and other associated site improvements on the properties located at 122 Water St (TMP# 585-027-000) and 124 Water St (TMP# 585-028- 000). The 122 Water St site is 0.33-ac in size. The 124 Water St site is 0.29-ac in size and is located in the Downtown Historic District. Both properties are located in the Business Growth and Reuse District, Sustainable Energy Efficient Development Overlay, and Downtown Railroad Property Redevelopment Districts.

A. Board Determination of Completeness

Senior Planner Tara Kessler recommended accepting this application as complete.

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel to recommend the Board accept Application S-04-21 as complete. The motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Mr. Jim Phippard of Brickstone Landuse Consultants addressed the Board on behalf of 100 Nights Inc and Green Diamond Group. He noted this application is to construct a new homeless shelter in Keene. He referred to a proposed rendering, and to the location of the site at the corner of Water Street (city street) and Community Way (private road through the Railroad property).

Both parcels on this application are owned by Green Diamond Group and the intent is to sell both properties to 100 Nights. Both parcels are in the Business Growth and Reuse (BGR) District. 124 Water Street (the eastern most parcel) is in the Historic District – both parcels are also in the SEED Overlay District and Railroad Land Development Overlay District as well. Both properties will be merged, and the existing building will be demolished. The property has a curb cut from Water Street as well as from Community Way.

The site plan being proposed is to remove the existing buildings, merge the lots and construct a three story building (15,000 square feet floor area) with a 5,000 sf footprint. The curb cut to Water Street will be closed leaving a pedestrian access only from the existing sidewalk. The driveway off Community Way will be expanded to the north and will lead to a proposed parking area. There will be 24 parking spaces on site. 48 beds are being proposed, the current parking requirement is one space per two beds.

Mr. Phippard noted this is not an expansion of 100 Nights but rather a consolidation of facilities located on Lamson Street, St. James Church, and the basement of the UCC Church. There will also be a resource center located on this new site. The site is half an acre in size and the applicant will be adding landscaping that does not exist today. Street trees are being proposed along the edge of Water Street and one on the edge of Community Way. During the site visit there was a suggestion to change the trees from pin oaks to linden which is better for pollination – the applicant has no objection to that. On site a variety of fruit trees are being proposed. Foundation plantings are being proposed around the building.

Mr. Phippard stated this property is not mapped as being located in the 100 year flood plain. He did not feel this was accurate as the property has flooded in the past. The FEMA flood map indicates the elevation of the rail trail prevents flood waters from Beaver Brook getting to this site. Because of the elevation of Water Street, flood waters do enter this site and have flooded this site in the past at elevation 475. The current ground elevation is 473 feet above sea level. Mr. Phippard stated because a flood permit is not required the applicant is raising the elevation of the first floor of the building to 476.1. They are also regrading around the site to balance the cut and fill.

Mr. Phippard noted to the large green space on the southeast corner of the property which would be a turned into a courtyard area for residents to congregate during the morning.

The applicant is proposing to surround the property with a six foot tall fencing except for the curb cut. On September 1 this is part of the land area that will be rezoned to downtown growth district which permits homeless shelters but there are specific regulations for this use and one of those is the installation of a six foot tall fence for outdoor activity areas.

There will be building mounted lights at each of the access points. There will also be five overhead lights on poles adjacent to the parking lot and one in the court yard. The lighting will be LED full cut off fixtures.

This site is serviced by city water and sewer and the lines on Water Street are adequately sized for this site. This building will have a sprinkler for fire protection.

Mr. Phippard review the differences in estimated traffic generation between the previous use of Tom's Auto (repair garage) versus the proposed use of 100 Nights (homeless shelter). He explained that 100 Nights will not generate a lot of traffic as most residents who visit this site don't own a car. Traffic will be generated by staff, volunteers and deliveries and this is about a third of the traffic generated by Tom's Auto use.

With respect to pedestrian access to the site, Mr. Phippard noted that the applicant does not want the residents to be encouraged to go into the residential neighborhood in the area. Most residents will be coming from downtown via Railroad Square, the Rail Trail/Railroad Development and into the site. As a result what was suggested is to install a midblock crosswalk to connect the existing sidewalk along Community Way to the site. This crosswalk would be approximately 150-feet to the north of the intersection of Water St and Community Way. However, staff indicated it is contrary to City policy to have a sidewalk mid-block. Mr. Phippard stated he in turn suggested one similar to what is located on Winchester Street with a speed table. He added the speed tables that exist now on Community Way are very effective. He added that after speaking to abutters, who are not in favor of the midblock crosswalk, they have decided to withdraw the request for a crosswalk on Community Way.

