



City of Keene Planning Board

AGENDA

Monday, December 18, 2023 6:30 PM City Hall, 2nd Floor Council Chambers

- I. **Call to Order** – Roll Call
- II. **Minutes of Previous Meeting** – November 13, 2023 & November 27, 2023
- III. **Final Vote on Conditional Approvals**
- IV. **Adoption of 2024 Meeting Schedule**
- V. **Master Plan Steering Committee – Continued Discussion**
- VI. **Staff Updates**
- VII. **New Business**
- VIII. **Upcoming Dates of Interest**
 - Joint Committee of the Planning Board and PLD – January 8th, 6:30 PM
 - Planning Board Steering Committee – January 9th, 11:00 AM
 - Planning Board Site Visit – January 17th, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed
 - Planning Board Meeting – January 22nd, 6:30 PM

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

3
4
5 **PLANNING BOARD**
6 **MEETING MINUTES**
7

8 **Monday, November 13, 2023**

6:00 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Harold Farrington, Chair
David Orgaz, Vice-Chair
Mayor George S. Hansel
Roberta Mastrogiovanni
Armando Rangel
Kenneth Kost, Alternate

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner

Members Not Present:

Councilor Michael Remy
Emily Lavigne-Bernier
Ryan Clancy
Randyn Markelon, Alternate
Gail Somers, Alternate
Tammy Adams, Alternate

9
10 **I) Call to Order – Roll Call**
11

12 Chair Farrington called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM and a roll call was taken.
13

14 **II) Final Vote on Conditional Approvals**
15

16 Senior Planner, Mari Brunner, addressed the Board and stated there are two projects ready for final
17 approval. The first one is the Whitcomb Mills CRD Subdivision & Surface Water CUP
18 applications, S-03-23 & SWP-CUP-02-23. This project was conditionally approved in May by the
19 Planning Board with a number of conditions precedent. There were standard conditions that were
20 required for this application, such as having the owner’s signature on the plan; the submittal of a
21 check for the recording fee; and the submittal of full sized copies of the plans. There was also a
22 condition related to the inspection of lot monuments by the Public Works Director or their
23 designee, or in lieu of that, the submittal of a security in an amount deemed satisfactory to the
24 Public Works Director to ensure that the monuments will be set. Ms. Brunner stated that this
25 condition precedent still has not been met; however, staff is recommending that the Planning Board
26 still move forward with issuing final approval and making this a condition subsequent to final
27 approval that will need to be met prior to the issuance of any sort of City permits.
28

29 She noted the cost of the security for setting monuments is pretty low compared to the security
30 that will need to be submitted to the Public Works Department for the construction of the road,
31 which is going to be much more expensive. The applicant is aware of this, and they are in support
32 of this requirement.

33
34 The other conditions included the submittal of written draft documentation of any legal instruments
35 required for this application, which shall be subject to review and approval by the City Attorney.
36 This condition did take a while to meet, but the documents have been reviewed by our City
37 Attorney and he is comfortable with them and feels that they are in accordance with the Planning
38 Board's regulations, specifically in regard to the protection of the open space land. The applicant
39 has revised the plan to indicate no cut zones on all land within 30 feet of designated surface waters
40 and this has also been incorporated into the HOA documents.

41
42 Other precedent conditions of approval included adding a note on the plan regarding fire
43 suppression and obtaining approval from the Keene City Council for all necessary waivers from
44 Article 22 of the Land Development Code for the proposed new street design – this has also been
45 completed. The last condition precedent, #9, was related to obtaining approval from the City
46 Council for the layout of the new street and posting adequate security for the construction of the
47 same to be approved by the City Engineer and Community Development Director and this has also
48 been met.

49
50 A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board issue final approval for S-
51 03-23 and SWP-CUP-02-23 with the following condition subsequent to final approval:

52 1. Prior to commencement of site work or the issuance of any City permits associated with
53 this project, security in an amount deemed satisfactory to the Public Works Director shall
54 be submitted to ensure that lot monuments will be set.

55 The motion was seconded by David Orgaz and carried on a unanimous vote.

56
57 Ms. Brunner stated there is a second item for final approval if the Board was willing to approve it
58 as well. This is for the Boundary Line Adjustment, S-10-23, between the Aroma Joe's site and
59 Granite State Carwash. This application had a few precedent conditions of approval related to
60 having the owner's signature on the plan; completing an inspection of the lot monuments or the
61 submittal of a security to cover the cost of this inspection; the submittal of a revised BLA plan
62 reflecting the voluntary merger of 364 West Street and 12 Pearl Street; the submittal of four full
63 sized paper copies and two mylar copies of the final plan; and the submittal of a check to cover
64 recording fees. All of these conditions precedent have been met.

65
66 A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board issue final approval for S-
67 10-23. The motion was seconded by David Orgaz and carried on a unanimous vote.

68
69 **III. Staff Updates**

70 Ms. Brunner stated that the Mayor will be bringing names up for the Board's consideration for
71 individuals to serve on the Steering Committee for the Master Plan update. The committee will
72 start meeting in early 2024 and the City is still in the process of selecting a consultant for the

73 project. She explained that depending upon how this process goes, it could affect the start time of
74 the project, but that they're anticipating starting in early 2024.

75

76 **III) New Business**

77 None

78

79 **IV) Next Meeting – Monday, November 27th at 6:30 pm**

80

81 **V) Adjournment**

82

83 There being no further business, Chair Farrington adjourned the meeting at 6:10 PM.

84

85 Respectfully submitted by,
86 Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

87

88 Reviewed and edited by,
89 Megan Fortson, Planning Technician

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

3
4
5 **PLANNING BOARD**
6 **MEETING MINUTES**
7

8 **Monday, November 27, 2023**

6:30 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Harold Farrington, Chair
David Orgaz, Vice-Chair
Mayor George S. Hansel
Councilor Michael Remy
Emily Lavigne-Bernier
Roberta Mastrogiovanni
Armando Rangel
Ryan Clancy
Kenneth Kost, Alternate
Randyn Markelon, Alternate

Staff Present:

Jesse Rounds Community Development
Director
Mari Brunner, Senior Planner
Evan Clements, Planner

Members Not Present:

Gail Somers, Alternate
Tammy Adams, Alternate

9
10 **1. Call to Order – Roll Call**

11
12 Chair Farrington called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and a roll call was taken.
13

14 **2. Minutes of Previous Meeting – October 23, 2023**

15
16 A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board approve the October 23,
17 2023 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy and was
18 unanimously approved.
19

