



## **City of Keene Minor Project Review Committee**

### **AGENDA**

**Thursday, November 16, 2023**

**10:00 AM**

**City Hall, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Council Chambers**

- I. **Call to Order** – Roll Call
- II. **Minutes of Previous Meetings** – November 2, 2023
- III. **Final Vote on Conditional Approvals**
- IV. **Staff Updates**
- V. **New Business**
- VI. **Upcoming Meeting Dates**
  - Pre-submission Meeting – December 7, 2023 at 9:00 am
  - 1<sup>st</sup> Monthly MPRC Meeting – December 7, 2023 at 10:00 am
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Monthly MPRC Meeting – December 21, 2023 at 10:00 am (*If needed*)

1 **City of Keene**  
2 **New Hampshire**

3  
4  
5 **MINOR PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
6 **PRE-SUBMISSION MEETING MINUTES**  
7

8  
9 **Thursday, November 2, 2023**

10 **9:00 AM**

11 **2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room,**  
12 **City Hall**

13 **Members Present:**

14 John Rogers  
15 Jesse Rounds  
16 Chief Don Farquhar  
17 Don Lussier  
18 Med Kopczynski

19 **Staff Present:**

20 Megan Fortson, Planning Technician  
21 Evan Clements, Planner  
22 Lt. Shane Maxfield, Police Dept.  
23 Mike Hagan, Plans Examiner

24  
25 **1) Call to Order – Roll Call**

26 Chair Rounds called the meeting to order at 9:02 AM. Roll call was conducted.

27  
28 **2) Scheduled Pre-submission Inquiries**

- 29 a. **Conceptual Site Plan** – The 9.5-ac parcel at 678 Marlboro Rd (TMP #241-107-000) is  
30 owned by Keene Mini Storage LLC and is located in the Industrial District.

31 Rob Hitchcock of SVE Associates was present at the meeting to discuss a potential new building  
32 and site plan modification on the Keene Mini Storage property at 678 Marlboro Rd (TMP #241-  
33 107-000). City Staff asked questions and provided feedback to Mr. Hitchcock about the proposal.

- 34 a. **Conceptual Subdivision & Surface Water CUP** – The 11-ac parcel at 186 Gunn Rd  
35 (TMP #205-013-000) is owned by Peter & Ashley Greene and is located in the Rural  
36 District.

37 Sam Ingram of Meridian Land Services was present at the meeting to discuss a potential  
38 subdivision and Surface Water Protection Conditional Use Permit (CUP) of the 11-ac parcel at  
186 Gunn Rd (TMP #205-013-000). City Staff asked questions and provided information to Mr.  
Ingram about the review process for the potential project.

39  
40 **3) Walk-In Pre-submission Inquiries**

41 There were no walk-in pre-submission inquiries.

42  
43 **4) Upcoming Meeting Dates**

- 44 • Pre-submission Meeting – December 7, 2023 at 9:00 am  
45 • 1<sup>st</sup> Monthly MPRC Meeting – December 7, 2023 at 10:00 am  
46 • 2<sup>nd</sup> Monthly MPRC Meeting – December 21, 2023 at 10:00 am (*If needed*)

39

40 **5) Adjournment**

41

42 There being no further business, Chair Rounds adjourned the meeting at 9:39 AM.

43

44 Respectfully submitted by,  
45 Megan Fortson, Planning Technician

46

47 Reviewed and edited by,  
48 Jesse Rounds, Community Development Director

1 City of Keene  
2 New Hampshire

3  
4  
5 MINOR PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE  
6 MEETING MINUTES  
7

Thursday, November 2, 2023

10:00 AM

Council Chambers, City Hall

Members Present:

Don Lussier  
Jesse Rounds, Chair  
John Rogers  
Don Farquhar  
Med Kopczynski, Vice Chair

Other Staff Present:

Megan Fortson, Planning Technician

8  
9 **1) Call to Order – Roll Call**

10  
11 Chair Rounds called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM. Roll call was conducted.  
12

