

**City of Keene**  
**New Hampshire**

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**Monday, July 22, 2024**

**6:30 PM**

**Council Chambers,  
City Hall**

**Members Present:**

Harold Farrington, Chair  
Roberta Mastrogiovanni, Vice Chair  
Mayor Jay V. Kahn  
Sarah Vezzani  
Armando Rangel  
Ryan Clancy  
Kenneth Kost  
Stephon Mehu, Alternate (Voting)

**Staff Present:**

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner  
Evan Clements, Planner  
Megan Fortson, Planner

**Members Not Present:**

Councilor Michael Remy  
Randyn Markelon, Alternate  
Michael Hoefler, Alternate  
Tammy Adams, Alternate

**I) Call to Order – Roll Call**

Chair Farrington called the meeting to order and a roll call was taken. The Chair invited Mr. Mehu to join as a voting member.

**II) Minutes of Previous Meeting – June 24, 2024**

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni to approve the June 24, 2024 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mayor Kahn and was unanimously approved.

**III) Final Vote on Conditional Approvals**

Chair Farrington stated as a matter of practice, the Board will now issue a final vote on all conditionally approved plans after all of the “conditions precedent” have been met. This vote will be the final approval and will start the 30-day appeal clock. The Chair asked whether there were any applications tonight that were ready for a final vote.

Senior Planner, Mari Brunner, stated there were no applications ready for final vote.

**IV) Continued Public Hearing**

- a. **WITHDRAWN - PB-2024-05 – Congregate Living & Social Services Conditional Use Permit – Live Free Recovery, 973 Marlboro Rd - Applicant Live Free Recovery Services LLC, on behalf of owner BTD Properties LLC, proposes to operate a residential drug and alcohol treatment facility on the property located at 973 Marlboro Rd (TMP #249-004- 000). The parcel is 1.1 ac and is located in the Rural District.**

Chair Farrington stated that the Board had received communication that this application has been withdrawn. Ms. Brunner indicated that because the Town of Marlborough had denied a Zoning Board Application related to this project, the applicant decided not to move forward with an appeal.

**V) Public Hearings**

- a. **a. PB-2024-06 – Subdivision – 435 Chapman Rd - Applicant Cardinal Surveying & Land Planning, on behalf of owner Cornelius W. & Ruth R. Schenck Irrevocable Trust, proposes to subdivide the ~48-ac parcel at 435 Chapman Rd (TMP #239-041-000) into three lots approximately 3.57 ac, 3.80 ac, and 40.63 ac in size. The parcel is located in the Rural District.**

**A. Board Determination of Completeness**

Planner, Megan Forston, addressed the Board and stated the applicant has requested exemptions from submitting a landscaping plan, lighting plan, traffic analysis, soil analysis, historic evaluation, screening analysis, and an architectural and visual appearance analysis. After reviewing each request, staff recommend that the Board grant the requested exemptions and accept the application as complete.

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni to accept the subdivision application, PB-2024-06, as complete. The motion was seconded by Mayor Kahn and was unanimously approved

**B. Public Hearing**

Ms. Wendy Pelletier of Cardinal Surveying & Land Planning addressed Board. She indicated this is a 48-acre lot on Chapman Road. The proposal is to subdivide two, ~3-acre lots from the front of the parcel. The remainder of the parcel with the existing house and driveway will remain. Ms. Pelletier referred on the proposed plan to where the steep slopes exist, but noted that there is no development proposed on these slopes. This concluded Ms. Pelletier's comments.

Ms. Forston addressed the Board again. She noted that the 48-acre subject parcel is located at 435 Chapman Rd in southeast Keene along the east side of Chapman Road. The lot is located in the Rural District and is surrounded by single-family residential uses and undeveloped parcels on all sides. The Branch River and the Town of Roxbury are located about 0.13 miles away from the easternmost property boundary. The parcel is currently developed with a single-family home,

garage, and a few other outbuildings that are accessed from a gravel driveway off of Chapman Road. The applicant proposes to subdivide the parcels into three lots that will be approximately 3.57 ac, 3.80 ac, and 40.63 ac in size. The 40.63-ac lot will serve as the site for the existing single-family home and the two 3-ac lots will be available for development. She noted that in the Rural District the minimum lot size is two acres.

With respect to regional impact, staff has made a preliminary evaluation that the proposed subdivision does not appear to have the potential for “regional impact” as defined in NH RSA 36:55. The Board will need to make a final determination as to whether the proposal, if approved, could have the potential for regional impact.

Ms. Forston then reviewed the subdivision standards as it pertains to the application.

Lots: The proposed subdivision will create three lots that are each greater than 2-ac in size, are at least 200’-wide at the building lines, and have greater than 50’ of frontage along Chapman Road as is required in the Rural District. This standard appears to be met.

Character of Land for Subdivision: As noted by Ms. Pelletier, there are wetlands located towards the rear of the proposed three-acre lots. Additionally, the project narrative states there are areas of precautionary and prohibitive slopes present at the rear of the 40.63-ac parcel that were not surveyed due to their location outside of the proposed subdivision area. Despite these site features, the proposed plans show that the two new lots can be safely developed without posing a danger to health or peril from fire, flood, poor drainage, excessive slope, or other hazardous conditions. This standard appears to be met

Scattered or Premature Development: The proposed subdivision would create two new lots in an area with existing residential development. This standard does not apply.

Preservation of Existing Features: The proposed subdivision plan shows that there are stone walls around and within portions of the parent parcel. Portions of these stone walls will be used as the property boundaries for the two new 3-acre lots. To address potential impacts to wetlands, the applicant has added a note to the plan stating that all development on the parcels must comply with all federal and state wetlands and surface water regulations, as well as the City’s Surface Water Protection Ordinance. The 75-foot surface water protection buffer is also shown on the plan. With respect to steep slopes, the applicant has added a note to the plan stating that that any work done within areas of precautionary and/or prohibitive slopes may require the submittal of a Hillside Protection Conditional Use Permit. This standard appears to be met.

Monumentation: The project narrative states that rebar has been set at all new lot corners. Planning Staff recommend the inclusion of a precedent condition of approval related to the inspection of the lot monuments by the Public Works Director or the submittal of a security to cover the installation of the monuments. This standard appears to be met.

Special Flood Hazard Areas: The parcel does not appear to be located near any Special Flood Hazard Areas. This standard is not applicable.