20 **3. Final Vote on Conditional Approvals**

21
22 Chair Farrington stated as a matter of practice, the Board will now issue a final vote on all
23 conditionally approved plans after all of the “conditions precedent” have been met. This final vote
24 will be the final approval for the project and will start the 30-day appeal clock.
25

26 Senior Planner, Mari Brunner, stated there were no applications ready for final approval at
27 tonight’s meeting.
28

29 **4. Extension Request**

30 **1. S-04-22 & SPR-04-22 – Conservation Residential Development Subdivision and**
31 **Site Plan – 0 Drummer Rd – Applicant Fieldstone Land Consultants, on behalf of**
32 **owner C. Eric Farris, requests a second extension to the deadline to satisfy the**
33 **precedent conditions of approval for the proposed 6-lot subdivision of the**
34 **property located at 0 Drummer Rd (TMP # 515-015-000) and construction of four,**
35 **5-unit multifamily residences and one, 6-unit multifamily residence. The property**
36 **is 13.1 acres and is located in the Low Density District**
37

38 Mr. Eric Farris, the property owner, addressed the Board and stated that he did not have much to
39 add to the extension request description that was read by Chair Farrington and said that he was
40 open to answering questions. He stated the consultant has been unusually busy and that the project
41 has also been delayed due to speaking with the NH Housing Finance Authority about how that
42 funding would impact this project.
43

44 Chair Farrington stated the extension request indicates that the applicant is looking to satisfy the
45 precedent conditions and asked whether there were any non-Planning Board issues that could be
46 delaying this project as well. Mr. Farris stated that as he had mentioned earlier, he is working with
47 the NH Housing Finance Authority to keep this project affordable. The Chairman stated the City
48 is encouraging development and would like to know the issues developers are facing and thanked
49 Mr. Farris for considering this project.
50

51 A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board grant a 180-day extension
52 to the timeframe to satisfy the precedent conditions of approval for the Timberlane Woods CRD
53 Subdivision and Site Plan applications, S-04-22 & SPR-04-22. The motion was seconded by
54 Councilor Michael Remy and was unanimously approved.
55

56 **5. Boundary Line Adjustment**
57

58 **1. S-11-23 – Boundary Line Adjustment & Street Access Permit – 143 & 147 Main**
59 **St & 0 Davis St – Applicant Brickstone Land Use Consultants, on behalf of owners**
60 **143 Main LLC & 147-151 Main Street LLC, proposes to merge the 0.12-ac parcel**
61 **at 0 Davis St (TMP# 584-059-000) with the existing 0.15-ac parcel at 143 Main St**
62 **and the 0.19-ac parcel at 147 Main St (TMP#s 584-061-000 & 584-060-000) and**
63 **adjust the common lot line between these two parcels. A new curb cut is also**
64 **proposed along Main St to access the parcel at 143 Main St. All parcels are located**
65 **in the Downtown Core District.**
66

67 **A. Board Determination of Completeness**
68

69 Planner, Evan Clements, stated the Applicant requests exemptions from providing a drainage
70 report, traffic analysis, soil analysis, and other technical reports. Staff have determined that the
71 requested exemptions would have no bearing on the merits of the application and recommend that
72 the Board accept the application as “complete.”
73

74 A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel to accept application S-11-23 as “complete.” The
75 motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy and was unanimously approved.

76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120

B. Public Hearing

Mr. Jim Phippard of Brickstone Land Use Consultants addressed the Board on behalf of the property owners, 143 Main LLC & 147-151 Main Street LLC. He indicated both of these entities are controlled by Michael Pappas, who is present tonight. The subject parcels consist of three tracts of land located at the corner of Davis Street and Main Street.

Mr. Phippard explained that the vacant gravel lot at the rear is for parking. The corner lot used to be the site of the Cobblestone building, which burnt down and the brick building on the third parcel is also being salvaged. Mr. Phippard stated the plan is to take the land area of the rear lot and combine it with the parcels with frontage along Main Street. The common boundary line between 143 & 147 Main Street will then be moved two feet to the south, which will provide space for a driveway. Mr. Phippard noted the brick house at 143 Main Street was constructed in the 1700's and is a historic building. The applicant is looking to salvage, renovate, and add uses to this property.

Mr. Phippard stated the request he submitted is for a boundary line adjustment and the second request is to approve a curb cut for 143 Main Street, which historically was the driveway for this parcel. When Main Street was reconstructed in 2007/2008, there was confusion as to whether this was an abandoned driveway or if it was still in use. During the reconstruction, the City installed a crosswalk at this location as well as 2'-wide strips of pavement on both sides. After much back and forth between the City and the applicant, the applicant decided they would not give up this curb cut. In order to use this as an active driveway to access the property, Public Works is requiring that the applicant to relocate the crosswalk further to the south so that it will be across from 147 Main Street. The applicant will replace this section with concrete, which is the City standard for sidewalks.

Mr. Phippard stated initially they had intended to construct a 12'-wide driveway leading from Main Street to the rear of the property where four parking spaces would be located to service this building. He referred to the porch that extends out from the south side of the building, which is in poor condition and has to be torn down and rebuilt. Mr. Phippard stated his recommendation to the applicant was to shorten the porch and cut it back by three feet. This way, the architectural design of the porch could still be maintained. He noted that the applicant is aware he would have to go to the Historic District Commission (HDC) to change the dimensions of the porch. By shortening the porch, the driveway could be maintained at a width of 12 feet for its entire length.

Mr. Phippard stated that staff explained that the HDC may not allow the porch to be altered, given its age, even though it needs to be completely rebuilt. He noted the property owner is working hard to preserve all existing features of the brick house and explained that he has already rebuilt the barn at the rear of the property. Mr. Phippard stated that in reviewing the driveway regulations, you are allowed a driveway for this type of use, as long as it is less than 20 feet wide. This means that the driveway can be less than 12' wide, but it cannot be made 20' wide or wider. He indicated that they are going to put a choke point in the driveway that will reduce it to 9' wide where it passes the porch and there will be a bollard on either corner to protect the porch. Between this and

121 the boundary line being relocated further to the south, there will still be adequate room to pass and
122 repass through this area to exit onto Main Street.

