



City of Keene Minor Project Review Committee

AGENDA

Thursday, July 18, 2024

10:00 AM

City Hall, 2nd Floor Council Chambers

- I. **Call to Order** – Roll Call
- II. **Election of Vice Chair**
- III. **Minutes of Previous Meetings**
 - a. **Pre-submission Meeting** – July 3, 2024
 - b. **Minor Project Review Committee Meeting** – July 3, 2024
- IV. **Final Vote on Conditional Approvals**
- V. **Staff Updates**
 - a. **MPRC Review Process Discussion**
- VI. **New Business**
- VII. **Upcoming Meeting Dates**
 - **August** - Pre-submission Meeting – August 1 2024 at 9:00 am
 - **August** - 1st Monthly MPRC Meeting – August 1, 2024 at 10:00 am
 - **August** – 2nd Monthly MPRC Meeting – August 15, 2024 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

Wednesday, July 3, 2024

9:30 AM

2nd Floor Conference Room,
City Hall

Members Present:

Evan Clements, Planner & Zoning
Administrator
Megan Fortson, Planner
Yelma Desseta, Public Works Dept.
Richard Wood, Building Official & Fire
Marshall

Staff Present:

Lt. Shane Maxfield, Police Dept.
Donald Lussier, Public Works Director

8
9 **1) Call to Order – Roll Call**

10
11 Evan Clements, Planner & Zoning Administrator, called the meeting to order at 9:30 am. Roll call
12 was conducted. Mr. Clements motioned to elect himself as the Chair pro tempore for the meeting.
13 Mr. Wood seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.
14

15 **2) Scheduled Pre-submission Inquiry**

- 16
17 a. **Conceptual Planning Board Application** – The ~0.16-ac parcel at 3 Aliber Place
18 (TMP #590-092-000) is located in the Residential Preservation District and the ~0.3-ac
19 parcel at 57 Marlboro St (TMP #590-093-000) is located in the Downtown Edge
20 District. Both parcels are owned by Jared Goodell.
21

22 George Hansel of Tailfeather Strategies was present at the meeting to discuss a proposed housing
23 development involving the existing parcels located at 57 & 59 Marlboro St & 3 Aliber Place
24 (TMP#s 590-093-000, 590-094-000, & 590-092-000). Jared Goodell, the property owner,
25 participated in the meeting by phone. City Staff discussed the proposal with Mr. Hansel and Mr.
26 Goodell and provided feedback.
27

28 **3) Walk-In Pre-submission Inquiries**

29
30 There were no walk-in pre-submission inquiries.
31

32 **4) Upcoming Meeting Dates**

- 33 • Pre-submission Meeting – Thursday, August 1, 2024 at 9:00 am
34 • 1st Monthly MPRC Meeting – Thursday, August 1, 2024 at 10:00 am
35 • 2nd Monthly MPRC Meeting – Thursday, August 15, 2024 at 10:00 am *(If needed)*
36
37

38 **5) Adjournment**

39

40 There being no further business, Chair Clements adjourned the meeting at 10:00 am.

41

42 Respectfully submitted by,

43 Megan Fortson, Planner

44

45 Reviewed and edited by,

46 Mari Brunner, Senior Planner

1 City of Keene
2 New Hampshire

3
4
5 MINOR PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE
6 MEETING MINUTES
7

8 **Wednesday, July 3, 2024**

10:00 AM

Council Chambers, City Hall

Members Present:

Evan Clements, Chair Pro-Tem
Rick Wood
Yelma Desseta
Megan Fortson

Other Staff Present:

None

8
9 **1) Call to Order – Roll Call**

10
11 Evan Clements called the meeting to order at 10:06 AM. He stated that in the absence of the chair
12 and vice chair, he nominates himself as Chair Pro-Tem for this meeting. Mr. Wood seconded the
13 nomination, which passed by unanimous vote. Roll call was conducted.

