

City of Keene
New Hampshire

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, March 28, 2022

6:30 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Pamela Russell Slack, Chair
Mayor George S. Hansel
Roberta Mastrogiovanni
Harold Farrington
Armando Rangel, Alternate

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner
John Rogers, Interim Community
Development Director
Evan Clements, Planner

Members Not Present:

David Orgaz, Vice Chair
Councilor Michael Remy
Emily Lavigne-Bernier
Gail Somers
Tammy Adams, Alternate

I) Call to Order

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

II) Minutes of Previous Meeting – February 28, 2022

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board approve the February 28, 2022 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Harold Farrington and was unanimously approved.

III) Boundary Line Adjustment

S-01-22 – Boundary Line Adjustment – 0 Gilbo Ave & 0 Commercial St – Applicant Fieldstone Land Consultants PLLC, on behalf of owner City of Keene, proposes a boundary line adjustment between the properties located at 0 Commercial St (TMP# 575-010-000-000-000) and 0 Gilbo Ave (TMP# 575-015-000-000-000). This adjustment would result in a transfer of 0.32-ac from the 0.56- ac parcel at 0 Gilbo Ave to the 1.6-ac parcel at 0 Commercial St. A waiver is requested from Section 25.10.8.B.2 of the Planning Board Regulations regarding the requirement to submit an updated survey showing all metes and bounds of the revised parcels. Both properties are located in the Downtown Growth and Downtown Core Districts.

A. Board Determination of Completeness

Senior Planner Mari Brunner stated the Applicant has requested exemptions from providing a separate grading plan, landscaping plan, lighting plan, and technical reports. After reviewing this request, staff have determined that exempting the Applicant from submitting this information would have no bearing on the merits of the application. In addition, the Applicant requests a waiver from providing an updated survey showing all metes and bounds of the revised parcels.

The submitted plan includes all the metes and bounds for 0 Gilbo Avenue but does not include the metes and bounds for all parcel boundaries of the property located at 0 Commercial Street. The Applicant submitted a written waiver request, which is included as an attachment to this staff report. In making a decision to accept this application as complete, the Board may wish to consider whether the missing information is necessary for the Board to complete its review.

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Board accept the application as complete. The motion was seconded by Harold Farrington and was unanimously approved.

The Chair stated before the applicant addresses this application, the Applicant would need to address their waiver request.

Mr. Michael Ploof of Fieldstone Land Consultants addressed Board on behalf of the City of Keene. He noted the City owns both these lots and referred to the lots on a plan. He noted the purpose of the plan is to adjust the common line between lot 575-15 (referred to in pink) and lot 575-10. Lot 575-15 is the current skate park which has a strip that goes up to Main Street. The first proposal is to add this portion to the Commercial Street lot. The south side of the skate park is also being proposed to be configured to be more rectangular in shape. He referred to two areas shown in orange, Parcels B and C, which are going to be added to lot 575-10. The area shown as Parcel A (small triangular sliver) will be added to lot 575-15 to make it the future rectangle shape.

The original acreage for the Commercial Street lot is 1.6 acres. After parcels B and C are added and Parcel A is subtracted, the area will change to 1.9 acres. The original acreage of the skate park lot 575-15 was 0.5 acres; after Parcels B and C are subtracted and Parcel A is added it will be 0.24 acres. Mr. Ploof stated there is development planned for this site in the future but nothing is being proposed with this application. This concluded his presentation.

The Chair went over the Board criteria for the Waiver as follows:

Strict conformity would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and the waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations.

Or specific circumstances relative to the site plan or conditions of the land in such site plan indicate the waiver would carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations.

Ms. Brunner noted what the Chair referred to is what the Board needs to find in order to grant the waiver request and asked if the applicant would like to address this issue.