123
124 He indicated that when the parcel at 147 Main Street is developed, the applicant's intent is to come
125 back before the Planning Board with a new building design for that location. They will be installing
126 bollards to protect the new building along the southern side of the driveway, so there won't be any
127 issues with maintenance of the new building. Mr. Phippard explained that the previous building
128 was designed so that the northeast corner was cut out and noted that the design for the new building
129 will maintain this feature. The applicant has indicated that he is able to drive an F-150 truck with
130 construction mirrors along the existing 9'-wide driveway. Mr. Phippard felt that with the choke
131 point, people will be forced to slow down. He added that there are other steps that can be taken, if
132 they see any safety concerns when the parcel at 147 Main Street gets redeveloped.

133
134 Following the boundary line adjustment, 143 Main Street will go from 0.15 acres in size to 0.21
135 acres. The parcel at 147 Main Street will go from 0.19 acres to 0.25 acres and each lot will be in
136 compliance with the Downtown Core zoning dimensional requirements. This concluded Mr.
137 Phippard's comments.

138
139 Staff comments were next. Mr. Clements addressed the Board and began with Traffic and Access
140 Management. He indicated that Mr. Phippard is correct in that the City doesn't have a minimum
141 width for driveways, so the nine foot pinch point is permitted under the regulations. He added,
142 however, that staff does have concerns related to the use of that driveway in all weather conditions,
143 specifically during the snowy season where that drive aisle may narrowed further. He reminded
144 the Board that during the site visit, Mr. Phippard explained that they are planning on keeping the
145 driveway at nine feet wide for now and at a future date adjusting the size of the historic porch to
146 widen that pinch point back up to 12 feet.

147
148 Mr. Clements stated staff believes there is an opportunity right now with the undeveloped nature
149 of 147 Main Street to provide the space for a 12'-wide drive aisle. When the new building is
150 constructed, it would create a potential hardship if that 9'-wide drive aisle is insufficient. He added
151 that staff also feels that it would put the Historic District Commission in the precarious situation
152 of having to approve something that they would not ordinarily approve because of a hardship that
153 was created when the new building was constructed.

154
155 He added that staff is looking for the Board to deliberate about whether this 9'-wide pinch point
156 with the bollards protecting the porch is an acceptable permanent solution to this issue. He added
157 that staff is also going to recommend tabling this application, so the applicant can either receive
158 an approval or denial for the modification of that porch from the HDC. This concluded staff
159 comments.

160
161 Mayor Hansel asked to clarify if the City's standards permit a 9' wide driveway and whether this
162 would be reviewed during the driveway permit application process. Mr. Clements explained that
163 the Street Access Permit application (Driveway Permit application) is part of this application, and
164 the issue is proving that there is safe access from Main Street to the rear of the site. The Planning
165 Board regulations for traffic and access management contemplate safe and effective travel
166 throughout the site. He stated that it would ultimately be up to the Board to decide whether the 9'

167 wide pinch point is acceptable for safe travel in all weather conditions for all potential uses of the
168 site. He added that this might be adequate for the current property owner, but felt that the City is
169 unintentionally creating a hardship down the line where the only solution would be a potential
170 impact to a historic resource in the downtown. The Mayor clarified that City Code does allow for
171 9'-wide driveways. Mr. Clements answered in the affirmative and added that there is no minimum
172 driveway width specified in City Code.

173
174 Ms. Brunner added that what staff is recommending is that if this is intended to be a temporary
175 solution and in the long run, they want to modify the porch, then the correct process would be to
176 go to the HDC first for their approval. However, if this is meant to be a permanent solution, it does
177 meet City standards.

178
179 Councilor Remy stated he does not have much concern about the 9'-wide driveway and did not
180 feel that the Board needs to require that a vehicle should be able to pass in a driveway. He also felt
181 that the entryway to the driveway does have visibility on both sides. He stated that he could not
182 see delaying this application and felt the applicant could always come back for a modification to
183 their site plan after HDC approval/denial.

184
185 Mr. Clancy asked whether the Board had considered looking at access from the back of the lot or
186 just maintaining a driveway in this location. Ms. Brunner stated that with a Street Access Permit,
187 the standards in City Code are geared towards the curb cut at the public right-of-way. The Street
188 Access Standards are focused on the right-of-way, but tonight the Board is reviewing a plan that
189 shows the full length of the driveway. The driveway connects the parking area to the road and
190 includes the section that narrows down to nine feet.

191
192 Ms. Lavigne-Bernier clarified that when someone turns right into this driveway, it will be 12' wide
193 and asked how long this section would be before you would get to the 9' pinch point. She also
194 asked whether two cars could pass on this driveway. Mr. Phippard stated that from the edge of the
195 travel lane on Main Street to the pinch point is about 86 feet. Ms. Lavigne-Bernier asked whether
196 two cars could pass comfortably in a 12'-wide driveway and Mr. Phippard noted that he did not
197 feel they could. He added that when someone is exiting the driveway and someone is entering the
198 driveway, they would have to wait to prevent the driver coming in from having to back out onto
199 Main Street.

200
201 Mayor Hansel felt that staff was asking the Board to look at hypothetical scenarios, which he felt
202 places the Board in a difficult position. He felt the applicant is complying with the regulations and
203 felt that the driveway they are proposing will meet their needs.

204
205 Mr. Clancy asked whether vehicle size could be considered a hardship in the future. Ms. Brunner
206 answered in the negative. She added that staff's concern is that this is a temporary solution, and
207 that the applicant would be coming back in the future with a request to reduce the porch size. She
208 stated that if that is true, then the correct process would be to go before the HDC first. Mr. Clancy
209 asked whether there was a way to create a one way driveway. He noted his knowledge of the
210 property is that they exit a different way.

211

212 In response, Mr. Phippard stated that when they looked at redeveloping the corner lot at 147 Main
213 Street, they considered a different configuration. The tenant that the property owner has an
214 agreement with needs room for a drive through, so a drive through with one-way in and one-way
215 out was designed and approved as a Special Exception by the Zoning Board. The one-way
216 driveway option was not feasible for the property at 143 Main St if the drive through was to be
217 accommodated on the adjacent parcel.

218
219 Councilor Remy referred to the northbound pedestrian crossing over the existing driveway on the
220 parcel at 143 Main St and noted that he felt the idea of having the new building designed with a
221 cutout similar to the previous building is a great way to solve this issue. He indicated that the Board
222 is reviewing changes to the 143 Main Street site and wasn't sure if they could rely on the new
223 proposed design for 147 Main Street to maintain the proposed cutout feature if they aren't
224 reviewing that application at tonight's meeting. Mr. Phippard stated that the parcel at 147 Main
225 Street cannot be redeveloped unless it comes back before the Planning Board for review. Councilor
226 Remy stated that he was concerned because this is an existing condition on another lot. If for some
227 reason the lot was sold before it is redeveloped, the new owner could raise the point that this is an
228 existing condition on a neighboring property.