Fire Protection and Water Supply: A note has been added to the plan set stating that any future buildings shall have an adequate and approved fire protection system installed. This standard appears to be met.

Utilities: The proposed subdivision plans show two potential well and septic system locations. A note has been included on the plan stating that private sewer and water systems will be required for any future buildings on the lots. Planning Staff recommend including a condition of approval related to submitting documentation of state approval for this subdivision, which Ms. Forston stated was received this morning by staff. At this point, staff would recommend that the state subdivision approval number be added to the plan.

Drainage and Stormwater Management: No development is proposed at this time; however, staff recommend including a subsequent condition of approval requiring that a stormwater management plan be submitted prior to the issuance of a building permit for either of the lots.

Sediment and Erosion Control: A note has been added to the plan stating that each project shall be designed to prevent erosion and sedimentation during and subsequent to construction. This standard appears to be met.

Sewer and Water: City water is available near all proposed lots; however, as stated previously, there is a note on the plan indicating that the lots will be serviced by a private well and septic system. This standard appears to be met.

Traffic & Access Management: The proposed subdivision plan shows that the single-family residence on the 40.63-ac parcel will be accessed via the existing gravel driveway. A note has also been added to the plan stating that a Street Access Permit must be obtained from the City Engineer's office prior to construction. This standard appears to be met.

Surface Waters and Wetlands: There are surface waters present at the rear of the two 3-acre parcels and the 75' surface water buffer is shown. Staff is recommending two conditions of approval related to the submittal of a stormwater management plan and flagging of the wetlands prior to the development of either of the new lots. This standard appears to be met

This concluded staff comments.

Mr. Mehu asked whether a Cottage Court Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would not be a better option for this property. Ms. Forston stated that this lot is not eligible to go through the Cottage Court CUP, as it is not connected to both City water and sewer which is one of the requirements. She deferred to the developer to explain why any other form of development was not considered. Ms. Pelletier stated they did meet with City Staff to discuss a potential Conservation Residential Development Subdivision with the assumption that five-acre zoning still existed in this district; however, the minimum lot size requirements have since been reduced to two acres, so there was no advantage to move forward with that development model at that time.

Chair Farrington noted City water is available, but there is a stipulation regarding wells and asked for clarification. Ms. Pelletier stated it is not a stipulation, but it the state approved the subdivision design with wells and she was unclear that City water was available.

Mr. Clancy asked when there is a development proposed how staff recommends city water versus a well. Public Works Director, Don Lussier, stated there is no requirement in City ordinance to hook up to City water; however, the ordinance does require connection to City sewer if it is within a certain distance of the proposed parcel (100 feet from any portion of the parcel or 200 feet from the proposed building).

The Chair asked for public comment. Ms. Carol Compton of 441 Chapman Road addressed the Board and stated 20 years ago when there was a proposal to develop the parcel across the street, which is now City property. She explained there was concern, as this is one of the few wildlife through ways to the river in Roxbury. She stated she is appreciative that this subdivision proposes lots that are three acres in size, which will provide for a buffer from further development. She felt that there would be an increase in wildlife and resident interaction in this area, especially with the high speeds at which some people tend to drive in this area.

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

### C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni that the Planning Board approve PB-2024-06 as shown on the plan set identified as “Title Sheet, Existing and Proposed Conditions, 3-lot Subdivision, Map 239-041-000, 435 Chapman Road, Keene, NH 03431” prepared by Cardinal Surveying & Land Planning at varying scales on June 14, 2024 and last revised on July 3, 2024 with the following conditions:

1. Prior to final approval and signature of the plans by the Planning Board Chair, the following conditions precedent shall be met:
  - a. Owner’s signature appears on both sheets of the plan set.
  - b. Submittal of four (4) paper copies, two (2) mylar copies, and a digital copy of the complete plan set.
  - c. Inspection of lot monuments by the Public Works Director or their designee following their installation or the submittal of a security in an amount deemed satisfactory to the Public Works Director to ensure that the monuments will be set.
  - d. Submittal of a check in the amount of \$77.00 made out to the City of Keene to cover the cost of recording fees.
  - e. Submittal of documentation demonstrating that the application has received state subdivision approval from NHDES. A note with the NHDES approval number shall be added to Sheet 1 of the plan set.
2. Subsequent to final approval and signature by the Planning Board Chair, the following conditions subsequent shall be met:

- a. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for new residential construction, a stormwater management plan shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for review and approval by the City Engineer.
- b. At the Community Development Director's discretion, the 75' wetland buffer shall be flagged and inspected by the Community Development Director or their designee prior to the development of the new lots.

The motion was seconded Stephen Mehu.

Mr. Clancy stated he agrees with staff that there is no regional impact from this development.

Chair Farrington stated he finds this application acceptable based on the Board's standards and the fact that it complies with the minimum lot size requirements for the Rural District.

The motion made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni was unanimously approved.

- b. **PB-2024-07 – Site Plan – Dinkbee's Redevelopment, 510 Washington St - Applicant Fieldstone Land Consultants PLLC, on behalf of owner OM 510 Washington Street LLC, proposes to demolish the existing Dinkbee's building on the property at 510 Washington St (TMP #532-003-000), construct a new ~6,256-sf building in its place, and expand the number of vehicle fueling stations. Waivers are requested from Sections 20.2.1.b, 20.6.E, 20.7.2.C, and 20.14.3.D of the LDC related to the submittal of a drainage report, parking lot landscaping, light trespass, and parking. The parcel is 0.74 acres and is located in the Commerce District.**

A. Board Determination of Completeness

Planner, Evan Clements, addressed the Board and stated the applicant has requested exemptions from submitting a drainage report, historic evaluation, screening analysis, architectural and visual appearance analysis, and soil analysis. After reviewing the requested exemptions, staff feels that they have no bearing on the merits of the application and is comfortable with the Board granting these exemptions. The applicant has also requested an exemption from submitting a drainage report, which staff is not in support of. Additionally, they have also requested a waiver from completing this report. As a result, staff feels the application is not complete. It would be up to the Board to decide if they support the waiver or not.

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni to accept the site plan application, PB-2024-07, as complete. The motion was seconded by Mayor Kahn and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Mr. John Noonan of Fieldstone Land Consultants addressed the Board on behalf of the property owner. He indicated that the proposal is to demolish the existing laundromat and gas station at 510 Washington Street and replace it with a larger building. He explained that they have already obtained a variance from the Zoning Board to encroach into the rear setback.