14
15 **2) Election of Vice Chair**

16
17 This agenda item was not discussed.

18
19 **3) Minutes of Previous Meetings**

20
21 **A) Pre-Submission Meeting – June 6, 2024**

22 **B) Minor Project Review Committee Meeting – June 6, 2024**

23
24 Mr. Wood made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of June 6, 2024. Ms. Fortson seconded
25 the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

26
27 Ms. Fortson asked if the motion was to approve the Pre-Submission Meeting minutes as well as
28 the minutes of the regular MPRC meeting. Chair Clements replied yes.

29
30 **4) Final Vote on Conditional Approvals**

31
32 Ms. Fortson stated that there are no final votes on conditional approvals today.

33
34 **5) Public Hearings**

35
36 **A) SPR-876, Modification #4 – Minor Site Plan – Ametek Addition, 44 Black Brook Rd**
37 **- Applicant SVE Associates, on behalf of owner NH Black Brook LLC, proposes to**
38 **construct an ~9,045-sf addition to the existing ~61,100-sf Ametek building and make**

39 **associated site modifications on the property at 44 Black Brook Rd (TMP #221-021-**
40 **000). The parcel is 18.43 ac and is located in the Corporate Park District.**

41
42 Chair Clements introduced SPR-876, Modification #4, and asked to hear from staff regarding the
43 application's completeness.

44
45 Ms. Fortson stated that she has a recommended motion on completeness. She continued that the
46 applicant has requested exemptions from submitting a traffic analysis, soil analysis, historic
47 evaluation, screening analysis, and architectural and visual appearance analysis. Staff have
48 determined that the requested exemptions would have no bearing on the merits of the application
49 and recommend that the MPRC accept the application as complete.

50
51 Mr. Wood made a motion to accept the application for SPR-876, Modification #4, as complete.
52 Mr. Desseta seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

53
54 Chair Clements asked to hear from the applicant.

55
56 Liza Sargent of SVE Associates stated that she is presenting for the proposed addition at 44 Black
57 Brook Rd. She continued that the existing building currently has parking in the front. Additional
58 parking was proposed in 2020 as part of the initial site plan application and was partially
59 completed. A temporary loading dock was installed near the northwestern corner of the building
60 adjacent to additional parking at the rear of the building. The proposed changes are to the north
61 side of the property. The existing, temporary loading dock will be modified. Of the 9,045 square
62 feet, the addition itself is only 6,380 square feet because they are utilizing what already exists.
63 Currently, the roof drain discharges to a structure that discharges to an existing stormwater basin.
64 They propose putting in a drainage structure to improve the flow out of that, expanding the size of
65 the stormwater basin.

66
67 Ms. Sargent continued that regarding landscaping, there will be proposed trees. There will be a
68 sidewalk connecting the parking. They (Ametek) are doing a great job and need more space for
69 their shipping department. That is why they are proposing the addition. She asked for questions
70 or comments from the Board.

71
72 Mr. Desseta stated that the proposed basin does not show any spillway. Ms. Sargent replied that
73 there is an existing culvert there. Mr. Desseta asked if they think that is sufficient. Ms. Sargent
74 replied that based on the analysis for the 25 year storm, yes. Mr. Desseta asked what would happen
75 with a 50 year storm. Ms. Sargent replied that the regulations do not require that. Mr. Desseta
76 replied that he knows, but he is asking if they think it is necessary to have a spillway of some sort.
77 Ms. Sargent replied that there is 30 feet of overland flow, so with the existing channel, they do not
78 need it in the (event of the) 25 year storm. She imagines it was designed for the larger storm and
79 that is why it exists currently. Mr. Desseta replied that he recommends some type of Riprap slope
80 or something similar to prevent erosion. Ms. Sargent replied that is an easy add.

