

City of Keene
New Hampshire

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, September 23, 2024

6:30 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

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

Staff Present:

Jesse Rounds, Community Development
Director
Mari Brunner, Senior Planner
Megan Fortson, Planner

Members Not Present:

Tammy Adams, Alternate
Randyn Markelon, Alternate

I) Call to Order – Roll Call

Chair Farrington called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and a roll call was taken. Mr. Michael Hoefler, Alternate, was invited to participate in the meeting as a voting member.

II) Minutes of Previous Meeting – August 26, 2024

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni to approve the August 26, 2024 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy and was unanimously approved.

III) Final Vote on Conditional Approvals

Chair Farrington stated that 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 final vote will be the final approval and will start the 30-day appeal clock. The Chair asked if there were any applications tonight that were ready for a final vote.

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

IV) Public Hearings

a. PB-2024-09 – Cottage Court Conditional Use Permit – 30 High St – Applicant Nancy M. Clark Esq., on behalf of owner Redion Kadilliu, proposes the conversion of the existing two-unit building at 30 High St (TMP #549-065-000) into three units. The parcel is 0.17-ac in size and is located in the High Density District.

A. Board Determination of Completeness

Planner, Megan Forston, addressed the Board and stated that the Applicant has requested exemptions from submitting separate existing and proposed conditions plans, a grading plan, landscaping plan, lighting plan, elevations, a drainage report, soil analysis, historic evaluation, screening analysis, and architectural & visual appearance analysis. After reviewing each request, staff have made the preliminary determination that the requested exemptions would have no bearing on the merits of the application and recommend that the Board grant the requested exemptions and accept the application as complete.

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni to accept the application, PB-2024-09, as complete. The motion was seconded by Mayor Kahn and was unanimously approved

B. Public Hearing

Mr. Redion Kadilliu, owner of 30 High Street, addressed the Board next. Mr. Kadilliu stated the property before the Board is currently a duplex. The upstairs unit has 5 bedrooms and two bathroom and occupies the second and third floors of the building. The attic space has been converted into a livable space and it was merged into one large unit. The plan in the future would be to split this into two units, so each floor will be a separate unit. The number of bedrooms will not change. The second floor will be a three-bedroom unit and the attic will be a two-bedroom unit. Mr. Kadilliu stated that his plan is to add a kitchen to the attic to make the apartment complete. This concluded his presentation.

Chair Farrington asked about access to the third floor. Mr. Kadilliu stated there are already two forms of egress as there are two staircases that can be used to access the third floor. He indicated that there is a shared hallway, which has access to the second floor apartment, and there is a spiral staircase that goes into the attic, which has a separate entrance.

Councilor Remy cautioned the Board about addressing issues that related to building code. Ms. Brunner noted that what the Planning Board is reviewing tonight is a change of use from two units to three units. The property owner has stated there will not be any changes to the exterior of the building as a result of this change.

Mayor Kahn asked whether this application would go through any conditional review that will take place. Ms. Forston stated that the recommended conditions of approval were included in the staff report. She noted that the two of the conditions of approval are the ones that are usually included as part of all conditional approvals, which include having the owner sign the final plans and submitting five paper copies of the final plans. However, there is one specific to this application regarding arborvitae that the property owner is going to be installing. The Mayor asked

whether the Fire Department will be reviewing the staircase for conformity. Ms. Forston stated that the Fire Department will be included as part of the review process when a building permit application is submitted because. Planning staff will also be included in that review process and the Plans Examiner will review the proposal for compliance with the applicable building codes.

Ms. Forston addressed the Board next and noted that this parcel is owned by Redion Kadilliu and is located at 30 High Street in north central Keene, approximately 300 feet west of Washington Street and Franklin Elementary School. The existing use is a two-family dwelling with a three-bedroom unit on the first floor and a five-bedroom unit on the second and third floors. Notable features on the site include a small, detached barn located at the end of the existing driveway and parking area. She noted that uses adjacent to the property include a mix of single-family, two-family, and multi-family uses.