He went on to explain that along the southern portion of the parcel, there is access to the gas station and the rear lot owned by Toby Tousley. This will be smaller curb cut and is related to the waiver request to allow for the creation of four parking spaces in this area. Additionally, asphalt will be reduced along the front entryway

Along the north side of the property, the applicant will be providing the main entryway for each of the two units in the building. One unit will be occupied by the existing convenience store and the second space has not yet been rented, but was designed with a retail use in mind. More parking will also be provided in this location. Overall, there will be 26 parking spaces with one being an ADA accessible space.

Mr. Noonan stated that at the same location where there are the four existing pump stations, the applicant would like to add two more. The applicant is also proposing to install another underground gasoline storage tank, which would require permitting through DES. Mr. Noonan noted the property has asked for relief regarding soil testing; however, when DES permits the installation of the underground storage tank, there is excessive amount of testing that will need to be done as part of that process and the city would be forwarded the results of these tests.

With respect to grading and drainage, the applicant has asked for an exemption and a waiver from providing a drainage report. He noted there is going to be a 6.6% reduction in the overall amount of impervious surfaces on the site. Just by reducing the impervious area, the post-condition runoff and velocity is going to be reduced compared to the existing amount of runoff. He referred to the infiltration trench shown on the proposed site plan, which is where water is going to be directed, which will further help to reduce the amount of runoff.

With reference to utilities – there are two existing overhead lines that feed the Tousley property. The existing line that goes to the gas station will be utilized for the proposed new building. The applicant is working with Eversource to get information about the potential installation of a second utility pole.

Water would be fed from a new domestic water line running from the existing curb stop valve that was replaced when Washington Street was upgraded. Sewer would come from the same connection.

In regards to landscaping, the frontage is currently paved, there will be two defined curb cuts; one to access the Tousley property and the other that they anticipate using for employee parking. There will be landscaping located along the front of the road. There will be a few additional trees and shrubs in addition to the existing trees that will remain. The arborvitae at the rear of the existing building will remain to help define the rear property line.

Mr. Noonan noted that the existing dumpster will also be enclosed.

In regards to lighting, wall packs are being proposed along all sides of the building (except for the side facing residences) as well as two pole mounted lights. Mr. Noonan noted one of their other waivers requests was to allow for light trespass levels of 0.2 foot candles, where only 0.1 foot

candles is allowed at the property line under the Planning Board's lighting standards. The applicant feels that this lighting is necessary for security reasons.

In regards to aesthetics, Mr. Noonan explained that when they first submitted their application, they did not have architectural plans. With the submittal of their updated materials, they were able to provide elevations and today they submitted updated plans from the architect showing the proposed exterior building materials. The unit closest to Washington Street would have techwood siding and the larger unit would have a combination of azek trim, hardie panel siding, and cultured stone along the bottom perimeter. The roof will be pitched roof and covered with asphalt shingles. The rear façade will be finished with hardy plank siding. This concluded the presentation.

Mayor Kahn asked about delivery vehicles accessing the site, which could be a challenge. Mr. Noonan stated the large landscaping island would be surrounded with stamped asphalt. Delivery trucks would enter as they do now during off hours. The stamped asphalt curb will have a sloped curve and trucks can drive over it, if there is a need. The Mayor asked where the anticipated delivery locations are for the building. Mr. Noonan stated that they are at the rear, similar to their current locations. He explained that there will be stairs and a grade change at this back portion of the building.

If it is off hours, deliveries would be through the front entrance. The Mayor asked whether there is an intent to have a circulating pattern through the parking lot. Mr. Noonan answered in the negative. The Mayor noted in that case, the exit for delivery vehicles off the site would be to back out of where they entered.

Mr. Kost stated that during the site visit, he noticed the employees parking on the southerly corner of the site, which does not leave much room for landscaping. He asked whether Mr. Noonan sees any benefit to moving two of those spaces to the east, to allow for more green space. Mr. Noonan stated this is something that could be considered.

Mr. Kost referred to the underground tanks – when the second one is added, it has to be approved by the state and a soil test will be completed at that time. Mr. Noonan agreed and added the state will be looking for many more chemicals as well as other items.

Mr. Clancy asked whether there will be gutters on this building. Mr. Noonan stated there will be closed gutters because this is going to be a pitched roof and the roof to the north and south corners will be tied into this gutter system. Mr. Clancy referred to the north side of the property and asked how much of that slopes down towards Washington Street. Mr. Noonan stated with the current condition, about 50% goes down to Washington Street and then about 50% goes to the rear. With the new proposal, 75% will go to the front and 25% will go to the rear.

Ms. Vezzani stated that during the site visit, there was a discussion about the 6% reduction in the amount of impervious surface on the site. She asked why the applicant was looking for waiver and exemption requests from submitting a drainage report. She asked whether there was a report done in the last 10 years that could be used and asked how the Board could determine if the drainage mechanisms will working the properly without this information. Mr. Noonan stated the last site plan was done to add the gas pumps. The existing and proposed condition are going to be almost



identical. He explained that ultimately the roof runoff from the gas canopy will be tied into a culvert, and the existing roof ties into a roof drain. With the proposed condition, they will be doing the same thing, but runoff will go through a stone infiltration trench and what doesn't end up in the trench will flow into the culvert. The proposed condition will slow runoff down by directing it through the stone infiltration trench.

Ms. Vezzani asked whether there are numbers Mr. Noonan has to that show that this drainage system would work. Mr. Noonan stated they are requesting a waiver to not go through that exercise and noted they do many of these type of systems that have been reviewed by the state. He added they will be reducing the runoff by at least 25%.

Chair Farrington asked for clarification about the screening along Washington Street. Mr. Noonan stated the islands they have created along the southern entrance would have a tree, shrubbery, and would be surrounded by grass on the corner. The large landscape island between the building and Washington Street would have two trees and nine shrubs.

Mayor Kahn asked if the applicant was required to install a transformer on site for the underground utilities and asked where that would be located and how that would be included in the landscape plan. Mr. Noonan stated the transformer currently is located on a pole and they are planning to do the same for the new plan. He added that pad-mounted transformers are hard to procure at this time.

Chair Farrington asked for a timeline for this project. Mr. Noonan stated they would like to start a year from when they receive approval.

Staff comments were next. Mr. Clements addressed the Board. With respect to regional impact, staff does not believe this application meets the threshold for regional impact.