229
230 Ms. Brunner stated that staff would encourage the Board to look at this plan without considering
231 the building that is going to be constructed at a future date and noted that the Downtown Core
232 District calls for this type of use. If you look further up Main Street closer to Central Square, there
233 are a few examples of alley type driveways and she noted that she felt City standards actually
234 encourage this sort of situation to occur.

235
236 Mr. Clancy asked if the Board was to approve this request whether the property owner of 143 Main
237 Street could permit patrons of the property at 147 Main Street to use this driveway without coming
238 to the Planning Board for their drive through. Ms. Brunner stated when the 147 Main Street
239 property is redeveloped, it would need to come before the Board for review and approval. The
240 Zoning Board of Adjustment did grant a special exception to permit a drive through as an accessory
241 use for this property. This use has been permitted, but the actual design has yet to come to the
242 Planning Board for review. They could propose using their neighbor's driveway, if they wanted to
243 and as long as the Board is amenable to that request, a cross easement could be granted.

244
245 Mr. Clements added that the applicant would have to go back to the Zoning Board of Adjustment
246 for another Special Exception for 143 Main Street to incorporate that property as part of the drive
247 through. He also noted that there is a zoning change under review that would prohibit drive
248 throughs in the downtown, which means that they would not be able to do that until the zoning
249 change has been resolved.

250
251 Councilor Remy asked why the City Engineer wanted the driveway to tilt south instead of north.
252 Mr. Clement stated his understanding is that the property owner and the City Engineer went back
253 and forth a couple different times in regard to the location of that crosswalk, and the City Engineer
254 ultimately decided that the southbound location was best from his point of view. Engineering Staff
255 had two comments related to the crosswalk, but neither one of them were really pertinent to the
256 final proposed location. One was for the submittal of a ramp detail that meets the public right-of-

257 way accessibility guidelines and the second was the direction of the style of bars being referred to
258 as continental; which is the same style that currently exists at that location.

259
260 The Chairman asked for public comment. With no comment from the public, the Chairman closed
261 the public hearing.

262
263 A. Board Discussion and Action

264
265 A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board approve S-11-23 as shown
266 on the plan set identified as “Boundary Line Adjustment” prepared by Cardinal Surveying & Land
267 Planning at a scale of 1 inch = 20 feet, dated September 28, 2023 and approve the Street Access
268 Permit for 143 Main Street, as shown on the plan identified as “Driveway Plan” prepared by
269 Brickstone Land Use Consultants at a scale of 1 in = 20 ft, with the following conditions:

- 270
271 *L. Prior to final approval and signature by the Planning Board Chair, the following*
272 *conditions precedent shall be met:*
- 273 *A. Submittal of a revised plan to show the revised driveway configuration with the*
274 *9’-wide section with protective bollards.*
 - 275 *B. Owner’s signature appears on the plan.*
 - 276 *C. Inspection of lot monuments by the Public Works Director or their designee*
277 *following their installation or the submittal of a security in an amount deemed*
278 *satisfactory to the Public Works Director to ensure that the monuments will be*
279 *set.*
 - 280 *D. Submittal of four (4) full sized paper copies, two (2) mylar copies, and a digital*
281 *copy of the final plan set.*
 - 282 *E. Submittal of a check in the amount of \$51.00 made out to the City of Keene to*
283 *cover recording fees.*

284
285 The motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy, who stated he sees no regional impact
286 from this project. The motion was unanimously approved.

287
288 **6. Public Hearing**

- 289 **a. CLSS-CUP-03-23 – Congregate Living & Social Services Conditional Use**
290 **Permit – Keene Serenity Center, 24 Vernon St - Applicant Keene Serenity**
291 **Center, on behalf of owner Monadnock Area Peer Support Agency, proposes**
292 **to operate a group resource center on the property at 24 Vernon St (TMP**
293 **#568-058-000). The site is 0.28 ac and is located in the Downtown Core**
294 **District. VII. Master Plan Steering Committee.**

295
296 A. Board Determination of Completeness

297
298 Planner, Evan Clements, explained that the applicant has requested exemptions from providing
299 existing & proposed conditions plans; grading, landscaping, and lighting plans; building
300 elevations; and technical reports. Staff have determined that the requested exemptions would have
301 no bearing on the merits of the application and recommend that the Board accept the application
302 as “complete.”

303 A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel to accept the application, CLSS-CUP-03-23, as
304 “complete.” The motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy and was unanimously
305 approved.
306

307 B. Public Hearing
308

309 Sam Lake, Executive Director of the Keene Serenity Center, addressed the Board. He indicated
310 that the Serenity Center has been operating in Keene for the past ten years and is a nonprofit peer
311 support agency. He indicated that they were approved for a Congregate Living & Social Services
312 (CLSS) License last year at their previous location. He indicated that because they moved from
313 Mechanic Street to Vernon Street, they are required to reapply for their license and a CLSS
314 Conditional Use Permit (CUP), which they have not had to apply for in the past. This concluded
315 the applicant’s comments.
316

317 Staff comments were next.
318

319 Mr. Clements stated that the Keene Serenity Center is a Recovery Community Organization that
320 offers peer support for individuals experiencing a substance use disorder. The organization offers
321 recovery coaching programs facilitated by Certified Recovery Support Workers. These programs
322 include individual sessions, group sessions, and telehealth formats. The Center also offers a
323 transportation program called “Road to Recovery” that provides ride services to members for
324 appointments and other services to aid in their recovery. Currently, 80 rides are provided per week
325 utilizing an organization-owned vehicle that is stored in a parking spot provided for their use on
326 site.
327

328 He explained that the subject property at 24 Vernon Street is an office building located on the
329 south side of Vernon Street, behind 10 Vernon Street and adjacent to the City of Keene Fire
330 Department building. The 12,640-sf building contains the Monadnock Area Peer Support Agency,
331 an existing clinic and large group home, that utilizes approximately 9,140-sf of the building area,
332 a small outdoor activity area, and most of the parking lot. The Monadnock Area Peer Support
333 Agency has obtained a Congregate Living and Social Service Conditional Use Permit (CUP)
334 through the Planning Board to operate a large group home on the site; however, the Keene Serenity
335 Center is required to obtain their own CUP because their use is separate from that of Monadnock
336 Peer Support.
337