Mr. Ploof explained the Commercial Street parking lot parcel is a larger and complicated piece of property consisting of various other parcels. In 1969, the Council laid this out as a public way and it has been modified from time to time for development in the area. Research of layouts, modifications, cross easements, etc. would require substantial time and effort and delay the development of the skate park and would have no bearing on this requested adjustment. He felt this causes an unnecessary hardship on the City and the entities supporting the skate park. During the development of Gilbo Avenue in the future, the City intends to modify Commercial Street and Wilson Street with a full property survey. As a result, the City requests the Planning Board grant the waiver and exempt the City from submitting a metes and bounds survey on lot 575-10.

The Chair asked for public next. There were no public comment on the waiver.

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board grant the waiver request. The motion was seconded by Harold Farrington and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Mr. Michael Ploof of Fieldstone Land Consultants addressed Board and referred to lots 575-10 (1.6 acres) and 575-15 (a little over 0.5 acres). The proposal is to revise the common line between the two lots, which would cause lot 575-15 to be 0.2 acres in size and the addition of parcels B and C to lot 575-10 would result in the parcel being 1.9 acres in size.

Mayor Hansel asked for clarification on the small sliver of land to the north. Mr. Ploof stated this is an existing condition and was part of the existing skate park lot, which includes a section of the rail trail. The Mayor asked why this could not be included with the new skate park lot. City Engineer Don Lussier in response stated this strip of land, which is about ten feet wide, is where the bike path is located. If it was to be transferred it would become detached from the overall public parcel and the rest of the rail trail.

Mr. Farrington referred to the portion to the south that would be subtracted from the skate park and asked whether this would cause any of the structures in the skate park to be modified. Mr. Ploof answered in the negative.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Brunner stated the bulk of the land swap would result from a transfer of the Cheshire Rail Trail portion of 0 Gilbo Ave to the property at 0 Commercial Street, making the skate park more rectangular. Both these parcels are located in the Downtown Growth District, with just the narrow extensions connecting to Main Street falling in the Downtown Core district. These districts don't have a minimum lot size.

Ms. Brunner noted there were no departmental comments on this application. The only two standards that would apply to this application are Traffic and Access Management – there are no changes proposed to the existing access to either property as part of this proposal. Surface Waters and Wetlands - no surface waters or wetlands are present on either site. This concluded staff comments.

Ms. Mastrogiovanni asked about future plans for this site. Ms. Brunner stated there are plans for the City to look at the Commercial Street parking lot which is not part of this proposal and hence it was not part of staff review.

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

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board approve S-01-22 as shown on the plan entitled “Lot Line Adjustment Prepared for City of Keene, 3 Washington St, City of Keene, County of Cheshire, State of New Hampshire” prepared by Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC at a scale of 1 inch = 30 feet on February 16, 2022 and last revised on March 9, 2022, with the following condition prior to signature by Planning Board Chair:

1. Owners’ signatures appear on the plan

The motion was seconded by Harold Farrington and was unanimously approved.

S-02-22 – Boundary Line Adjustment – 50 & 62 Rule St – Applicant Cardinal Surveying & Land Planning, on behalf of owners Elfriede Wagner & Pilot Realty LLC, proposes a boundary line adjustment between the properties located at 50 Rule St (TMP# 518-047-000-000-000) and 62 Rule St (TMP# 518-051-000-000-000). This adjustment would result in a transfer of 0.03-ac from the 6-ac parcel at 50 Rule St to the 0.21-ac parcel at 62 Rule St. A waiver is requested from Section 25.10.8.B.2 of the Planning Board Regulations regarding the requirement to submit an updated survey showing all metes and bounds of the revised parcels. Both properties are located in the Low Density District.

A. Board Determination of Completeness

Ms. Brunner stated the Applicant requests exemptions from submitting separate Existing and Proposed Conditions Plans that show the boundaries and acreage of the existing and proposed lots subject to review, a Grading Plan, a Landscaping Plan, a Lighting Plan, and Technical Reports. After reviewing this application, Staff have determined that exempting the Applicant from submitting this information would have no bearing on the merits of the application.