Screening – Mr. Clements stated the Board does not need to make a motion with reference to this item, but section 9.4.4.A.5, of the land development code refers to screening of parking lots from public rights-of-way. The applicant is requesting an alternative landscape plan and the Board would need to decide if the proposed landscape plan meets the spirit of the screening standard.

Lighting Waiver – As Mr. Noonan described, this is very much an existing condition with the City-mounted lighting and light trespass onto the abutting property. There is very nominal amount of trespass. The Board will need to vote on the requested waiver from this standard.

Traffic Management – There is going to be a reduction in the width of the curb cuts. Mr. Clements stated there is also a traffic report that is pending for this application, which has not yet been finalized and submitted to staff. He stated staff is recommending a condition of approval that this be submitted and reviewed by the City Engineer. The waiver request is technically from complying with the architectural and visual guideline standards due to the addition of six parking spaces within the front building line.

Hazardous and Toxic Material – The applicant does acknowledge that the existing site is a refueling station and will be continuing to use it as such. Mr. Clements noted that they will be

applying for the underground storage tank permit and a copy of the permit, along with the decision by DES, will be submitted to the Community Development Department.

Mr. Clements stated there are three waiver request motions and then the approval request at the end, so there will be four votes taken for this application. He reviewed the waivers and motions as proposed.

Mr. Clements noted this application was noticed with those waivers being cited. After this application was noticed and this staff report was created, the Land Development Code was updated to include the new Cottage Court Overlay Conditional Use Permit process. He explained that the Site Development Standards in Article 21 (formerly Article 20), are exactly the same, but wanted to note that the article numbers had changed.

Mr. Kost clarified that staff was not in favor of granting the drainage waiver and asked what staff's concern was. Mr. Clements stated he appreciates the assumptions made by Mr. Noonan with the low impact development of this design for the stormwater system, but stated he would like to see proof with numbers. Staff would like to see proof that the system will function as described. Because City Staff can't do their own drainage modeling, he explained that they rely on stamped reports.

Mayor Kahn clarified the waiver motion – it is granting a waiver from the requirement. Mr. Clements agreed and explained the proposed motion is for the Board to grant the waiver and if that motion fails, then the waiver request is denied. At that time, staff could add a condition of approval regarding submittal of a drainage report.

Mr. Clancy asked for the ratio of parking spaces to trees and if arborvitae are on the approved list of trees. Mr. Clements stated it is one tree per ten spaces, and arborvitae are not considered trees. Mr. Clancy asked whether staff is looking to add the requirement for a traffic study as a condition of approval. Mr. Clements stated the applicant is working on a traffic study, but it has not been submitted yet. As a result, it is being included as a recommended condition of approval.

Chair Farrington noted the Board will need to make some assumptions, as there is no clear use for the second unit. Mr. Noonan stated they have contracted with VHB Traffic Engineers and they are working on a report. He indicated the second unit would be a retail space; however, the driving factor is the gas station. They have increased the traffic trip counts per day based on the square footage of the building. The traffic count would be based on the convenience store use and increasing the total number of gas pumps from four to six. These two uses combined generate the total trip count. Mr. Noonan agreed that the submittal of a traffic report could be included as a condition of approval.

The Chair asked for public comment next.

Mr. Toby Tousley of 500 Washington Street addressed the Board and asked whether the screening will remain at the rear. Mr. Noonan answered in the affirmative and referred to the arborvitae shown on the proposed site plan that will remain at the rear of the lot.

Mr. Tousley went on to say that he has come before the Board with numerous projects previously and if he had not completed for instance a traffic study, the application would not have made it before the Board. He stated the public was not given the opportunity to review the report and hoped he would have the same consideration as is being offered to this applicant for future projects.

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

Mayor Kahn asked staff what they thought about Mr. Tousley's perception – when does a traffic study become a condition of approval versus a submission. Mr. Clements stated usually this is something staff would like to see prior to a public hearing so they have an opportunity to review the material. Staff had hoped this material would be provided to them prior to the meeting. He stated his personal opinion with this project is that this is an existing gas station and convenience store with four pump stations. The increase in size of the building and the increase to the number of pump stations is not a dramatic change of use or would be a dramatic increase to traffic.

He stated he understands the comment about the public not being given the opportunity to review the report, but it is a quantifiable report and staff did not feel it was necessary to continue this application for that purpose. The City Engineer will be given the opportunity to review the report and if it the City Engineer is not satisfied with the report, then that condition of approval would not have been met and the applicant would have to come back and address those comments.

### C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni that the Planning Board grant a waiver from Section 21.2.1.B "Runoff Volume and Velocity" of the Land Development Code regarding the requirement to submit stormwater and drainage data in the form of a Drainage Report stamped by a Professional Engineer licensed in the state of New Hampshire.

The motion was seconded by Mayor Kahn.

Ms. Vezzani stated that in looking at the responsibilities assigned to the Board, she did not feel comfortable granting the waiver. She stated she does not have information about whether not the system is currently working and how it is going to work in the future with the proposed new changes. She stated she likes that the applicant is installing an infiltration system, but is not sure how that is going to work.

Mr. Kost stated he is stuck on the language in the code stating that, "*strict conformity would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant.*" He stated that he did not want to address the applicant's finances, but noted that he felt the true hardship would be a day or two of engineering design. He felt submitting a drainage report is an obligation the developer should be meeting, so the proposed drainage system is on record for staff to review.

The motion for the waiver failed on a 0-8 vote.

Mr. Clements stated based on the public's concern regarding the traffic study and the motion and the denial of the waiver for the drainage report, he suggested continuing this application to the next meeting of the Board to give the applicant time to submit this information.

The Chair asked for Mr. Noonan's comments. Mr. Noonan stated he was in agreement with continuing the application to provide the drainage report and the traffic report for staff to review.

Chair Farrington felt this was a great project for this area.

Mr. Clancy asked whether the Board should vote on the other waivers, so the applicant knows what items are still outstanding for next month. The Chair agreed.

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni that the Planning Board grant a waiver from Section 21.7.2.C "Light Trespass" of the Land Development Code to allow light trespass of 0.2-footcandles on an adjacent property where only .1-footcandles is permitted."

The motion was seconded by Mayor Kahn and was unanimously approved.

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni that the Planning Board grant a waiver from Section 21.14.3.D "Site Design and Relationship to Surrounding Community" of the Land Development Code to allow for required off street parking to be located in front of the building where parking is normally required to be located on the sides and rear of buildings."