338 He indicated the purpose of this application is to seek a Congregate Living and Social Service
339 Conditional Use Permit to operate a group resource center within 3,500-sf of leased space within
340 the building at 24 Vernon Street. The Keene Serenity Center has a separate entrance from the other
341 uses in the building and utilizes one parking space within the existing parking lot. No exterior
342 alterations to the building or site are proposed as part of this application.
343

344 Mr. Clements then moved on to the application analysis for the CUP.
345

346 Following are the criteria:

- 347 A. *“The nature of the proposed application is consistent with the spirit and intent of the*
348 *Zoning Regulations, this LDC and the City’s Comprehensive Master Plan, and complies*
349 *with all the applicable standards in this LDC for the particular use in Section 8.3.4.*
350 B. *The proposed use will be established, maintained, and operated so as not to endanger the*
351 *public health, safety, or welfare.*
352 C. *The proposed use will be established, maintained, and operated so as to be harmonious*
353 *with the surrounding area and will not impede the development, use, and enjoyment of*
354 *adjacent property.*
355 D. *The proposed use will be established, maintained, and operated so as to be harmonious*
356 *with the surrounding area and will not impede the development, use, and enjoyment of*
357 *adjacent property.*
358 E. *The proposed use will not place an excessive burden on public infrastructure, facilities,*
359 *services, or utilities.*
360 F. *The proposed use will not result in the destruction, loss, or damage of any feature*
361 *determined to be of significant natural, scenic, or historic importance.*
362 G. *The proposed use will not create a traffic safety hazard or a substantial increase in the*
363 *level of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the use.*
364 H. *The proposed use will be located in proximity to pedestrian facilities (e.g. multiuse trails*
365 *and sidewalks), public transportation, or offer transportation options to its client*
366 *population.”*
367

368 With respect to the application being consistent with the Master Plan – Mr. Clements stated this
369 property is located in the Downtown Core (DT-C) district. The intent of this district is to
370 accommodate the highest intensity of development in the City and promote a mix of uses. The
371 applicant proposes to create a group resource center as a principal use in the leased space provided
372 by the property owner, which is an allowed use within this district. This site is also within the
373 Downtown Historic District; however, no changes are proposed to the exterior of the building or
374 site and no impacts to the historic district are anticipated from this application. Hence, staff feels
375 this standard has been met.
376

377 *“The proposed use will be established, maintained, and operated so as not to endanger the public*
378 *health, safety, or welfare.”* Mr. Clements explained that the applicant states in their narrative that
379 they are a day program that only operates Monday – Friday from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm with
380 occasional evening and weekend trainings and groups that typically do not last for more than two
381 hours. Members will have access to the Monadnock Area Peer Support Agency facilities located
382 on the property. Staff consists of four fulltime and one parttime employee. The program does not
383 include beds or overnight support. Staff will be on-site during business and activity hours and
384 members utilize on-street public parking or alternative modes of transportation to get to the facility.
385 The existing site includes lighting on the Vernon Street side of the building to enhance pedestrian
386 safety to navigate the site. This standard has been met.
387

388 *“The proposed use will be established, maintained, and operated so as to be harmonious with the*
389 *surrounding area.”* Mr. Clements stated this site is located in a densely populated area of the
390 downtown. Adjacent uses include a mix of commercial, multi-family, office, institutional, and
391 social service uses. The existing outdoor activity area is screened from the public right-of-way and
392 adjacent properties. Both the parking area and outdoor activity area existed prior to this proposed

393 use and are not proposed to be altered or expanded as part of this application. This standard has
394 been met.

395
396 *“The proposed use will be established, maintained, and operated so as to be harmonious with the*
397 *surrounding area and will not impede the development, use, and enjoyment of adjacent property.”*
398 The proposed use will be located entirely inside the existing building. It is not expected that it will
399 generate noise, odors, glare, or vibration that would adversely affect the surrounding area. Staff
400 believes this standard has been met.

401
402 *“The proposed use will not place an excessive burden on public infrastructure, facilities, services,*
403 *or utilities.”* Mr. Clements stated the applicant is not proposing any changes to the existing water
404 or sewer access for the building and City Engineering Staff did not express any concerns about the
405 capacity of the City’s sewer and water facilities to accommodate the additional load from the
406 proposed use. In regard to City services, this site is located in a dense area that is well-served by
407 both fire and police. This standard has been met.

408
409 With reference to the destruction or loss of relevant features, Mr. Clements stated there are no
410 features of natural or scenic importance on this site. He noted this building is located in the
411 Downtown Historic District and has been before the HDC to seek approval for exterior
412 improvements, but this project has not moved forward yet. As part of this application, no exterior
413 changes to the historic nature of the building is being proposed. Staff feels this standard has been
414 met.

415
416 *“The proposed use will not create a traffic safety hazard or a substantial increase in the level of*
417 *traffic congestion in the vicinity of the use.”* Mr. Clements stated that in working with Engineering
418 Staff, it was concluded that the ITE Trip Generation Estimate for traffic would resemble that of a
419 small office building use. Based on these calculations, the estimate is approximately 14.39 vehicle
420 trips per 1,000-sf of gross floor area. With 3,500-sf of gross floor area for the proposed use, this
421 will generate approximately 50 vehicle trips per day. This is less than the Planning Board threshold
422 of 100 trips per day for a full traffic study. The applicant also noted that most of their care seekers
423 use alternative modes of transportation to get to the site, so the real traffic impact is estimated to
424 be less than what is being projected. This standard appears to be met.

425
426 *“The proposed use will be located in proximity to pedestrian facilities.”* Mr. Clements stated that
427 this use is located in the Downtown Core District, which is easily accessed by multiple modes of
428 transportation including walking, bicycling, and public transportation. He noted that many care
429 seekers use these modes of transportation to access the site. Staff feels this standard has been met.

430
431 Mr. Clements then went over the proposed motion. This concluded staff comments.

432
433 The Chairman asked for public comment next.