The parcel itself is approximately 0.17 acres in size, which is just above 7,400 square feet total. The property is located in the High Density District. The owner is proposing to convert the existing building into a three-unit building by converting the five bedroom apartment on the second and third floors into two separate units. Ms. Forston stated although this lot does not meet the minimum lot size required for three dwelling units in the High Density District, this use is allowed through the new Cottage Court Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process. She noted that because fewer than 5 units are proposed, the project does not meet the threshold for Major Site Plan Review.

Ms. Forston stated staff performed a preliminary determination of regional impact and did not feel the project met the threshold for regional impact.

She next reviewed the Cottage Court CUP standards, which are outlined under Article 17 of the Land Development Code (LDC), and the applicable Site Development Standards outlined under Article 21. The development is proposed to be on a single parcel of land with a property management entity. That standard appears to be met.

Dimensional Requirements – The table in the staff report shows the required dimensional standards for a Cottage Court Development (CCD) in the High Density District as well as the dimensional standards for this specific application. The existing building was constructed around 1870 and has two apartments with approximately 3,000 total square feet of gross floor area. The narrative states that the building exterior will remain unchanged and all renovations will take place within the existing building envelope. While the structure does not comply with the 15 foot front or 10 foot side setbacks, these are existing nonconformities and no changes are proposed to the building or site that would increase these nonconformities.

The setback of the building from the road matches the established building line along the road, which, is allowed within the Cottage Court regulations. Additionally, the structure blends in with the established development patterns in the neighborhood and will continue to do so after its conversion to three units. This standard appears to be met.

In regards to the dwelling unit size, Ms. Forston stated the Cottage Court standards require that the maximum average size of a unit can be 1,250 square feet of gross floor area and the maximum

building footprint can be 900 square feet per unit. The proposed units would average approximately 884 square feet of gross floor area, so this standard appears to be met.

Parking – The standard requires a minimum of one parking space per unit and a maximum of one parking space per bedroom. The applicant is proposing three apartments with a total of eight bedrooms and eight parking spaces. To minimize the visibility of the parking area from High Street, which is the adjacent public right-of-way, the property owner is proposing to install three arbor vitae. The narrative states that the arborvitaes will be three feet tall at planting and will reach up to 15 feet tall at maturity.

Planning staff is recommending that the Board include a precedent condition of approval related to the submittal of a security to cover the cost of this landscaping to ensure its health - that standard appears to be met.

Driveways - The project narrative states that the parking area is proposed to be repaved and restriped in its existing configuration. The driveway is currently 20 feet wide at its entrance, which will allow for the flow of two way traffic - that standard appears to be met.

Screening – The standard states that either a six foot tall fence or landscaped buffer is required for screening. The subject parcel directly abuts two single-family residences to the south and east, and a two-family residence to the southeast. The property owner is proposing to use an existing fence that runs along the southern portion of the eastern property boundary. There is also an existing fence that runs along most of the southern portion of the eastern property line. At the northern portion of the eastern property boundary, there is going to be a total of seven arborvitae installed to offer privacy between this building and the adjacent single-family home directly to the east. In terms of the southern property line, there is an existing fence and barn which appear to provide sufficient screening - this standard appears to be met.

Ms. Forston addressed the applicable Site Development Standards.

Snow storage – Snow will be moved to the southwestern corner of the site – this standard appears to be met.

Landscaping – There will be a total of ten arborvitae installed - three along the public right-of-way and seven along the eastern property line to provide screening from the higher intensity use –this standard appears to be met.

Screening - Waste storage containers and recycling containers will not be visible from High Street – this standard appears to be met.

Access Management - There are no changes being proposed to the existing street access. With respect to bicycle access and parking, the plot plan shows that there's going to be a bike rack towards the southeastern corner of the building - this standard appears to be met.

Ms. Forston noted the architectural standards state that all required off-street parking shall be to the side or rear of the buildings on the proposed site, and such parking shall be screened in

accordance with Section 9.4 of the Land Development Code. The existing parking area is to the east of the building. There are no changes proposed to that area and the parking lot is proposed to be screened - this standard appears to be met.

This concluded the staff comments.