The motion was seconded by Mayor Kahn.

Ms. Vezzani stated the improvements to this site look exciting and she is inclined to move forward with approving this waiver request for that reason.

The waiver request was unanimously approved.

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni that the Planning Board continue the site plan application, PB-2024-07, to the August 26<sup>th</sup> Planning Board meeting scheduled for 6:30 pm in the Council Chambers on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor of City Hall.

The motion was seconded by Stephon Mehu and was unanimously approved.

- c. **PB-2024-08 – Cottage Court Conditional Use Permit – Townhomes, 0 Ellis Ct - Applicant Sampson Architects LLC, on behalf of owner POMAH LLC, proposes to construct a two-unit townhome on the parcel at 0 Ellis Ct (TMP #535-012-000). The parcel is 0.18 ac and is located in the Medium Density District.**

A. Board Determination of Completeness

Senior Planner, Mari Brunner, addressed the Board and stated that the applicant has requested exemptions from submitting an existing conditions plan, a lighting plan, a landscaping plan, and technical reports that are not relevant to this project including traffic, soil, historic and screening

analyses. Staff recommends that the Board grant these exemptions and accept the application as complete.

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni to accept the Cottage Court Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application, PB-2024-08, as complete. The motion was seconded by Mayor Kahn and was unanimously approved.

#### B. Public Hearing

Tim Sampson of Sampson Architects addressed the Board on behalf of the property owner. Mr. Sampson stated they are proposing to construct a duplex on the existing 8,000 square foot lot. He indicated that normally duplexes would not have to go through a Planning Board review process; however, given that the lot is small, there isn't sufficient square footage to be able to construct a duplex under the current zoning requirements for the Medium Density District.

He went on to state that the duplex will be two stories and will be built into the slope of the hill. He noted the site does meet front and rear setbacks as well as all other applicable land use requirements outlined in the code. Each unit will be approximately 1,050 square feet of living space, including a garage, two bedrooms, one-and-a-half baths and is consistent with the neighborhood's existing uses and appearance. This concluded Mr. Sampson's presentation.

Ms. Vezzani referred to the constraints of this roadway and asked how construction vehicles were going to be handled. She noted there was no room for the parking of construction vehicles. Mr. Sampson stated this would be up to the contractors to address and agreed it is small site and storage would be limited. He felt there could be an opportunity to park in a neighbors' driveway and added that this is not a large development and he can't see more than six to eight people on the site doing work at any given time. He indicated that once the foundation is in and the first floor is decked off, there would be room for the storage of materials on the site.

The Chair asked for staff comments next. Ms. Brunner stated this is the first Cottage Court CUP application coming before the Board and is not what staff was expecting for these types of applications, but noted that she felt it was a creative application.

Ms. Brunner noted this is a vacant undeveloped parcel ~8,000 square feet in size, which is the minimum lot size for the Medium Density District. She explained that in this zoning district, you can have up to three units on a lot. For each additional unit to be added on a lot, there must be an additional 5,400-sf of lot space available (in addition to the required 8,000-sf minimum lot size). The applicant does not have enough lot area to construct a duplex on this lot. Ms. Brunner noted that a duplex would not ordinarily come before the Board, but because they did not have enough lot area to construct a duplex by right, they are going through the Cottage Court Conditional Use Permit application process.

Ms. Brunner went on to say that this lot was created in 2007 through a subdivision and called the Board's attention to a few notes on that subdivision plan: Notes 8 through 11.

She explained that Note 9 talks about the proposed Lot 2, which is the subject parcel being discussed this evening. Note 8 is talks about a 20-foot wide sewer easement that runs across Lot 1 for the purposes of installing a sewer line for a future structure. Note 10 states that the Planning Board requires approval by the City Engineer for sediment and erosion control and stormwater management designs prior to the issuance of a building permit for any new development. Note 11 states that prior to the issuance of building permits on Lot 2, the applicant shall install sedimentation and erosion control devices following best management practices and stormwater management designs must be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer

Ms. Brunner stated that because these notes are on the subdivision plan, staff is recommending that they be included in the motion for approval for this application, so that it is clear that these items need to be addressed when the building permit is submitted.

With respect to the surrounding uses, adjacent to this property there is an existing four-unit residential building, a duplex, and then across the street and to the south are single-family homes. Staff did make a preliminary determination that the proposed duplex would most likely not have regional impact, but she noted that the Board will have to make the final decision on that.

With reference to departmental comments, Ms. Brunner stated that between the time the staff report came out and this evening, the applicant has submitted revised materials that address many of the departmental comments that are listed in the staff report. The applicant has clarified that they are going to be connecting to water on Colony Court and sewer on Ellis Court. They have also modified the location of the driveway to address the concerns about turning conflicts.

With respect to the Cottage Court CUP standards,

Development Types Allowed: Ms. Brunner stated she had included a table of what the requirements are and what the proposal calls for; all of these items appear to be met.

Dwelling unit size: This standard requires a maximum average size of 1,250 square feet gross floor area and a maximum building footprint of 900 square feet per unit. This gross floor area does not include the garage area. The proposed units would each be 1,140 square feet of gross floor area and would have a footprint of 608 square feet per unit. This standard has been met.

Parking: This standard requires a minimum of one parking space per unit and a maximum of one parking space per bedroom. Each unit within the duplex would have two bedrooms. The applicant proposes four parking spaces, (two surface and two garage). This standard has been met.

Building Separation: Does not apply as there is only one building

Driveways: The applicant proposes a shared driveway on Colony Court - 20 feet wide at the property line 30 feet at the road. Mr. Brunner went on to say, with respect to the driveway, that for a single-family or two-family home, if someone were to submit a Street Access Permit application or request a modification to their approved Street Access Permit, the Planning Board has delegated their authority for review of those driveway permits to the City Engineer's Office. Because this item is coming before the Board for review, staff is suggesting adding a note to the

plan indicating that any future changes to the driveway can go before the City Engineer for approval.

Internal Roads: No internal roads are being proposed. This standard is not applicable.

Screening: This standard requires either a six-foot tall opaque or semi opaque fence between uses that are higher in intensity not density. This means a more intense type of use (duplex next to a single family home) requires this type of fencing. Landscaping can be used in lieu of the fence as long as the Board feels its meets the standard. The applicant is proposing to maintain the existing vegetation to use as this screening.

Architectural Guidelines: This section is to encourage development to fit in with the surrounding neighborhood. There are guidelines but not requirements and this something the Board will need to evaluate whether or not it has been met.