She further stated that, similar to the application the Board just reviewed, the Applicant has requested a waiver from Article 25 Section 10.8.B.2 of the Land Development Code regarding the requirement to submit an updated survey showing the boundary line adjustment and all metes and bounds of the revised parcels. The submitted plan includes all metes and bounds for the property at 62 Rule Street but does not include the metes and bounds for the property at 50 Rule Street. The Applicant has submitted a written waiver request, which is included in the Board’s packet.

Ms. Brunner stated in making a decision to accept this application as complete, the Board may wish to consider whether the missing information is necessary for the Board to complete its review.

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel to recommend the Board accept Application S-02-22 as complete. The motion was seconded by Councilor Harold Farrington and was unanimously approved.

The Chair reminded the Board the waiver request needs to be addressed first.

The Chair noted the Applicant has requested a waiver from Article 25.10.8.B.2 of the Land Development Code, which states that, "An updated survey showing the boundary line adjustment, and all metes and bounds of the revised parcels shall be prepared by the Applicant." Specifically a plan includes all metes and bounds for the property at 62 Rule Street.

The Chair invited the Applicant to address the waiver request.

Ms. Wendy Pelletier from Cardinal Surveying addressed the Board. She began by referring to a .21 acre parcel which was surveyed in the fall. The second parcel is 6 acres in size and the only portion the Applicant is concerned with is the .03 acres near the property boundary and felt conducting a survey on the entire parcel would be an undue burden on the owners. The request would have no effect on the abutters.

The Chair asked for public next. There were no public comment on the waiver.

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board grant the waiver request. The motion was seconded by Harold Farrington and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Ms. Pelletier from Cardinal Surveying referred to the existing residential lots on Rule Street, and stated these lots were taken out of the larger lot back in the 1920's. She referred to the lot in question, and noted that is smaller (not as deep) than the other lots. The house was built in the 20's and additions were added on at a later date that have gone over the lot line. The property was sold last year and upon sale is when it was realized the house was over the lot line. The request is to move the lot line to be in keeping with the other houses. The shed will still be over the line and will need to be moved. Ms. Pelletier noted what is being requested is to add the .03 acres to the .21 acres. She noted the building does not conform to the setback requirement but will be more conforming compared to what it was. This concluded Ms. Pelletier's comments.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Brunner stated the two properties that are the focus of this proposal are single-family lots in the Low Density District with frontage on Rule Street. There is no development being proposed at this time. The proposed boundary line adjustment would make it so that the house on the 62 Rule Street become more conforming. The minimum lot size in the Low Density District is 10,000 square feet.

She indicated prior to the adjustment, 50 Rule Street was 6 acres, but 62 Rule Street is 9,061 square feet, slightly under 10,000 square feet but it will be 10,539 square feet after the adjustment.

The only departmental comments are whether the shed was going to be moved and the Applicant has addressed that.

Ms. Brunner went on to say with respect to the Board's standards, the only standards that apply are Traffic and Access Management - There are no changes proposed to the existing access to either property. Hence, this standard does not apply.

Surface Waters & Wetlands - There are no known wetlands or surface waters present on either of the subject parcels, and there is no new development proposed as part of this application. Hence, this standard does not apply.

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

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board approve S-02-22 as shown on the plan entitled "Boundary Line Adjustment, Map 518-051-000 & Map 518-047-000, 50 & 62 Rule Street, Keene, NH 03431" prepared by Cardinal Surveying & Land Planning at a scale of 1 inch = 20 feet on February 15, 2022 and last revised on March 14, 2022, with the following condition prior to signature by Planning Board Chair:

1. Owners' signatures appear on the plan.

The motion was seconded by Roberta Mastrogiovanni and was unanimously approved.