Mr. Kost stated maybe not for this application, but perhaps staff could reconsider the requirement to install fencing between this type of development and adjacent parcels. Ms. Brunner stated that this type of conversion from 2-units to 3-units was not the target for proposed cottage court developments. She noted that some property owners who do not have enough land area on their lots are looking to go through the Cottage Court CUP process to allow for increased density on their properties without having to go before the Zoning Board to seek a variance for a sub-standard lot size. She explained that Planning Staff are working on submitting an ordinance soon that will remove the density requirement for additional units in zoning districts that have them (such as High Density), which will negate the need for projects like this to come before the Planning Board.

The Chairman asked for public comment next. Mr. Douglas Hill of 123 Elm Street addressed the Board. Mr. Hill stated his question is access into and out of the third floor. He also asked why this application could not go before the ZBA for its review and was required to come before the Planning Board instead. Ms. Brunner stated that prior to the Cottage Court Ordinance, this item would have in fact gone before the ZBA for a variance. With the Cottage Court ordinance, since it is under a process called a Conditional Use Permit, which is a special type of zoning relief, it goes through the Planning Board instead of the ZBA. She explained that it is similar to a special exception from the ZBA.

He asked whether there wasn't a simpler way to have addressed this item. If you're not changing the outside the house, there is sufficient parking – why would it not be easier to go before the ZBA instead. Ms. Brunner in response stated that as she had indicated earlier, there is a lot size issue. Mr. Hill also felt there was not sufficient room between the building and the property line for trees. Ms. Forston clarified that the trees are going to be located on the eastern portion of the building along the edge of the parking lot. They will not be located along the edge of the building.

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni that the Planning Board approve PB-2024-09 as shown on the plot plan identified as “City of Keene, NH” prepared by Redion Kadilliu at a scale of 1 inch = 18 feet on July 24, 2024 and last revised on August 9, 2024 with the following conditions precedent to final approval and signature by the Planning Board Chair:

- a. Owner's signature appears on the proposed plot plan.
- b. Submittal of five (5) color paper copies of the approved plan.
- c. Submittal of a security in an amount and form acceptable to the Community Development Director and City Engineer to cover the cost of landscaping.

The motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy.

Chair Farrington stated this was a pretty straightforward application and noted that he is glad to see it come forward. He felt that three units is a good fit for the neighborhood. Councilor Remy agreed and stated he does not see any regional impact from this application.

The Mayor called the Board's attention to page 33 of the agenda packet in reference to Mr. Kost's comments about the landscaping that is being added. He felt adding arborvitae in the proposed location will obscure the view between two buildings, which could impact that existing neighbor more so than providing any assistance to that neighbor. He did not feel that recommendation was helpful. Ms. Brunner stated staff does agree and suggested asking the applicant if they would consider a shorter shrub with a smaller maximum height.

Councilor Remy asked whether the Board has the authority to say it does not believe screening is required for a Cottage Court Development. Ms. Brunner stated that would require a variance from the ZBA.

Mr. Hoefler noted the abutter is going to have a view of six vehicles. Ms. Brunner stated the parking lot is going to be repaved in its existing configuration and there will be parking along that property line. Ms. Brunner stated it would be difficult to know if the neighbor would like a view of parked cars versus shorter trees or taller trees. The Board standards are what they are at the present time. Ms. Brunner also noted that this applicant also owns the abutting property. Installing a different type of shrub, it is up to the Board to discuss this with the applicant.

The Chair invited the applicant to address this issue. The applicant stated he was agreeable to whatever the Board would like to see here. The Board decided that the installation of arborvitae along the edge of the parking spaces would serve as sufficient screening between the lot at 30 High St. and the adjacent parcel to the east.

The Mayor felt this was a good project that met City standards. He stated he also appreciates the quality of the application. He stated he hoped more large single family homes in Keene could be turned into multi family dwelling units.

The motion made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni carried on a unanimous vote.

b. SPR-806, Modification #2A – Major Site Plan – Applebee's, 40 Key Rd - Applicant Apple New England LLC, on behalf of owner RAM 3 Keene Properties LLC, proposes modifications to the exterior of Applebee's Grill & Bar located at 40 Key Rd (TMP #111-016-000), including painting the existing unfinished brick exterior and the installation of new lighting. The parcel is 0.83-ac in size and is located in the Commerce District.