Mr. Phippard noted adjacent to the Railroad land is a site that has soil/groundwater contamination. In 2010 a phase 1 environmental site assessment was done and discovered MTBE and arsenic which exceeded allowable levels in the groundwater at this location. This year the phase 1 study was upgraded and a copy of the study has been submitted to city staff. This site is in the Brownsfield Program. A Phase 2 site assessment is underway which will outline the final remediation.

Mr. Phippard noted that there are no wetlands, stump dumps or surface waters on the property. He explained that a detailed drainage report was completed. There are no catch basins currently on this site. The applicant will be locating catch basins on the property with additional capacity to treat storm water. The location of the catch basins would increase the rate of runoff from 2.6 cubic feet per second to 2.8 cubic feet per second during the peak period, but the amount of runoff from the site will be reduced.

Mr. Phippard noted that the proposed architecture and visual appearance of the building is similar to City Side Apartments directly adjacent to the site. He noted that the Historic District approved the proposed design and appearance of the building. The first two floors would have painted cedar siding and the top floor would contain vinyl siding. It would be an energy efficient building to keep with the City's zoning requirement for 3-story buildings in the Business Growth and Reuse District.

This concluded Mr. Phippard's comments.

Councilor Remy asked whether there are any other requirements that would go into effect as of September 1 that are not included in this application. Mr. Phippard referred to staff to clarify but added the screening has been added, there is approval received from the Historic District and felt this site would be in compliance with the new zoning.

Mayor Hansel asked whether the applicant tried to match the siding with what exists on the City Side apartment building. Mr. Phippard stated they looked at surrounding buildings before the design was put in place and felt the architecture has found a good balance with what already exists. The Mayor asked about the material being used. Mr. Phippard stated the wood siding is similar to what is in the area and has a warranty of 50 years. He indicated only the top floor would have vinyl treatment. He felt this site balances well with City Side Apartments.

Chair Russell Slack asked whether there should not be more lighting at the rear of the site and wasn't sure about the lighting in the basketball courts and whether that would help this site. Mr. Phippard noted the light fixtures being proposed which are LED full cutoff fixtures match City Side Apartments – he indicated the lighting will be inside the fence. The Chair expressed concern with not having lighting outside the fence. Mr. Phippard stated this is not the applicant's land and locating lighting here would be in violation of the Board's development standards. He felt the applicant's property is lit adequately to address public safety.

Chair Russell Slack asked about the energy features on the property. Architect Christina O'Brien in response stated the plan for energy efficiency is still in design stage but some of the items being proposed are continuous air barriers and weather resistant barriers; high efficiency building envelope insulation; high efficiency HVAC system; air source heat pumps; energy recovery throughout the building; high efficiency LED fixtures; low flow plumbing; high performance windows and doors; and energy star appliances.

Chair Russell Slack asked whether there were plans to add solar. Ms. O'Brien stated the roof is being designed for solar, but this might not happen right away.

Ms. Adams referred to the north side of the property boundary and asked who owned that land and asked about lighting in this location. Mr. Phippard stated this land area was owned by Railroad Land Development and locating lighting here would need to be approved by this abutter.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Kessler addressed the Board and began by noting the variance for locating a hundred shelter use in this location was approved by the Zoning Board of Adjustment last year, and that the Historic District Commission approved the appearance of this building and the demolition of the existing buildings on site at its meeting in July. She noted that since this new building was reviewed by the Historic District, Standard 19 is not the purview of the Planning Board for this application.

With respect to drainage, Ms. Kessler stated that City staff agree with the applicant that there will be a reduction of stormwater on site and this standard has been met.

With respect to flooding, she explained that the applicant has indicated this property is not in the flood zone but has voluntarily agreed to raise the first floor of the building a foot above elevation, and this standard has been met.

With respect to landscaping, she noted that street trees are being proposed along Water Street and Community Way and a mixture of perennials and fruit trees are proposed for the interior of the site.

Ms. Kessler noted that a six-foot tall fence being proposed along the entire perimeter of the parcel and the applicant is doing this to be in compliance with the Land Development Code which will take effect September 1.

Ms. Kessler noted that the pole mounted lights and the fixtures and light levels proposed are in compliance with the Board's standards.

Ms. Kessler noted that the applicant has shown that there will be a reduction of vehicle trips coming in and leaving the site compared to the prior auto use that was on this site.