434
435 Mr. Gary Kinyon, who owns property at 50 Washington Street, addressed the Board. He indicated
436 that he is part of a law practice with other attorneys at this location. He stated that he does not
437 oppose this project and did not oppose it when it was initially proposed in 2022. He added,
438 however, that he has concerns. He felt that the reason an annual license is required is so that the

439 Board can have a fresh look at this use each year to make sure it is conforming with the necessary
440 standards.

441
442 Mr. Kinyon stated that in January 2022, a Conditional Use Permit was approved and at that time
443 the application stated there would be no activities outside the building – it was all going to be
444 inside. By September 2022, it became obvious to neighbors that there were significant activities
445 taking place outside the building. Mr. Kinyon referred to the standards for the granting of a CLSS
446 CUP, which state that, *“outdoor activity areas and waiting areas associated with this will be*
447 *adequately screened from adjacent properties and through public rights of way.”* He felt that as a
448 result, outdoor areas associated with the proposed use, such as this, are part of the use and need to
449 be reviewed by the Board and complied to by the applicant. These were not addressed as part of
450 the initial application. Mr. Kinyon stated he sent a letter to Code Enforcement Staff addressing this
451 issue. The applicant then submitted an updated CUP application in September with a modified use
452 proposal, which indicated that there would be screened areas outside in the existing parking lot
453 that would be designated as smoking and non-smoking areas.

454
455 Mr. Kinyon stated that he is not aware of any application being submitted in late 2022 or 2023 to
456 renew their CLSS License, but explained that the applicant is before the Board today for a renewal
457 for 2024. He stated that his concern for the property is because when he filed his complaint, it
458 resulted in a modification to the Monadnock Area Peer Support’s CLSS CUP application in
459 September 2022. He explained that his concerns stem from the deterioration that he has observed
460 in the neighborhood since the proposed use was established. He indicated that what he is seeing
461 now is instead of a waiting room or the outdoor activity area being limited to the screened parking
462 area, now virtually every day for a substantial part of the day, there are people standing or sitting
463 on the curb. He said that this is not presenting a good atmosphere for the rest of the neighborhood.

464
465 Mr. Kinyon talked about some of the encounters he has had with various individuals, including
466 people sitting under the porch of his building; kids playing in the parking lot and the unpleasant
467 exchange he and his staff had with the parents; a man camping out with clothes spread around him
468 in the parking spots; and the landscaper who maintains the property got a hypodermic needle stuck
469 in his palm and had to be treated with medication.

470
471 Mr. Kinyon felt that the agency needs to try to work with their clients to be more respectful of
472 neighboring properties.

473
474 In response, Mr. Clements stated that the Planning Board reviews the CLSS Conditional Use
475 Permit application, which is a one-time permanent approval related to a special use contemplated
476 in the zoning code. The City of Keene has linked that with an annual license renewal process
477 completed by the Congregate Living & Social Services Licensing Board. This is the license that
478 has to be renewed annually. Organizations have to come in and provide additional documentation
479 related to their use, including a neighborhood plan for how they intend to be good neighbors. This
480 document, along with everything else, is reviewed annually by the Licensing Board, which is not
481 a land use board, and abutters are not notified when the item comes up for renewal. He noted that
482 what Mr. Kinyon was referring to is the Conditional Use Permit for the Monadnock Area Peer
483 Support Resource facility, which is the organization that owns 24 Vernon Street.

484

485 When the Monadnock Area Peer Support Agency went through this process, they indicated that
486 there would not be any outdoor activities and came back to the Planning for a modification to their
487 CLSS CUP to include the outdoor activity areas, which was reviewed and approved. Mr. Clements
488 noted that the application before the Board this evening is for a different use that will be operated
489 on the property at 24 Vernon Street. Jesse Rounds, the Community Development Director, added
490 that he hears the concerns from abutters about the activity happening on neighboring properties
491 and will have Code Enforcement staff look into this, as well as the Police and Fire Departments.
492

493 Chris Freeman, owner of Bell Tower Property Management located at 11 Vernon Street, addressed
494 the Board next. Mr. Freeman stated that his company is a specializes in co-living rentals, which
495 explained as being partway between congregate living and conventional rentals. He explained that
496 they take traditional apartments, furnish them, and offer them to people on a room-by-room basis,
497 typically for a one-year contract. He indicated that what they are doing is providing affordable
498 housing alternatives at market rates by breaking the units down and giving people access to
499 housing.
500

501 Mr. Freeman stated that he was not before the Board to oppose the renewal of the license. He noted
502 that he thinks this is a great program and is grateful that it is available in the community to address
503 the serious issue of substance abuse. However, he stated that he would be remise if he did not share
504 the experiences that they have had as neighbors to the Serenity Center and Monadnock Area Peer
505 Support Agency. Since purchasing this property in March, they have been subjected to trespassing,
506 drug dealing, theft, littering, loitering, public urination, and public defecation. Mr. Freeman felt
507 that most of those infractions are likely being committed by people who are associated with the
508 Center.
509

510 He explained that in a single two week period, they documented more violations of their property
511 rights at 11 Vernon Street than they have at all of the other locations they own in Keene over the
512 past seven years. He went through some of the issues they have experienced on their property
513 including nearly stepping into human feces, drug dealing (he noted that this was the third time he
514 has had to break up such an activity), flood barriers being strewn all over Vernon Street and their
515 storage container being stolen (he noted that a report was filed with KPD), and an accumulation
516 of trash being stored behind their building consisting of items that were stolen from nearby
517 dumpsters.
518

519 He stated that these types of activities have impacted their use of the property and their sense of
520 safety when on the property. From a business standpoint, these activities are affecting the
521 marketability of their rental spaces. There is substantial square footage at his property on Vernon
522 Street that he would like to make available, but he has been sitting on an empty building for eight
523 months, which is causing a financial hardship.
524

525 Mr. Freeman stated that he would like to ask the staff of the center to emphasize to their patrons
526 the importance of being a good neighbor and perhaps encourage a neighborhood trash pickup. He
527 noted that the fence that was erected is not serving the purpose it was intended for and he suggested
528 extending the fencing around the outdoor areas and making this a condition of the license renewal.
529

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

531
532 Mayor Hansel deferred to staff. He explained that because the Congregate Living & Social
533 Services Licensing Board is relatively new, he was looking for an interpretation as to where some
534 of these issues should best be addressed. Is it with the Planning Board or with the Licensing Board?
535

536 Ms. Brunner stated that most of the issues that have been raised tonight are most likely related to
537 the other use in this building, not the proposed use that is before the Board tonight. She indicated
538 that Monadnock Peer Support (MPS) did receive a CUP to operate a large group home at this
539 location and they did modify that their CUP to include screened outdoor activity areas. In addition
540 to this, MPS has to get their annual license renewed through the Licensing Board. The issues that
541 were raised tonight appear to be related to that use and not necessarily the Group Resource Center.
542