IV) Public Hearings

SPR-927, Modification #11B – Site Plan – 2 Ash Brook Rd #12 – Applicant KPR Centers LLC, on behalf of owner Keene MZL LLC, proposes to renovate the north tenant space in the building located at 2 Ash Brook Rd #12 (TMP# 109-027-000-010-012) for use as a Panera Bread Restaurant with a drive-through window. This site is 1.64-ac in size and is part of the larger Monadnock Marketplace plaza located in the Commerce District

A. Board Determination of Completeness

Ms. Brunner stated the Applicant requests an exemption from submitting a Lighting Plan, a Drainage Report, a Soil Analysis, an Historic Evaluation, and a Screening Analysis. Staff recommend that the Board grant the requested exemptions and accept the application as complete.

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel to recommend the Board accept Application SPR-927 as complete. The motion was seconded by Councilor Harold Farrington and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Jim Phippard of Brickstone Land Use Consultants addressed the Board on behalf of Keene MZL LLC (Monadnock Marketplace). Mr. Phippard stated this proposal is to locate a new Panera Bread Restaurant at Monadnock Marketplace. He referred to an existing conditions plan and

referred to where Ash Brook Road, Ash Swamp Brook and Route 9 are located. To access this site the public comes down Ash Brook Road to a signalized intersection and takes a left to where the parking lot that serves the restaurant section and Price Chopper are located. He referred to where Olive Garden was located at the corner which opened in 2005 and was in business until 2015. This vacant building was removed and a multi-tenant building was constructed to locate “small shops”.

Panera Bread will locate at the north end of this building. With this space being occupied, there are changes being also proposed for the parking area to locate a drive thru lane. Mr. Phippard stated parking will be eliminated on the west side of the building to create an outdoor seating area. There will be 70 seats inside the restaurant. The parking area will be reconfigured to create a drive thru in the north. The drive thru will be able to accommodate 10 to 11 cars.

Mr. Phippard noted there are parking spaces being eliminated but per zoning for this entire “small shop” building only 47 spaces are required, there are 81 spaces still remaining.

The existing dumpster will be relocated and will be well screened with a six foot high solid wood fencing and will be located away from the drive thru. There is also a dedicated delivery area being created for this site.

Because of the change to parking, drainage was reviewed. Lot coverage is being decreased and green space is being increased by about 200 square feet which will reduce run off. This is the reason for requesting an exemption from providing a drainage report.

Landscaping – Mr. Phippard referred to newly created landscaping for the site. Two trees and shrubs will be located to buffer the cars sitting in the queue lane. There is additional plantings also being proposed along Ash Brook Road.

Lighting – The existing light poles are not being changed. There are wall packs being added to the building only. Applicant is requesting an exemption from providing an additional lighting plan because the lighting is not being changed.

A traffic report was provided at the request of staff. Mr. Phippard stated he did not submit a traffic report initially because he did not feel it was necessary and went on to explain the drive thru is within the Monadnock Market Place and if traffic ever backed up beyond the queue it backs up onto private property not onto the City street. He added going from a 200 seat Olive Garden Restaurant to the retail stores and this 70 seat restaurant, did not justify the need for a traffic report. Staff requested a traffic report, hence the Applicant hired a traffic engineer to complete a traffic study. He added because Panera has other sites in New England they have data for drive thru sites and these numbers are far less than what the ITE Manual estimates. The traffic engineer went with the ITE numbers to provide much more conservative numbers. Even with these artificially high numbers there is no concern for traffic safety on NH Route 9 and Ash Brook Road.

There is no change to snow storage – it will be hauled off site.

There is no change to water and sewer – the existing facilities will be utilized.

There will no impact to surface water and wetlands.

Architecture – The architectural theme is being maintained; cornice work, brick columns are all part of the original architectural theme the Board approved in 2015. The only thing being changed is the color away from the red brick and terracotta where this tenant spaces is going to be located. Panera is going with darker colors. The color of the awning is also being changed. The glass windows and doors will remain in the same location. This concluded Mr. Phippard's presentation.

Mr. Farrington clarified the traffic report is now part of the application. Mr. Phippard answered in the affirmative.

The Chair asked for public comment next.