With respect to access management, Ms. Kessler noted that staff agrees the path of travel for this site is going to be via the Railroad property from downtown. Ms. Kessler explained the reason staff is not in support of the crosswalk on Community Way is because the crosswalk will be 150 feet from a controlled intersection and the City does not support mid-block crossing due to safety concerns. It is also because Community Way is a private road on City land, it is not a public right of way. Separate approvals would be required for this to happen from the both the City and the Railroad Land Development LLC.

Ms. Kessler noted that a Phase 1 assessment has been completed and Phase 2 is underway through the Brownfield Program.

Ms. Kessler noted that there will be trucks entering and exiting the site during construction and the applicant has noted their main route of travel via Community Way, Water Street, Grove Street to Marlboro Street, roundabout to Route 101 and south on Route 12 – this route has been reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Division.

Ms. Kessler noted that the Historic District reviewed and approved the proposed design of the building at its July meeting, and hence standard 19 is not part of the Planning Board's review. She explained that this site is in the BGR District, and to have a third story it has to be built according to green building standards and the applicant has agreed to do so. Once construction is complete a third party review is necessary – this will need to be a condition of approval.

The Chair asked for public comment. Ms. Kessler noted there were emails from the public regarding this application that have been emailed to the Board. However, there was an email that came into the department from David and Judy Bell which is also in support of this application.

With no public comments, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Councilor Remy asked whether the gate could remain closed when it is not in use. Mr. Phippard clarified it was the gate on Water Street and agreed they had no problem having this gate closed when it is not in use. Mr. Lamb stated this item be added as a condition of approval.

A. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board approve SPR 04-21 as shown on the plan set entitled “Proposed Hundred Nights Shelter, 122 & 124 Water Street, Keene, New Hampshire” prepared by Brickstone Land Use Consultants on July 16, 2021 and last revised on August 9, 2021 at a scale of 1” equals 20’ with the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature by the Planning Board Chair:
 - A. Submittal of security for landscaping, erosion control measures, and an “as-built” plan in a form and amount acceptable to the Community Development Director and City Engineer.
 - B. Submittal of a revised plan set that removes the proposed mid-block crosswalk/speed table on Community Way.
 - C. Submittal of documentation that the properties at 122 and 124 Water Street have been voluntarily merged.
 - D. Submittal of documentation that Green Diamond Group LLC has granted the right to use the temporary right-of-way that is Community Way to Hundred Nights Shelter.
 - E. Owner’s Signature of Plan.
2. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall submit documentation from a qualified third party reviewer that the as-built project has achieved the proposed green building rating system, which is a requirement to have a third story in the Business Growth and Reuse Zoning District per Sections 102-771.4 and 102-771.3 of the Zoning Ordinance.
3. That the gate to the interior of the site on Water Street remain closed when not in use.

The motion was seconded and was unanimously approved.

Change to Planning Board Site Plan Regulations:

The City of Keene Community Development Department proposes to amend the Keene Planning Board regulations related to the review of Major Site Plans to require that any Major Site Plan application for new buildings or additions to buildings, which are younger than 50 years old, that are located in the Downtown Historic District, be reviewed and commented on by the Historic District Commission prior to the Planning Board closing the public hearing on the application. This proposed amendment would affect Sections 25.1.10 and 25.12.8.B, and Table 25-1 of the adopted City of Keene Land Development Code, which will become effective on September 1, 2021.

Ms. Kessler stated this item is specifically to address a concern raised by the Historic District Commission during their review at their public hearing on proposed changes to their regulations

as part of the Land Development Code. By the time this change was proposed, the Planning Board had concluded its public hearing on changes to their regulations that would be brought into the Land Development Code.

One of the changes made to the Historic District Regulations with the Land Development Code was that new construction and buildings younger than 50 years old located in the downtown district would be exempt from the Historic District Regulations. The Historic District Commission asked however, that an added step be included by the Planning Board to give the Commission the opportunity to comment on Major Site Plan applications for new construction or additions to buildings younger than 50 years that are proposed to occur within the Historic District. Major Site Plan review would be required by the Planning Board for new buildings that would be over 5,000 square feet in gross floor area or new additions that are greater than 15% of the gross floor area. She reiterated that these Major Site Plan applications would go before the Historic District Commission for their review and comment prior to the Planning Board's public hearing.

Ms. Kessler noted a similar example exists with the Surface Water Ordinance, where Surface Water Protection Conditional Use Permits go to the Conservation Commission for a recommendation prior to the Planning Board's vote.

The proposed change would be added as a statement to the Historic District Commission's roles and responsibilities and also will be added under the section for major site plan review.

This proposed change would also be before the Joint Committee at its September session to review an ordinance proposing amendments to the Land Development Code.