543 Mr. Rounds added that a Neighborhood Outreach Plan is required as part of the CLSS license
544 review process and added that staff could reach out to the manager of MPS and Mr. Lake and
545 address this through their Neighborhood Outreach Program. Chair Farrington encouraged
546 members of the public to attend the Licensing Board meeting scheduled for tomorrow night. Mr.
547 Rounds stated that he would also be addressing these issues with Code Enforcement, Police and
548 Fire Department Staff.
549

550 Mr. Lake stated that they have been attending the MSFI meetings for the past two months focusing
551 on their relationship with the residents of the east side of Keene. He indicated that it does look like
552 the individuals the abutters are raising concerns about belonging to the Serenity Center, but they
553 are actually people in the community. He added that this is an issue in most areas of Keene where
554 other social service organizations are located. He added that their staff often pick up trash and have
555 invited people who are hanging around their facility to join them, but that they have not had much
556 success. He added that homelessness is increasing drastically in Keene, which is adding to these
557 issues.
558

559 Mayor Hansel stated that he has not seen any one individual being targeted and noted that as
560 regulators, the City is trying to figure out how they can best contribute overall to all of these
561 individual organizations trying to do the best they can for the community. One mechanism the City
562 has are these Neighborhood Outreach Plans that are reviewed and approved through the annual
563 licensing process. He thanked the organizations for what they are doing in the community.
564

565 A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board approve the Congregate
566 Living & Social Services Conditional Use Permit, CLSS-CUP-03-23, for a group resource center
567 as depicted in the application materials received October 20, 2023 with the following conditions:
568

569 *1. Prior to final approval and signature by the Planning Board Chair, the following*
570 *conditions precedent shall be met:*

571 *A. The Applicant shall obtain a Congregate Living and Social Services License,*
572 *which shall be renewed annually in accordance with Chapter 46 of the City*
573 *Code of Ordinances.*
574

575 The motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy, who indicated that there is no regional
576 impact from this application.

577
578 Councilor Remy noted that in reviewing the Neighborhood Outreach Plan, it is reading more like
579 a community engagement plan explaining how clients can find the organization. He asked for
580 clarity as to what these plans should look like. He did not feel that it was a proactive plan.
581

582 Ms. Markelon asked whether abutters are notified about the Licensing Board meetings. Ms.
583 Brunner stated the public hearings for Congregate Living & Social Services Licensing Board are
584 noticed according to RSA 91-A (which requires that the meeting notice be posted at two public
585 venues 24 hours prior to the meeting). She did not recall that an abutter mailing is done. Mr.
586 Rounds stated that the intention with CLSS Renewals is that over the next two years they will be
587 on a cycle and all resource centers will come on for their renewal at the same meeting, so that
588 neighbors will be aware. He agreed that the City needs to do a better job informing people about
589 these individual centers. That is the purpose of the licensing process, and this is the reason Council
590 put this in place a few years ago.

591
592 The motion made by the Mayor was unanimously approved.
593

594 **7. Master Plan Steering Committee**

595
596 Ms. Brunner addressed the Board and stated that this item is to establish a Steering Committee to
597 guide the next Master Plan update and appoint members to that Committee. She noted that the
598 Board's packet included a proposed roster of individuals that have been recommended by the
599 Mayor, which has been revised slightly. There are now 14 individuals instead of 16 and 11 of these
600 individuals would be regular members and 3 would be alternates.
601

602 The reason why staff is recommending that the Planning Board establish this committee is because
603 under RSA 674-2, it is the duty of the Planning Board to both prepare and amend a Master Plan
604 every few years to guide the development of the municipality.
605

606 After consulting with the City Attorney, staff felt that the most appropriate path for this project
607 was for the Planning Board to guide the Master Plan update. Rather than having this full board be
608 involved in detail, what the City has done in the past and what is being recommended today is to
609 establish a special Steering Committee comprised of a mix of individuals, including Planning
610 Board members, City Council members and members of the Community to provide that guidance.
611 Ultimately when the Master Plan has gone through the full process and there is a draft document
612 ready, the committee would make a recommendation back to the Planning Board and ultimately
613 the Planning Board would be the one to adopt the Master Plan. In the City of Keene, the Master
614 Plan would also be sent to the City Council for their endorsement.
615

616 Mr. Clancy stated that he was under the impression that in New Hampshire, the Planning Board is
617 not permitted to establish a Steering Committee. The Board is allowed to set up special committees
618 comprised of Board members, but not establish a Steering Committee. Ms. Brunner stated staff
619 has consulted with the City Attorney and the State RSA does give the Planning Board broad
620 authority to put in place what needs to be done with respect to a Master Plan update.
621

622 She agreed that for a regulatory function, the Board has to act as its body, but for a Master Plan
623 update, the City Attorney felt that the Board can form its own Steering Committee; however, all
624 members have to be Keene residents.

625
626 With respect to all sectors being represented, Ms. Lavigne-Bernier noted that she sees just one
627 voting member who is a woman and there are a lot of men who have had their voices heard in the
628 community for a long time. As a young resident, homeowner, and future business owner of the
629 community, she asked whether this was the direction Keene was moving towards. The Mayor and
630 Chairman agreed this was a great observation. The Mayor explained that he works with staff to
631 come up with a list of names. The new Mayor-elect also wanted to have a voice and that is how
632 the membership was formulated. He added Ms. Lavigne-Bernier's comments bring up an
633 important concern that needs to be discussed.

634
635 Mr. Clancy asked why Judy Rogers and Phil Wyzik were omitted from the updated list. Ms.
636 Brunner stated that when it was decided to shift certain people to be alternates and staff reached
637 out to these two individuals, they declined to participate because they wanted to participate as
638 regular members and not as alternates. Mr. Clancy stated that in reviewing the list, if the City is
639 looking for a diverse group, he sees three City Councilors, three Planning Board members, plus
640 the Mayor-elect being involved in the committee. He noted the 2007 committee only had one
641 Board member. He added that if the Board wants the community to assist in the update, then maybe
642 community members should be allowed to participate rather than City Councilors and Board
643 members who will eventually have a say when it is finally ready to be approved. The Mayor stated
644 people always feel being an alternate is a lesser role, but in this case alternates are those you rely
645 on at each meeting to fill that vacant spot.