Ms. Brunner stated that because this is a duplex, it does not meet the threshold for formal site plan review and these are the only standards for the Board to consider.

Mayor Kahn asked whether there is additional wording for the Board to use for the other conditions. Ms. Brunner referred to page 59 of the staff report where the motion is outlined and stated that item #2 addresses those items. The Mayor asked about language for a landscape buffer. Ms. Brunner stated this is not included as a condition of approval, but stated it can be added as a condition.

Chair Farrington felt the Mayor was referring to Item F in the staff report related to screening properties with different intensities. Ms. Brunner explained the screening standard states that a six foot tall fence should be used for screening or in lieu of that, the Planning Board can approve landscaping. The applicant is proposing to use existing vegetation that is there today as that proposed landscaping. The rationale is that this landscaping is tall and provides the same level of screening as a fence. She indicated it would be up to Board to decide if they feel this is or is not sufficient screening. The Board could then ask the applicant if they would be willing to install additional landscaping or install a fence to meet this standard.

Mr. Kost stated that during the site visit, they could not access the site to look at the landscaping and asked what type of landscaping exists at the site; is it invasive species, etc. Ms. Brunner referred to pages 60 and 61 of the agenda packet, which outlined the existing landscaping, but explained that just based on the pictures she is not able to determine what type of species are present on the site. She noted that if the Board is concerned about this, she would suggest including a condition of approval requiring that any invasive species be removed and replaced with a suitable alternative.

Chair Farrington asked the applicant to comment on the screening. Mr. Sampson stated they would agree to remove any invasive species and replace it with suitable plantings. The Chair asked which sides would require screening. Ms. Brunner stated it would be to the south and along Colony Court. The Chair asked whether this was included in the application. Mr. Sampson stated screening along Colony Court is not included. He was agreeable to screen this portion of the site as well.

Mr. Clancy referred to the property on the east side and asked whether intensity would also extend to this property. Ms. Brunner stated that property was also a duplex.

The Chair asked for public comment next.

An abutter, who did not provide her name, addressed the Board and stated there were drainage issues recently in that area that were supposed to be fixed by the Public Works Department and residents are concerned about additional runoff taking place as a result of this construction. She indicated there are already standing water issues in yards during severe storm events. She went on to say that they are also concerned about parking. She stated that as was indicated by Ms. Vezzani, the road is very narrow.

She indicated there are at least two households who have individuals with medical issues and the residents wanted to make sure the road is accessible in an emergency. She also asked how long construction would last and the about the expected noise level during construction, as there are certain neighbors on the street who work from home. She also asked about safety measures during construction as there are children who play outside and ride bicycles. She questioned what permits would be needed and if the public could have access to reports as it pertains to traffic patterns, drainage, etc., prior to this application being approved.

With respect to the driveway, if it is going to be a 12% grade coming from Colony Court, there is going to be significant excavation necessary. She asked how that is going to affect the slope behind the property and then eventually the drainage. She questioned if the snow storage area will have any impact on drainage.

She asked what type of impact exterior lighting would have on the houses across the street. With reference to vegetation, if the driveway is going to come in directly from the road, is the vegetation going to be installed on a hill in front of the home.

Mr. Stephen Dover of 16 Colony Court addressed the Board. He referred to the right-of-way on Ellis Court and asked why that is not being utilized. He stated he reiterates everything that was stated earlier and felt this construction will disrupt the neighborhood.

Mr. Chris Newer of 12 Colony Court stated he was concerned about flooding and stated his basement floods all the time. He indicated where this house is going to be sited, it will undoubtedly cause more flooding issues for his home. He stated he is also concerned about parking and the introduction of more vehicles to this area.

Mr. Jared Goodell stated he does not live in this neighborhood, but noted that Keene has a housing shortage and hopes that the Board would keep in mind the need for housing in Keene. He stated new development does need to take into consideration abutters in the area, but Keene has a housing shortage which also needs to be considered.

Mr. Troy Kelsey of 55 Washington Avenue addressed the Board and stated the landscaping that exists in the area has already been trimmed. He felt there should be a barrier along the side of the



duplex adjacent to the single-family house. With respect to traffic, Mr. Kelsey stated traffic coming off of Washington Avenue is fast and constant. There is a housing complex already in the area and there is also a bus stop. He stated there should be a traffic study for this application.

Ms. Kelsey of 55 Washington Avenue stated the screening barrier looks a lot different in the summer compared to how it does look in the winter (no screening at all). She felt a fence would provide consistent screening throughout the year.

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

Based on the comments made regarding screening, Ms. Brunner asked whether the Board was inclined to go with vegetative screening or a fence. Mr. Kost stated the Board is not aware of the quality or effectiveness of the landscape proposed to be used for screening and felt fencing would be better unless the developer wants to install quality landscaping.

Mayor Kahn stated that based on the erosion issues and drainage concerns having whatever vegetation that can be sustained is important. He felt having a fence all around the site might not be the best solution.

Chair Farrington stated that based on the public comment, the new development would have internal parking. He felt the stormwater issues have been addressed. With respect to erosion control, that item is being addressed by a recommended condition of approval in the recommended motion.

Ms. Brunner agreed and added what the City Engineer would be looking for is that this site complies with the City's stormwater and runoff requirement. For erosion control, he will be looking to make sure sedimentation does not go onto abutting properties. The Chair addressed traffic on Washington Avenue and noted that he did not feel this was in the purview of the Planning Board's review of the application. Ms. Brunner stated the City of Keene is working with a consultant on a Roadway Safety Action plan and felt those comments would be useful to that plan.

She explained that in terms of this development, there would be minimal traffic impact and unless there are ten or more units being proposed as part of a development, the submittal of a traffic study is not required. The Chair asked how the duration of construction and safety measures during construction is handled. Ms. Brunner stated these types of issues are handled by other City ordinances and a pre-construction meeting can always be requested. She explained that City staff could always meet with contractors based on how constrained this street is. This Chair felt this would be a good option for this property.

Mr. Clancy stated he was more inclined to go with a vegetative screening rather than a fence to keep with the rest of the neighborhood and noted that vegetative screening also would require less maintenance.