81

82 Chair Clements stated that regarding the trees that were proposed to be removed, Ms. Sargent said
83 she was going to look at the plan and discuss that with her client. He asked what alternative they
84 have landed on for that. Ms. Sargent replied that she does not think, with the 2020 plan, that they
85 were ever planted. Pointing to locations on the plan, she continued that she proposed putting them
86 “here” because they would be in a nice location out of the way, but as they discussed over the
87 phone, to relocate them to “this” island, not the other one, because of the visibility into the loading
88 dock, and close to “these” parking spaces.

89
90 Chair Clements stated that his other comment is, as they discussed on the phone, the project did
91 originally receive a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for an encroachment into the surface water
92 buffer surrounding the wetlands. He continued that he believes that regarding the proposed riprap
93 for the guardrail, that encroachment has effectively already been approved. Thus, there is no need
94 for an update or a new CUP for that.

95
96 Ms. Fortson stated that she looked thoroughly at the application materials. She continued that
97 everything looks like it complies with the standards. During her review of the application, she
98 noted a few things that might need to be addressed through some recommended conditions of
99 approval, such as the submittal of a complete lighting plan for the site, because the lighting is
100 proposed to be expanded by over 50%; the submittal of a security to cover the cost of landscaping
101 and erosion control; and as-built plans if engineering staff felt that would be necessary for this
102 project. She herself does not have any specific questions for the applicant at this time.

103
104 Rick Wood stated that his question is relative to the redesign of the parking lot flow. He continued
105 that according to the sheet C1, it appears that they are not making changes to existing islands, but
106 then there is a new island that comes out from the addition, on the south side of the catch basin. It
107 appears to pinch in there. He asked if there is a different layout for the parking lot. Last time staff
108 looked at this that was one of the questions they had.

109
110 Ms. Sargent replied that something she did not mention is that “these” (she gestured) parking
111 spaces are being removed, so there will be more maneuverability so the tractor-trailers can get in
112 and out. She asked if that answers his question. Mr. Wood replied that at the Pre-Submission
113 Meeting, staff asked if they could get something showing the proposed layout of the parking lot.
114 He continued that a condition (of approval) would be submitting a plan of how the parking lot will
115 actually look, because here it looks like they have converging islands with not enough space to
116 even pass a vehicle, so it is a little confusing.

117
118 Ms. Sargent replied that he might not have seen where this plan says, “Remove the island lighting
119 pole, 12 spaces to be removed,” but she can certainly prepare a plan restriping the entire parking
120 lot so they can see where the parking spaces are. Mr. Wood replied yes, that would be helpful.

121
122 Mr. Wood stated that he has one other comment, regarding the dumpster size. He continued that
123 it appears they will remove the ramp and add a dumpster. The building and life-safety codes have

124 requirements for a dumpster's distance from a building, based on the dumpster's size, which is
125 something they should have in their vision. It is certainly workable.

126

127 Chair Clements asked if a dumpster enclosure currently exists, or if that will be new. Ms. Sargent
128 replied that it would be new.

129

130 Chair Clements asked if the MPRC had any more questions or comments. Hearing none, he asked
131 if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing and asked the MPRC
132 to deliberate.

133

134 Ms. Fortson stated that she has largely already said what she thinks needs to be addressed. She
135 continued that she thinks the proposal looks good overall, but it sounds like the MPRC wants to
136 see an updated plan that just shows what the proposed parking layout will be, without the existing
137 parking lot and landscaping island lines shown. She asked if engineering staff thinks the submittal
138 of a security for the project should include as-built plans. Mr. Desseta replied yes.

139

140 Ms. Fortson stated that as she said before, she thinks the submittal of an updated photometric plan
141 for the entire site needs to be included as a recommended condition of approval, because they are
142 proposing to expand the lighting installation. Her only other comment is that in order to comply
143 with Zoning, they are required to have a 75-foot side building setback, because they are adjacent
144 to a residential zoning district, which is the Rural District in this case. She does not believe the
145 plans have yet been updated to reflect that, so she would include that as a recommended condition
146 of approval. In addition, in order to meet the perimeter landscaping requirements, there is already
147 an existing wooded buffer around the building's perimeter. She recommends the plan be updated
148 to show a 25-foot buffer to comply with the perimeter landscaping requirements.