Mr. Edward Haas of 114 Jordan Rd asked about flooding in this area and the date of the flood maps that were used for drainage purposes for the original design. Mr. Phippard stated there was no flooding at Monadnock Market Place. He explained before Monadnock Market Place was developed this property was identified as part of a split floor floodway where Ash Swamp Brook was obstructed by a culvert flowing under Route 9 and in a 100 year flood event, water would over top the embankments and pass across this property. The flood study done in 1985 was not correct – incorrect information was used to develop the topography. They modeled the flooding of this property as a three foot wall of water when it reached the intersection of Routes 9 and 12 but it didn't cross the highway. It was known this was incorrect, but there were no funds to correct the error.

The flood model was amended using correct topographic information; this was done by Konover Development and was incorporated in the 2006 FEMA flood maps that are utilized by Keene. This property is no longer in the 100 year floodplain, it was removed because of the incorrect modeling. He added there has been no flooding in this area that he is aware of.

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

Staff comments were next. Ms. Brunner stated this proposal is for 12 Ash Brook Road #12 is located on the northwest corner of the NH Route 9 and Ash Brook Road intersection. It is part of the larger, 70.5-acre Monadnock Marketplace development, in the former location of the Olive Garden Restaurant.

With respect to Drainage, as the Applicant noted, there is going to be an overall reduction in the impervious surfaces and hence the Applicant has requested an exemption from providing a Drainage Report, and staff felt this was reasonable given the reduction of impervious surface.

Sediment and Erosion Control - During construction, the Applicant is proposing to install silt fencing along the south end of the disturbed area and silt socks at all existing catch basins. In addition, the perimeter of any stockpiles will be protected with silt fencing, and they will be

seeded and mulched if left in place for more than 21 days. Post-construction, Sheet N1 of the plan set specifies that all finished graded areas shall be seeded, fertilized, and mulched within 72 hours of finish grading. This standard appears to be met.

With respect to Snow Storage and Removal, there are no changes being proposed.

Landscaping - The Applicant proposes to install a mix of 31 shrubs and 36 perennials and no existing trees are proposed to be removed. During construction, the Applicant proposes to protect the root system of existing trees by installing temporary fencing. This standard appears to be met.

Screening – Ms. Brunner stated the Applicant has described the type of screening that would be installed for the dumpster. In addition, there is a rooftop equipment being proposed which will be screened by an existing roof parapet and will be setback 20 feet from the edge of the roof.

With respect to Lighting - the Applicant proposes to install six wall-mounted lights, including four on the north façade along the drive-through and two on the west façade. The proposed light fixture is an LED wall sconce with an Antique Bronze finish. The color temperature of the proposed light fixtures is 3000K and the color rendering index is 90, which exceeds the Board Standard. Hence, the Applicant has requested an exemption from providing a photometric plan as no changes to the existing parking lot lights.

With respect to Traffic and Access Management, the Applicant submitted a Trip Generation Analysis prepared by VHB, which concludes that the proposed restaurant with a drive through window would not change the trip generation estimates for the previously approved Small Shops building as there would be no change in the overall square footage of the building. In addition it looked at the queue lengths for the drive-thru and notes that the 95th percentile drive-through queue length would reach a maximum of 6 vehicles, assuming a 2-minute processing time at the pickup window; the franchisee estimates a processing time of 1 minute. This is also assuming that during the peak hour, about 30% of total customer transactions will occur at the drive-through window. The study concludes there will only be a maximum of six vehicles, and the drive thru can accommodate 10-11 vehicles.

Ms. Brunner further noted, there are no changes proposed to the access to the site. With respect to internal traffic flow, the only area of concern is the break in the drive thru lane where trucks could drive thru to get to the dumpster but this will be striped off to indicate vehicles cannot block this area while waiting in the queue line.

There are no surface waters present on the site; however, Ash Swamp Brook is located about 300 feet to the west and the proposed development is outside the Surface Water Protection buffer and the Shoreland Protection Area.

There are no known hazardous or toxic materials on the site.

Architecture and Visual Appearance – Ms. Brunner noted she has included images of what is existing and the excerpts from the elevations to compare the two. As the Applicant noted, the only thing that is changing are the colors.