Chair Farrington indicated there are two outstanding items that need to be addressed: the pre-construction meeting and effective screening. He asked how these should be handled. Ms. Brunner stated that the pre-construction meeting would be subsequent to final approval and prior to the start

of construction. With respect to the screening plan, Ms. Brunner asked that the Board be as specific as possible as to what is being required of the applicant. If it is a vegetative buffer the Board is requiring, then it could be a condition subsequent. If the Board wants to just see a fence on the plan, it would be a condition precedent. As long as what the Board is looking for is clear, it could be just “checked” off by staff once it is completed, otherwise the applicant would have to come back before the Board for further review.

Mayor Kahn stated he likes the Chairman’s suggestion of effective screening; vegetation versus a fence. He also asked whether the issue with parking would be discussed at the pre-construction meeting. The Mayor felt if parking could be restricted to the site, it could alleviate much of the concern from the public. Ms. Brunner agreed these are things could be handled at a pre-construction meeting, but the key component here is during construction that the applicant is keeping with all city ordinances and regulations; not blocking the flow of traffic or causing hazardous conditions for the neighbors. She added that for the members of public who are here, to let City Staff know when there is an issue.

Ms. Brunner read some recommended motion language: *“Prior to the start of construction, the applicant shall hold a pre-construction meeting with staff to address any potential impacts to the neighborhood from construction activities.”* She asked whether this would be acceptable to the Board. The Chair agreed it would.

For the screening condition, the Chairman suggested wording the condition as follows: *“Submission and approval of an effective screening design for the lesser intensive abutters.”* Ms. Brunner stated that for this type of condition, she would suggest continuation of the public hearing, so that the Board can review and approve the screening, due to the subjective nature of the wording. Mayor Kahn stated he wanted to be clear that screening to the front of the property was not a necessity.

Ms. Brunner suggested inviting the applicant’s representative to address the screening issue. Mr. Sampson stated they would be willing to place some sort of screening along the property line, but wouldn’t want a six foot tall fence in front of the site. He stated that they would be willing to place some sort of vegetated screening here as well. The Chair asked whether Mr. Sampson would be willing to locate a fence along the southern portion of the site. Mr. Sampson answered in the affirmative. Mr. Clements asked whether Mr. Sampson would agree to an ornamental bushes along the front. Mr. Sampson agreed.

### C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni that the Planning Board approve PB-2024-08 as shown on the site plan identified as “Site Grading Plan, POMAH, LLC” prepared by Fieldstone Land Consultants at a scale of 1 inch = 10 feet and dated June 21, 2024, and on the architectural plans identified as “Proposed Townhouse, 0 Ellis Court, Keene, NH 03431” prepared by Sampson Architects at varying scales and dated May 21, 2024, with the following conditions:

1. Prior to final approval and signature of the plans by the Planning Board Chair, the following conditions shall be met:

- a. Engineer's stamp appears on the site grading plan.
  - b. Owner's signature appears on the site plan and architectural plans.
  - c. Submittal of five (5) paper copies and one digital copy of the site plan and architectural plans.
  - d. Submittal of an effective screening between the abutters of a six foot tall fence along the southern property boundary and ornamental shrubs along Colony Court to create a buffer that would have no impact on drainage or flooding.
2. Subsequent to final approval and signature by the Planning Board Chair, the following conditions shall be met:
- a. City Engineer review and approval of sediment and erosion control and stormwater management designs prior to the issuance of a building permit.
  - b. Any future modification to the street access shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.
  - c. Schedule a pre-construction meeting to review plans including parking and material storage and any impact the project may have on the neighborhood.

The motion was seconded by Mayor Kahn and was unanimously approved.

## **VI. Advice and Comment**

- a. **Planning Board Review and Comment on Proposed Development at 57 Marlboro St. and 3 Aliber Pl.** – In accordance with RSA 674:41, sub-section I.(d), owner Jared Goodell seeks Planning Board review and comment regarding his request for City Council authorization for the issuance of building permits where the street giving access to the lot upon which the buildings are proposed to be placed is a private road.

Applicant, George Hansel of Tailfeather Strategies, addressed the board and explained that this request pertains to an issue he has never encountered before, which is a state statute that requires any parcel that does not have frontage to be approved by the governing body. Furthermore, the statute requires that the Planning Board provide comments to the governing body. He noted that this project will also require other approvals, including relief from zoning. He said he and the owner participated in a Pre-submission meeting with staff and got feedback from planning, zoning, police, fire, engineering, and building. He appreciates staff working with him on a new and different idea.

The plan calls for the construction of three duplexes on a currently un-used section of 57 Marlboro St, which is located between a two-family parcel on Marlboro St and a single-family property to the rear. This lot would not be allowed to be created today – it is an existing nonconformity. The area where the duplexes are proposed is currently deteriorated gravel, so part of the plan is to make improvements to the site and add some desperately needed housing in a developed area of the city.

Mr. Hansel stated that the RSA does not provide guidance for reviewing this type of request. In his research, he found that most communities when reviewing these types of requests are mostly reviewing to make sure there is emergency access. They are concerned with Class VI roads that

are way out in the woods where it might be difficult to get a fire truck or emergency vehicle to access the site. That is not an issue for this instance – this is an established site; it has been reviewed by fire and police and they did not have any comments or concerns.

Chair Farrington asked for clarification on the location of Aliber Place. Mr. Hansel responded that it is essentially a shared driveway that runs along the east of the properties that are part of this proposal. It provides access for the single-family home at 3 Aliber Place and a three-family home on 57 Marlboro. Mayor Kahn asked for clarification that Aliber Place is a private road; Mr. Hansel responded in the affirmative.

Mayor Kahn noted that the City Council has a policy, Resolution R-2000-28 that pertains to Class VI roads. Ms. Brunner addressed the Board and said that this resolution was adopted in 2000 and it deals with the RSA under discussion tonight, RSA 674:41. At the time the resolution was adopted, the RSA did not mention private roads; however, in 2002 the RSA was amended to include a section on private roads. She noted that this resolution is a matter for City Council to discuss and not the Planning Board. The role of the Planning Board is to provide comment as required by RSA 674:41 on this specific proposal, or in other words, the Planning Board is being asked to comment on whether the City Council should authorize building permits to be issued specifically for properties with frontage/access from Aliber Place. City Council will have to decide whether the resolution the Mayor mentioned is pertinent to this situation, and if so, whether they want to amend it or suspend it.