13 **2) Minutes of Previous Meetings – June 1, 2023; July 6, 2023; August 3, 2023; and October**  
14 **5, 2023**

15  
16 Mr. Rogers made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of June 1, 2023. Mr. Kopczynski  
17 seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.  
18

19 Mr. Lussier made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of July 6, 2023; August 3, 2023; and  
20 October 5, 2023. Mr. Rogers seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.  
21

22 **3) Final Vote on Conditional Approvals**

23  
24 Megan Fortson, Planning Technician, stated that the project ready for a vote on final approval is  
25 SPR-881, Modification #2, the site plan for the new Ramunto's restaurant, going into the building  
26 at 342 Winchester St. She continued that prior to final approval, the following precedent  
27 conditions of approval needed to be met by the applicant:  
28

- 29 - Have the property owner's signature on the proposed conditions plan  
30 - Submit five paper copies and one digital copy of the final plan set  
31 - Submit a paper copy and digital copy of the color elevations, showing the dimensions of  
32 the building and the proposed screening mechanism for the electric meters  
33 - Submit documentation satisfactory to the City Engineer that the existing drainage system  
34 was installed and functioning as approved under the original site plan from 1999

- 35 - Submit a revised site plan showing dumpster screening, the location of the existing  
36 landscaping that was going to be relocated, and the protection of the sprinkler room and  
37 fire connection areas, subject to approval by the Fire Chief.  
38

39 Ms. Fortson stated that all of these conditions precedent have been met.  
40

41 Mr. Rogers made a motion to issue the final approval for Site Plan 881, Modification #2. Mr.  
42 Lussier seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.  
43

44 **4) Public Hearings**

45  
46 **A) SPR-10-23 – Site Plan – Duplexes, 661 Main St - Applicant and owner the**  
47 **Wayne E. Brown Jr. Rev. Trust proposes to construct two duplexes that are**  
48 **each ~2,070 sf in size on the property at 661 Main St (TMP #120-056-000). The**  
49 **parcel is 0.70 ac and is located in the Low Density District.**  
50

51 Chair Rounds introduced SPR-10-23 and asked to hear from staff regarding the application  
52 completeness.  
53

54 Ms. Fortson stated that the applicant exemption requests from submitting the following: a lighting  
55 plan, a drainage report, traffic analysis, soil analysis, historic evaluation, screening analysis, and  
56 architecture and visual appearance analysis. She continued that staff believes that granting these  
57 exemptions would have no bearing on the merits of the application and recommends the MPRC  
58 accept the application as complete.  
59

60 Mr. Kopczynski made a motion to accept the application as complete. Mr. Lussier seconded the  
61 motion, which passed by unanimous vote.  
62

63 Chair Rounds asked if the MPRC needs to address DRI (Development of Regional Impact) for  
64 this. Ms. Fortson replied that it certainly could not hurt. Chair Rounds stated that the question is  
65 whether this project has any regional impact, in staff's view. Ms. Fortson replied that staff's  
66 recommendation is (to find that) the project does not meet the threshold for being reviewed as a  
67 Development of Regional Impact. She continued that the MPRC can make that determination  
68 during the discussion of the application. They do not need to vote.  
69

70 Mr. Rogers stated that this is a proposal to replace what was a four-unit building, four dwelling  
71 units, and he therefore sees no impact, or no increase in impact to what was there prior to this  
72 application.  
73

74 Chair Rounds stated that he thinks it is worth taking a vote, just to be clear. He continued that this  
75 is required as part of the review for every new project. Mr. Lussier asked him to explain what a  
76 DRI is. Chair Rounds replied that NH RSA requires the Planning Board or the MPRC to determine  
77 whether the development as designed would have "regional impact." He continued that it is a