149

150 Chair Clements stated that they can amend that precedent condition for the submittal of an updated
151 proposed conditions plan to also clean up the sheet to show what is actually going to be proposed,
152 as opposed to the "to be removed."

153

154 Ms. Sargent asked if they are asking for just sheet 1 to be revised. Ms. Fortson replied yes, the
155 recommendation would be regarding the proposed conditions plan.

156

157 Chair Clements stated that he agrees with those conditions. He continued that overall, he believes
158 the proposal meets the regulations of the Land Development Code and the intent of the Planning
159 Board's Site Development Standards. He thanks the applicant for taking the time to come to the
160 MPRC for this review. He asked for a motion to approve.

161

162 Mr. Wood asked clarifying questions about the wording of the motion, with the conditions the
163 MPRC just discussed. Ms. Fortson replied that she made notes about the wording of the motion.

164

165 Ms. Fortson made a motion for the Minor Project Review Committee to approve SPR-876,
166 Modification #4 as shown on the plan set identified as, "Modification to SPR-876, Proposed

167 Addition for: Ametek, 44 Black Brook Road, Keene, NH 03431” prepared by SVE Associates at
168 varying scales on June 13, 2024 and last revised on July 1, 2024, with the following conditions:
169

- 170 1. Prior to final approval and signature of the plans by the Minor Project Review Committee
171 Chair, the following conditions precedent shall be met:
172 a. Owner’s signature appears on the title page and proposed conditions plan.
173 b. Submittal of five (5) paper copies and a digital copy of the final plan set and elevations.
174 c. Submittal of a security in a form and amount acceptable to the Community Development
175 Director and City Engineer to cover the cost of sediment and erosion control, landscaping,
176 and as-built plans.
177 d. Submittal of an updated proposed conditions plan showing the required 75’ side building
178 setback line, a 25-foot wooded buffer around the perimeter of the building in compliance
179 with Section 9.4.4.A.5 of the Land Development Code, and the location of all proposed
180 parking.
181 e. Submittal of updated photometric plans for the entirety of the developed portion of the site
182 that demonstrates compliance with the lighting standards outlined under Section 20.7 of
183 the Land Development Code.
184 2. Subsequent to final approval and signature by the Minor Project Review Committee Chair, the
185 following condition subsequent shall be met:
186 a. Prior to the commencement of site work, the Community Development Department shall
187 be notified when all erosion control measures are installed and the Community
188 Development Director, or their designee, shall inspect the erosion control measures to
189 ensure compliance with this site plan and all City of Keene regulations.
190

191 Mr. Wood seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.
192

193 **6) Staff Updates**
194

195 Ms. Fortson stated that there are no staff updates today. She continued that she is typically the
196 staff liaison, but today she is here as the Community Development Director’s designee. At the
197 next MPRC meeting when a quorum of regular members is present, they will need to elect a new
198 vice chair.
199

200 **7) New Business**
201

202 There was no new business.
203

204 **8) Upcoming Meeting Dates**
205

- 206 **July** - 2nd Monthly MPRC Meeting – July 18, 2024 at 10:00 am (*if needed*)
207 **August** - Pre-submission Meeting – August 1 2024 at 9:00 am
208 **August** - 1st Monthly MPRC Meeting – August 1, 2024 at 10:00 am
209 **August** – 2nd Monthly MPRC Meeting – August 15, 2024 at 10:00 am (*if needed*)

210

211 9) **Adjournment**

212

213 There being no further business, Chair Clements adjourned the meeting at 10:25 AM.

214

215 Respectfully submitted by,
216 Britta Reida, Minute Taker

217

218 Reviewed and edited by,
219 Megan Fortson, Planner