Mayor Kahn asked whether or not the Planning Board could even look at this tonight, given City Council's policy on Class VI roads. Ms. Brunner said that the City Council's policy is not the Planning Board's policy; the Planning Board does have jurisdiction to provide review and comment on this request under RSA 674:41. City Council will have to decide whether and how their resolutions applies to this request and work through that when this item gets to them. She reiterated that the Planning Board, tonight, is being asked to comment specifically on Aliber Place and not private roads city wide. Mr. Clements added that the Board should look at this from the perspective of their role as a regulator for the safe, orderly development of the community in a general sense. He noted that the RSA contemplates old woodlots and large, very remote parcels; he doesn't the legislators were considering an urban developed area when the RSA was written.

Ms. Vezzani said that, in her view, the applicant has addressed emergency access. She has no concerns related to fire or police access. She would like to know how maintenance such as snow removal will be handled.

Chair Farrington asked whether Aliber Place is a Class VI road; Ms. Brunner said it is not. A Class VI road is a type of road in New Hampshire that is a public right of way that is no longer maintained for motor vehicle access or emergency access. The City has specific regulations relating to Class VI roads, but does not have any regulations specific to private roads. Neither the city nor state statute defines what a private road is.

Don Lussier, Public Works Director addressed the Board and said that private roads, for all intent and purposes are shared driveways – there is no public right to use a private road, versus a Class VI road which is a public road under state statute. He noted that the RSA requires that a notice be filed with the Registry that states the municipality is not, and will never be, responsible for maintenance of the road or damages resulting from it. He said Public Works will not be maintaining this road and utilities will remain private, therefore there is no public interest.

Mayor Kahn asked what the City's responsibility is to provide services to this development. Mr. Lussier said that currently, all of the buildings on these lots have individual private water service and a shared private sewer line. City ordinances allow a shared service for multiple buildings on a single parcel, but do not allow shared service for buildings on multiple parcels. The applicant has proposed to merge these lots into a single residential parcel, so it is permissible under City code to have a single water service and a single sewer service serving multiple buildings. He noted that he strongly recommends that the owner upgrade the water service in order to provide adequate water pressure to the new and existing units. Mayor Kahn asked if this is sufficient for fire service. Mr. Lussier said the Fire Department would be better equipped to answer this question, but typically single and two-family homes do not require sprinkler systems. Mr. Hansel said that the Fire Department did look at the proposal and gave guidance on fire separation between the buildings.

Chair Farrington asked whether 57 Marlboro St. is accessed by Aliber Place; Mr. Hansel answered in the affirmative.

Ryan Clancy asked if this will be a Cottage Court overlay, Mr. Hansel said it is not – in this case the Cottage Court overlay was not useful.

Chair Farrington asked about the size of the combined parcel. Mr. Hansel did not have the acreage but showed what the outline of the merged parcel would be on a map. Mr. Mehu said he believes it would be about a half-acre.

Mayor Kahn asked what action the Board is being asked to take. Ms. Brunner recommended that the Board make a motion that summarizes any comments that the Board has so it is clear going to City Council. She said this item is going to PLD Committee on Wednesday. Mayor Kahn said he would like the committee reviewing this to consider the 2000 ordinance and its application in this instance. He thinks it deserves this kind of attention – other applicants might have similar considerations on private drives, and he thinks Council ought to weigh in.

Mr. Kost said he thinks this is a very creative approach to provide some workforce housing and its using a site that is in need of some attention. This will provide small, rentable housing in a really nice location which we need. He hopes this succeeds.

Chair Farrington asked if the Planning Board will have another chance to review this request. Ms. Brunner said that this request does need zoning relief, including two variances related to dimensional requirements and a special exception for major parking reduction, so the public will

have a chance to comment on this proposal at the public hearing before the ZBA. With respect to planning, there is a three-family building on the parcel so the site changes will require administrative planning review. The new duplexes will not require site plan approval.

Chair Farrington asked what zoning districts these parcels are in. Mr. Hansel said that 57 Marlboro Street is in Downtown Edge. These parcels are located on the edge of downtown where different zoning districts come together.

Mayor Kahn asked about screening, especially from the adjacent parking lot which is heavily used. Mr. Hansel said that he included a rendering in the packet to show how heavily vegetated the area is between the parking lot and the proposed duplexes. Mayor Kahn said his comment is with respect to screening and privacy for the future occupants of the duplexes. Mr. Hansel said that is the reason they are asking for variances from setbacks – they feel the proposed location for the duplexes is ideal because it is screened from view and will provide the most privacy for the residents.

Chair Farrington asked about the process for a voluntary merger; Ms. Brunner responded that it is administrative.

Vice Chair Mastrogiovanni made a motion to recommend that City Council grant the request to authorize the issuance of building permits for three duplexes on the property located at 57 Marlboro Street. The motion was seconded by Ms. Vezzani. The Chair asked for any further discussion.

Mayor Kahn reiterated his request that the Board ask City Council to consider Resolution R-2000-28. Ms. Mastrogiovanni made a motion to amend the motion to reference Resolution R-2000-28 to be considered. The motion to amend was seconded by Mr. Mehu.

Chair Farrington asked for a vote on the motion as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

## **VII. Master Plan Update**

### **a. Project Updates**

Ms. Brunner stated that throughout the month of July visioning sessions are being conducted on an on-demand basis. Three more sessions are being planned for August when the consultant is in town for the Steering Committee meetings. One session will be held on Monday, August 5<sup>th</sup> from 5 pm to 6 pm at the United Church of Christ and another session is scheduled the same day from 6:30 pm to 7:30 pm in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room of City Hall. A morning session will also be held on August 6<sup>th</sup> at the Monadnock Food Co-op. Additionally, the Steering Committee will be meeting on Tuesday, August 6<sup>th</sup> at 5:30 pm at Heberton Hall. They will be looking at key themes for the Master Plan.

She noted that community members are looking for non-digital methods to provide feedback to staff. Staff is making comments cards available throughout the City as well as postcards that can be mailed in.

Ms. Brunner encouraged Board members to assist in promoting the visioning sessions.

**VIII. Training: Site Plan Review Process**

Not Discussed

**IX. Staff Updates**

None

**X. New Business**

None

**XI. Upcoming Dates of Interest**

- Joint Committee of the Planning Board and PLD – August 12th, 6:30 PM
- Planning Board Steering Committee – August 13th, 11:00 AM
- Planning Board Site Visit – August 21st, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed
- Planning Board Meeting – August 26th, 6:30 PM

**XII. Adjournment**

There being no further business, Chair Farrington adjourned the meeting at 9:47 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,  
Megan Fortson, Planner