78 nebulous term. In reviewing a DRI, the Board would look at whether the subject parcel is on the  
79 border with another town, or large enough to impact traffic in another town, or change how the  
80 planning would happen in an adjacent town, etc. Mr. Lussier asked if this is a new requirement.  
81 Chair Rounds replied no, it has been around for a while. He continued that the RSA is nebulous  
82 and does not give any sort of criteria for what counts as “regional impact.” He asked for a motion.  
83

84 Mr. Rogers made a motion to (find) that this project does not have a regional impact. Mr.  
85 Kopczynski seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.  
86

87 Chair Rounds asked to hear from the applicant.  
88

89 Taylor Shulda from Stevens & Associates stated that Stevens & Associates has been working with  
90 Wayne (Brown) on the site plan. He continued that he would go through the site plan. The existing  
91 conditions plan shows the conditions on the site before the building was removed. A paved  
92 driveway comes off Rt. 12/Main St. and across the site to access the garage. There is a paved  
93 walkway off that, then the old multi-unit home that was there.  
94

95 Mr. Shulda continued that the proposed site plan is relatively simple. They are seeking to build  
96 two duplexes to replace the four units that existed in the building that burned down. Parking at  
97 the site will be up to current standards. They will add four parking spaces on the east side of the  
98 paved driveway and tenants will have access to four additional covered spaces in the existing  
99 garage. They will add landscaping in the front and add a fence along the southeast side of the  
100 project site, mainly for privacy for the tenants, so that passing vehicles cannot see directly into the  
101 windows, for example. It would be some kind of screening. A small dumpster will replace the  
102 one that existed in the back of the site at the end of the driveway. They propose screening that  
103 with a small stockade fence. There will be a couple concrete entrances to access the buildings  
104 with stairs leading up to them. There will also be concrete stoops with handrails.  
105

106 Mr. Shulda stated that for the utility plan, it is a little jumbled, because in the basement of the  
107 former building there is a firewall, so the utilities have to penetrate the basement in two locations  
108 for each building. He continued that they spoke with the Public Works Department and got  
109 recommendations for materials and connection preferences for the underground utilities. There is  
110 slight grading on the site. At the north edge of the property between the garage and one of the  
111 units, they are proposing a small stormwater pond for a lot of the roof runoff.  
112

113 Mr. Kopczynski asked if they will screen the property from the church parking lot to the southeast.  
114 Mr. Shulda replied that (the plan) has a line showing the proposed screening. He continued that  
115 while it is not fully screened from the whole church parking lot, the majority of it is. The intention  
116 is to mainly screen for the tenants, from the road, which has many people passing by.  
117

118 Mr. Kopczynski stated that he heard something about a fence and landscaping. He asked if he  
119 heard correctly, or if it will just be a fence. Wayne Brown replied that they will either fence [or  
120 have] arborvitaes. He continued that he spoke with the church. He has a good relationship with

121 them. It was never blocked off before. Mr. Kopczynski replied that he understands, and is very  
122 familiar with the property. Mr. Brown continued that he has to decide whether he thinks trees  
123 would look more attractive, or a fence. Mr. Kopczynski replied that he does not think the MPRC  
124 has a preference. He was just asking as a clarifying question.

125  
126 Mr. Kopczynski asked if the MPRC knows or needs to know the colors of the building, or the  
127 materials. Ms. Fortson replied that the applicant submitted elevations and that is something he  
128 could speak to. Mr. Brown replied that it will be a grayish blue just like it was before, with vinyl  
129 siding, white trim, and a black roof. He continued that the doors on the entryways will be separated  
130 approximately four feet apart. They will build steps with the proper railings and an overhang.

131  
132 Mr. Rogers stated that the elevations show the right elevation as a blank wall. He asked if one of  
133 the blank walls will face Main St. Mr. Shulda replied that each building that is facing the road  
134 will have windows facing the road. Mr. Rogers asked if the left elevation shown in the plans will  
135 be facing the road on both buildings. Mr. Shulda replied yes.