646
647 Ms. Lavigne-Bernier stated she would like more female participation. She referred to mental
648 health, substance abuse, and homelessness and questioned who represents those sectors. Ms.
649 Brunner stated that Phil Wyzik from Monadnock Family Services was on the original list, but he
650 has been removed. She referred to the Planning Board members and City Councilors on the
651 Committee. She explained that in addition to these members, other proposed members include Joe
652 Walier from Walier Chevrolet, Cody Morrison from the Monadnock Economic Development
653 Corporation, Marc Doyon from Keene State College, Josh Meehan from Keene Housing, Alex
654 Henkel who is a local business owner, Beth Wood who is also a local business owner, Jay Kahn
655 who is the Mayor-Elect, and Sparky Von Plinsky from the Conservation Commission.

656
657 The Mayor asked that this item be put on more time so he could come back with a revised list of
658 members.

659
660 Councilor Remy asked whether the composition of the committee can ultimately be the choice of
661 the Planning Board. Mayor Hansel stated that it could, but rather than debate the merits of the
662 composition of the committee in a public session, it would be better to come up with a list and then
663 debate the list as was done today. Chair Farrington noted that not every segment of the community
664 can be represented on the committee, but felt that those groups should be heard from during the
665 community outreach process.

666

667 Mr. Clancy stressed his desire to see a more diverse group of individuals to serving on the
668 committee.

669
670 Ms. Brunner stated that everyone could serve as regular members, but explained that having a 14-
671 member committee could create a logistical challenge for scheduling. She explained that having
672 alternates helps to ensure that there will be a quorum present for meetings, but stated that she did
673 not realize how asking someone to serve as an alternate would be received. As far has having
674 Board involvement in creating the steering committee, the City is anxious to start this process in
675 January and wasn't sure how that would work with respect to the established timeframe for this
676 process.

677
678 Mr. Kost suggested that the creation of a sub-committee also be considered as part of the steering
679 committee process to address issues people would like considered.

680
681 Mr. Clancy stated that he would like to see just one Planning Board member and City Councilor
682 on the steering committee and felt he does not see a diverse group to represent the future of Keene
683 serving on the committee. He stated that the City has waited this long to update the Master Plan
684 and felt that another month or two to get the right representation was necessary. He noted that the
685 Board and Council would eventually have a voice on the approval of the Master Plan.

686
687 Councilor Remy stated he does not have a position on the number of Planning Board members,
688 but cautioned that the City Council does not get a vote on this. The Council may be asked to
689 endorse the plan at the end, but they will not change it. However, if the Council found that they
690 did not agree with the Master Plan and did not endorse it, it could lead to other challenges, so
691 perhaps keeping the Council involved in the process would be prudent. He added that it is good to
692 have individuals who are not involved in City processes as part of the steering committee, but felt
693 that there is some advantage to having individuals involved who are aware of the City's formal
694 processes.

695
696 Chair Farrington felt that starting with a brand new list was not a practical option at this time. He
697 suggested that if there are names Boards members wanted to add to the steering committee roster
698 that they should forward those names to staff to be discussed at the Board's next Steering
699 Committee meeting on December 5th. Ms. Brunner stated that if there are new names, staff would
700 need those names soon based on the date of the next Board meeting on December 18th) because of
701 the holiday. She suggested that Board members have an initial conversation with individuals they
702 are putting forward, so that they have an idea what would be expected of them.

703
704 A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board continue the Master Plan
705 Steering Committee discussion to its next scheduled meeting for December 18th. The motion was
706 seconded by Councilor Michael Remy and was unanimously approved.

707

708 **7. Staff Updates**

709
710 None

711

712 **8. New Business**

713

714 None

715

716 **9. Upcoming Dates of Interest**

717 • Joint Committee of the Planning Board and PLD – December 11th, 6:30 PM

718 • Planning Board Steering Committee – December 5th, 11:00 AM

719 • Planning Board Site Visit – December 13th, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed

720 • Planning Board Meeting – December 18th, 6:30 PM

721

722 **Adjournment**

723

724 There being no further business, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8:46 PM.

725

726 Respectfully submitted by,

727 Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

728

729 Reviewed and edited by,

730 Megan Fortson, Planning Technician



Planning Board

2024 Meeting Schedule

All meetings are generally held on the 4th Monday of each month at 6:30 PM in the 2nd Floor Council Chambers of City Hall, unless otherwise noted with an *

January 22, 2024

February 26, 2024

March 25, 2024

April 22, 2024

May 20, 2024

June 24, 2024

July 22, 2024

August 26, 2024

September 23, 2024

October 28, 2024

November 25, 2024

December 23, 2024

January 27, 2025



December 8, 2023

TO: City of Keene Planning Board
FROM: Mari Brunner, Senior Planner
THROUGH: Jesse Rounds, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Master Plan Steering Committee

Recommendation:

To appoint a Master Plan Steering Committee to guide and assist with updating the City of Keene 2010 Comprehensive Master Plan.

Background:

Following the November 27, 2023 Planning Board meeting, the Planning Board chair, in consultation with other Board Planning Board members and the Mayor-elect, has identified the following individuals to serve on a Master Plan Steering Committee:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Harold Farrington | Regular Member, Slot 1 |
| 2. Armando Rangel | Regular Member, Slot 2 |
| 3. Mike Remy | Regular Member, Slot 3 |
| 4. Joe Walier | Regular Member, Slot 4 |
| 5. Cody Morrison | Regular Member, Slot 5 |
| 6. Marc Doyon | Regular Member, Slot 6 |
| 7. Josh Meehan | Regular Member, Slot 7 |
| 8. Elizabeth Wood | Regular Member, Slot 8 |
| 9. Alex Henkel | Regular Member, Slot 9 |
| 10. Emily Lavigne-Bernier | Regular Member, Slot 10 |
| 11. Joe Parras | Regular Member, Slot 11 |
| 12. Sparky Von Plinsky | Regular Member, Slot 12 |
| 13. Juliana Bergeron | Regular Member, Slot 13 |
| 14. Jay Kahn | Alternate Member, Slot 14 |
| 15. Ken Kost | Alternate Member, Slot 15 |
| 16. Phil Jones | Alternate Member, Slot 16 |
| 17. Catt Workman | Alternate Member, Slot 17 |

These individuals include Planning Board members, City Councilors, and residents that represent various sectors or interests within the community, including the business community, economic development, housing, education, recreation and natural resources, and public health.

Staff recommend that the Planning Board create a Steering Committee to help guide the Master Plan update project and appoint the individuals identified above to serve on the Committee.