The Mayor stated he was not in favor of this request and understands why the Commission wants this step. He felt this request goes against what has been done with the Land Development Code update; to streamline items and make things easier for developers and applicants. This process makes it necessary for the applicant to have to go before yet another Board.

Mr. Lamb stated the referral would be informal and the applicant would not necessarily have to attend this meeting. The Historic District Commission would play an advisory role to the Planning Board and even though it has the perception of another step it is not a binding step. Mr. Lamb stated this came up as the final step in the adoption process of the Land Development Code.

Chair Russell Slack stated she will not be in support of this request either. Councilor Remy asked whether there was a way to make this optional – if it would benefit the applicant in some way. Staff did not feel optional could be something that should be added in to the regulations.

The Chair asked for public comment – with no comment from the public, the Chair closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board amend Sections 25.1.10 and 25.12.8.B, and Table 25-1 of the adopted City of Keene Land Development Code related to

the review of Major Site Plans to require that any Major Site Plan application for new buildings or additions to buildings, which are younger than 50 years old, that are located in the Downtown Historic District, be reviewed and commented on by the Historic District Commission prior to the Planning Board closing the public hearing on the application.

The motion was seconded by Councilor Remy.

The motion failed on a 1-5 vote with Tammy Adams voting in favor.

Mr. Lamb explained by the Board failing to pass this motion it equates to the Board taking no action. At this point the process stops. He further stated what the Board at this point needs to do is to take an affirmative action on it. Mayor Hansel asked why an affirmative action was necessary as this was a recommendation to the Board to change its own standards but the Board does not want to change them. Mr. Lamb stated what the Board did was it failed to pass motion and did not take action on this item, the item is being left to expire. Mr. Lamb felt this was adequate but will come back to the Board after reviewing this item with the City Attorney. Ms. Kessler stated this item will come back as part of the public workshop for the ordinance that was submitted to City Council. Councilor Remy asked if the item was rejected tonight, if it could left out of the Joint Committee agenda. Ms. Kessler stated at the Joint Committee it would be recognized that the Planning Board did not adopt this change.

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel to reject the staff proposed changes of the Planning Board Regulations. The motion was seconded by Councilor Remy. The motion carried on a 5-1 vote with Tammy Adams voting in opposition.

V) Minor Project Review Committee
a. Review of Committee Roles and Responsibilities
b. Appointment of Members

Ms. Kessler stated the Board has in its packet an overview of the role of the Minor Project Review Committee. She explained that the Planning Board created this Committee as part of the Land Development Code as a body to review and approve minor site plans. She reviewed the thresholds for minor and major site plans in the new code. These thresholds are included in Section 25.12 of the Land Development Code. She reminded the Board that this Committee would be composed of staff that currently have experience reviewing site plans. The purpose for this agenda items is for the Board to appoint members to serve on this Committee in time for September 1, when the Land Development Code becomes effective.

Chair Russell Slack stated a lot of work was put into this item. Councilor Remy asked what the makeup of this committee was going to be. Mr. Lamb stated it would consist entirely of staff as per the Statute. Mayor Hansel clarified this was a common practice in other municipalities. Ms. Kessler agreed that it is; some communities use this committee as an advisory body, whereas in other communities it serves as decision making body.

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board appoint the following individuals to serve on the City of Keene Minor Project Review Committee:

Regular Members:

1. John Rogers, Building / Health Official

2. Rhett Lamb, Community Development Director / Assistant City Manager
3. Don Lussier, City Engineer
4. Captain John Bates, Fire Prevention Officer
5. Med Kopczynski, Economic Development Director

Alternates:

1. Michael Hagan, Plans Examiner
2. Kürt Blomquist, Public Works Director
3. Tara Kessler, Senior Planner

The motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy and was unanimously approved

VI. Community Development Director Report

Mr. Lamb stated the Land Development Code is becoming effective on September 1. He explained that the Planning Boards Regulation are in Articles 19, 20 and 25 of this Code. As there will be amendments to the Code in the near future, staff is waiting for these to be adopted before printing copies of the Code for the Board.

VII. New Business

No new business was addressed at the meeting.

VIII. Upcoming Dates of Interest – September 2021

- Planning Board Steering Committee – September 14, 11:00 AM
- Planning Board Site Visit – September 22, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed
- Planning Board Meeting – September 27, 6:30 PM
- Joint Committee – September 13, 6:30 PM

There being no further business, Chair Russell Slack adjourned the meeting at 8:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Tara Kessler, Senior Planner