136  
137 Mr. Rogers stated that the site plan shows decks off the backs of the houses. Mr. Shulda replied  
138 that those will be concrete platforms; there is secondary egress off the back there. Mr. Rogers  
139 replied that the plan says, "provide wooden deck and stairs." Mr. Brown replied that for safety  
140 purposes he thought he would do a 12' x 10' concrete pad. He continued that it will be 12' in  
141 length because approximately 2-3' of that will be taken by the stairs and rail. That way they will  
142 be at ground level so there will be no chance of someone falling off the back. Mr. Rogers asked  
143 if that means he will be building a patio off the back. Mr. Brown replied that is correct.

144  
145 Mr. Shulda stated that the only lighting proposed for the site will be entrance lighting, fully  
146 downcast, night skies compliant, with LED bulbs.

147  
148 Mr. Lussier stated that he wanted to double check something, related to the utility connections.  
149 He continued that Section 22.1.4 (of the Land Development Code) says, "*Any infrastructure that*  
150 *serves two or more residential parcels shall be public.*" Currently, they have the water and sewer  
151 going into one parcel, with the two buildings on it, which is completely acceptable in the Code.  
152 He wants to point out that if there is any intention in the future to subdivide this and sell it as two  
153 different duplexes that would not be possible with the way the utilities are currently configured.  
154 Each building, each parcel, would need to have its own connections to the water and sewer if he  
155 wanted to subdivide in the future.

156  
157 Mr. Brown replied that he was going to have separate meters for each of the duplexes, and  
158 obviously, separate electrical utilities for each duplex. He continued that that way, if he did decide  
159 to sell it, it would be sold as one. He does not know if they could be sold as condominiums or if  
160 he would just sell the whole property, but he does not think he would come before the Planning  
161 Board and try to subdivide. That is not the plan.

162

163 Mr. Lussier replied that as long as it is one parcel – and a condominium would still be considered  
164 one parcel – it is acceptable the way it is. He continued that regarding the metering, he does not  
165 know if Mr. Brown or Mr. Shulda has talked with water meter staff (in the City). Mr. Brown  
166 replied that he did, and they did not seem to have a problem with it.

167  
168 Mr. Rogers stated that he sees a proposed shed on the site plan, to be built by owner in the future.  
169 He asked what the use would be. Mr. Brown replied lawnmowers, a snow blower, and other  
170 maintenance materials. He continued that to have the property made whole again is what he was  
171 proposing. Depending on how the insurance works out, if there were enough money left over to  
172 build that, he would like to. Mr. Rogers asked if it is correct that the shed would be an accessory  
173 use on this property, for materials that Mr. Brown would need on the property, and/or for his  
174 tenants to use as storage. Mr. Brown replied yes. Mr. Rogers stated that the shed would not  
175 become a business. Mr. Brown replied absolutely not.

176  
177 Mr. Lussier stated that the site plan shows the sewer connection being cored into an existing sewer  
178 manhole. He asked if there is a reason they are doing it that way. Mr. Shulda replied that they  
179 were trying to avoid disturbing that new road, as much as possible. He continued that secondly,  
180 according to the City employee they talked with, the old sewer connection was an old pipe they  
181 had trouble locating. The connection was not ideal. Mr. Lussier replied that the reason he  
182 mentions the sewer manhole is that per RSA, connecting at a manhole requires a sewer connection  
183 permit from the State. He continued that it is just an extra step in the process. If they were  
184 connecting into the sewer mainline, they would not need to go through that.

185  
186 Chair Rounds asked if the MPRC members had any further questions. Hearing none, he asked for  
187 public comment. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing and asked for further discussion from  
188 the MPRC.

189  
190 Mr. Rogers stated that he wants to reiterate that this (development) will be replacing what was  
191 occurring on this lot. He continued that as nice as the big farmhouse and barn were, it is not what  
192 is being built today for dwelling units, and he thinks this is a good compromise. This project had  
193 to go to the ZBA to change things a little bit. In the Low Density District, Mr. Brown would have  
194 had the ability without going to the ZBA to build a big, four-unit building. In his opinion, this is  
195 proposal is more in character with the neighborhood, which is mostly single-family homes. There  
196 are some multi-family homes, but most are one- or two-family homes. This will be more fitting  
197 to the neighborhood than the previous building was.