This concluded staff comments.

Mayor Hansel noted when evaluating this building the Board is considering as part of the site plan just the Panera Bread site and does not include the other attached retail spaces. Ms. Brunner stated this is the only section of the building that is proposed to have any changes, the rest is proposed to remain as it was approved in 2015. The Mayor noted this is an existing site plan the Planning Board approved in 2015 with all those spaces included in that approval, but the Board is considering just this space and added the reason he is raising this question is because of the change in color and the Board's standard as it relates to visual appearance. Ms. Brunner stated this would be something the Board would need to decide – whether the proposed changes does not fit with the overall building. She indicated staff only looked at this tenant space as this was the only part of the building that was changing.

Mr. Phippard stated he would like to offer some consideration for the Mayor; he noted the store fronts down Main Street are all attached. Over time businesses are changing their appearance to brighter colors in an effort to stand out and identify as a separate entity. Mr. Phippard felt this was no different in a multi-tenant building. The Mayor stated he does not disagree it is consistent with how it is in other areas in the City with businesses with varied colors schemes. He stated he wanted to internalize how as a Planning Board member he would review this, as this was approved under a prior plan. He stated he was in agreement to what is being proposed.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board approve SPR-927, Modification #11B for renovations to the northern tenant space in the Small Shops building located at 2 Ash Brook Road #12, as presented in the plan set identified as “Panera Drive Thru-Lot 16B” prepared by Brickstone Land Use Consultants and SVE Associates at a scale of 1 inch = 20 feet on February 18, 2022 and last revised on March 4, 2022 with the following conditions prior to signature by Planning Board Chair:

1. Submittal of security for erosion control, landscaping, and as-built plans in a form and amount acceptable to the City Engineer.
2. Owner's signature appears on the plan.

Mr. Farrington noted the motion refers to the last revision as March 4 but the letter from VHB is dated for March 11 and asked for clarification. Ms. Brunner stated that letter came in after the plan but it did not alter the plan itself.

The Mayor felt the design for the drive-thru was a smart design. The Chair agreed.

The motion was seconded by Harold Farrington and was unanimously approved.

Change of Governmental Land Use – RSA 674:54 regarding a proposed salt shed on the former City landfill property located 0 Main St (TMP# 113-007-000-000-000). The 23.1-acre parcel is owned by the City of Keene and is located in the Industrial District.

The Chair began by stating per RSA 674:54 the Planning Board received notification from the City of Keene regarding the relocation of the City salt shed to the 0 Main Street property, which is the former Keene landfill. She added any comment from the Board is non-binding.

City Engineer Don Lussier and Lee Dexter, Civil Engineer were the next two presenters. Mr. Lussier reminded the Board about the location of the Froling Energy facility at 560 Main Street. He indicated this discussion arises out of that project. Mr. Lussier stated the City sold a portion of its landfill at 560 Main Street as well as the existing salt shed. The terms of the sale the City has is that they were permitted to continue using the salt shed until December 2022. Mr. Lussier stated the City chose 0 Main as the option for the relocation of the salt shed because the surrounding uses are industrial in nature. The activity will be moved just 1,000 feet to the east. He further stated this site is not likely to be developed for any better use because of its prior use as a landfill.

He indicated the City was able to develop this project in manner to avoid environmental impacts by staying out of wetland areas and flood plain areas. Mr. Lussier stated this project has been developed to comply with Planning Board Standards to the maximum extent possible. The Standards that were not met were because they were impractical or undesirable. Because this is a landfill and has soil contamination as well as groundwater contamination, it is not desirable to infiltrate groundwater as it would push it to different areas of the site. For this reason and because the impervious surface is being increased, the total maximum rate of discharge is being increased slightly (less than a cubic foot per second).

Mr. Lussier went on to say the City is not submitting a formal landscaping plan or lighting plan. This is not a site open to the public, it is used only by City employees who drive to the site to conduct City business.