198  
199 Ms. Fortson stated that as a reminder, it is the intent behind the MPRC that if there is anything the  
200 MPRC feels needs to be addressed as part of this application, such as questions about where  
201 utilities will be located or the need to see updated plans showing something different, the  
202 application should be continued. She continued that it would be better to continue the application  
203 and allow the applicant the opportunity to fix anything on their plan that needs to be fixed, to make  
204 sure there will be a satisfactory site plan, than to approve the application with a laundry list of  
205 precedent conditions of approval. That is something to keep in mind as they deliberate.

206  
207 Mr. Lussier replied that in terms of the issues he raised, it is up to the applicant. He continued that  
208 he does not see anything here that cannot be approved as is, but the applicant might want to change  
209 the way they are doing some things, based on how they want to use the property.

210  
211 Mr. Rogers asked what the process would be if this were to be approved today, and then the  
212 applicant decided to not connect the sewer line into that manhole and changed the location of the  
213 sewer line as shown on this plan. He asked if that would be something for administrative approval,  
214 or what the path would be for that approval.

215  
216 Ms. Fortson replied that if, for example, the MPRC decided to approve the application as is, and  
217 then when the building permit is submitted the applicant decides to change the location of  
218 something like that, it depends on what the scope of the changes are. (Things like) changes to the  
219 siding, or small changes to the exterior of the building, could just be noted in the project folder as  
220 changes. However, if they were changing something (larger) like all of the utilities, that is  
221 something they would have to document, either through an administrative application or a return  
222 to the MPRC.

223  
224 Mr. Rogers stated that given that feedback from staff, he would be comfortable approving this  
225 application as submitted today.

226  
227 Chair Rounds asked if any MPRC members had concerns they might need a continuance for, or if  
228 anyone wanted to make a motion.

229  
230 Mr. Lussier made the following motion, which was seconded by Mr. Rogers.

231  
232 On a vote of 5-0, the Minor Project Review Committee approved SPR-10-23 as shown on the plan  
233 entitled "Layout and Planting Plan" prepared by Stevens & Associates, PC at a scale of 1 inch =  
234 20 feet, on October 13, 2023 and last revised on October 17, 2023, with the following conditions  
235 precedent prior to final approval and signature of the plan by the Minor Project Review Committee  
236 Chair:

- 237  
238 - Owner's signature shall appear on the site layout plan.  
239 - The submittal of five paper copies and a digital copy of the final plan set and elevations.

240  
241 **5) Adoption of 2024 Meeting Schedule**

242  
243 Chair Rounds stated that the proposed 2024 meeting schedule is in the agenda packet.

244  
245 Mr. Lussier made a motion to approve the proposed schedule of meetings. Mr. Rogers seconded  
246 the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

247  
248 **6) Staff Updates**

249

250 Chair Rounds asked if staff had any updates. Ms. Fortson replied no.

251

252 7) **New Business**

253

254 None.

255

256 8) **Upcoming Meeting Dates**

257

258 • **November** - 2nd Monthly MPRC Meeting – November 16, 2023 at 10:00 am (*if*  
259 *needed*)

260 • **December** - Pre-submission Meeting – December 7, 2023 at 9:00 am

261 • **December** - 1st Monthly MPRC Meeting – December 7, 2023 at 10:00 am

262 • **December** - 2nd Monthly MPRC Meeting – December 21, 2023 at 10:00 am (*If*  
263 *needed*)

264

265 9) **Adjourn**

266

267 There being no further business, Chair Rounds adjourned the meeting at 10:30 AM.

268

269 Respectfully submitted by,

270 Britta Reida, Minute Taker

271

272 Reviewed and edited by,

273 Megan Fortson, Planning Technician