In terms of Developmental Standards:

Drainage is being increased by 0.88 cubic feet per second this is due to an increase to impervious surfaces. The ground in this area is compacted gravel, which is impervious, but not at a high rate. Through discussion with the New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT), the proposed site plan will drain (at the north) about half of the drainage towards the NHDOT right of way. There are well defined grass swales between the abutting property and Route 101 which the City is taking advantage of - this will act as a vegetated buffer. Drainage of the southern end will follow the existing storm water pattern and flow to the south and east until it reaches the Branch River.

Sedimentation and Erosion Control – This is a relatively flat site and hence does not present any significant challenges.

Snow Storage – The City is providing some snow storage but this site is also used as a snow dump.

Landscaping – The northern line is well screened already with evergreen and deciduous trees. The northwest corner is a little sparse and will be filled in with evergreens.

Lighting – The site does not have electricity and electric is not being run to the site. Lighting will be done on a task purpose essentially using solar. There will be a few solar street fixtures to light the area where equipment is loaded and where employees will be accessing the building.

Water and Sewer – There will be no water and sewer utilities on site.

Traffic and Access Management – Access is through the right of way across the Froling property. The unpaved portion will be paved. There will be no change to the traffic pattern.

Wetlands and Surface Water – There are wetlands on the parcel but they are at a good distance to the east from this activity.

Hazardous and Toxic Material – This is a former closed landfill area and there is known to have contaminated groundwater and soils in the project area and hence the City is trying to minimize activity on site, instead will be bringing the grade up by about two feet by reusing material on site.

Noise – No changes are being made to the operation, operations are just being moved 1,000 feet to the east. There have been no noise issues on site.

Architecture and Visual Appearance – Mr. Lussier referred to a similar type of building. The project is going to be bid out. He noted there will be a slight difference to the shape of the arch. It will be a steel building with fabric cover, available in different colors. The building will be about 100 feet long. He further referred to an equipment storage shed – today equipment storage is part of the salt shed, a wood frame structure. A 30' x 80' pole barn structure with four garage bay doors, each door will be 12 feet wide, will be located as well. This is for storage of Public Works equipment. It will be located on the eastern side of the salt shed building. Mr. Lussier stated with reference to color, he prefers white so day light would come into the building. He asked for the Board's opinion on the color options, which all cost the same.

This concluded Mr. Lussier's comments.

Chair Slack said she prefers the gold color, and noted the white color might get dirty. Mayor Hansel asked for the life span of the fabric being used. Mr. Lussier stated it is guaranteed for 20 years.

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

V. Minor Project Review Committee Membership

The Chair noted that members nominated to the Committee are listed on page 79 of the packet. Ms. Brunner said that for regular members, Deputy Fire Chief Jeff Chickering will be replacing Captain John Bates. For Alternates there will be two new members, Evan Clements, Planner and Deputy Fire Chief Donald Farquhar. Ms. Brunner stated this is a temporary fix and there is a permanent solution staff will be discussing in the next few months.

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel to approve the slate of Minor Project Committee members as presented. The motion was seconded by Harold Farrington and was unanimously approved.

VI. Staff Updates

Ms. Brunner introduced new Planner, Evan Clements.

VII. New Business

• Update to the Planning Board Rules of Procedure

Ms. Brunner stated at a future meeting staff would like to propose an update to rules of procedure that were last updated in 1990. In addition, staff would like to build the process for membership on the Minor Project Review Committee into the Board's rules of procedure so that specific individuals are not named. The City Attorney has suggested having members be representatives from specific departments; this will help with quorum when employees leave the City's employment or go on vacation.

VIII. Upcoming Dates of Interest – April 2022

- Joint Committee of the Planning Board and PLD – April 11, 6:30 PM
- Planning Board Steering Committee – April 12, 11:00 AM
- Planning Board Site Visit – April 20, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed
- Planning Board Meeting – April 25, 6:30 PM

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

Respectfully submitted by,
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Mari Brunner, Senior Planner