A. Board Determination of Completeness

Planner, Megan Forston, addressed the Board and stated the Applicant has requested exemptions from submitting a grading plan, landscaping plan, lighting plan, soil analysis, drainage report, traffic analysis, historic evaluation architecture and visual appearance analysis, screening analysis, and elevations showing the building dimensions. After reviewing each request, staff have made

the preliminary determination that the requested exemptions have no bearing on the merits of the application and recommend that the Board accept the application as complete.

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni to accept application, PB-2024-06, as complete. The motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy and was unanimously approved

B. Public Hearing

Mr. Eric Elfreich, the Applebee's General Manager, addressed the Board next. He stated that Applebee's has been located in Keene since 1994. He indicated the pictures included in the Board's packet are an accurate representation of what is being proposed for this site. New lighting is being proposed and they are also looking to paint the building. He noted that the existing brick will remain, but it will be painted.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Forston addressed the Board and stated she has been working with Rachael Cooper out of the Applebee's corporate office in Ohio. She stated her understanding is that Applebee's is doing a redecorating project, nothing structural. As part of this updated project, they would like to make some changes to the outside of the building including painting, lighting, and adding some updated signage.

Ms. Forston stated that staff does not have the ability to review major changes to architecture and visual appearance at the staff level or at the Minor Project Review Committee level. This is the reason why this application is coming to the Board for its review. Not because of its complexity, but just due to the fact that there is going to be quite a big difference in what the building will look like after the renovations.

Ms. Forston went on to say there is no regional impact from staff's preliminary review.

She noted the light fixture cut sheet that the applicant has submitted complies with the full cut-off requirement and the color temperature standards, which dictate that a light has to have a color temperature of 3,500 Kelvin or less.

With respect to architecture and visual appearance standards – the standard states that, *“front facades and exterior walls shall be articulated to express an architectural identity to avoid a uniform appearance, and architectural details shall give the impression of being integral to and compatible with the overall design.”*

Ms. Forston noted this building is going to be painted in a white and tan color scheme. There is an existing entry tower at the northeastern corner of the building which is made of a stone product on the outside and is going to be recovered with simulated wood paneling. Ms. Forston indicated the proposed design and elevations were included in the staff report, and noted that it is up to the Board to review whether they feel the proposed elevations meet the Board's applicable standards. This concluded staff comments.

Mr. Kost stated what he read in the staff report is the lighting being proposed are up lights, but that they will not be installing light bulbs in the top portion of the fixture. He felt however, in a few

years, if ownership of this establishment should change and someone starts installing light bulbs now you end up with up non-compliant lights on this site. Ms. Forston stated that since sending out this agenda packet, the applicant has updated the proposed light fixture. It is going to be very similar to what is shown and it will have a cap on the top which will eliminate the ability of someone to be able to install a bulb that would point upwards.

Ms. Clancy asked for clarification as to what was going to happen with the existing landscaping, whether it was going to be removed to allow for painting of the building. Ms. Forston, in response, stated the applicant has indicated that they will not be making any changes to the site other than painting the building, change the finish materials, and update the lighting.

Ms. Forston went on to say that because the only part of this work that is going to require a building permit is the replacement of the lighting, the applicant is seeking final approval at this meeting tonight. They have submitted five copies of the plans that have been signed by the property owner.

The Chair asked for public comment next. With no comments from the public, the public hearing was closed. The Chairman asked the applicant to address Mr. Clancy's question about landscaping. Mr. Elfreich stated their landscaper has already trimmed back all landscaping so the painters could start their work.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni that the Planning Board approve SPR-806, Modification #2A as shown on the elevations titled "Applebee's" prepared by Flynn Group on August 14, 2024 and last revised on September 4, 2024 with no conditions."

The motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy.

Councilor Remy felt what is being proposed blends well with other uses in the area. He stated he also agrees there is no regional impact and is comfortable approving this motion with no conditions. Mr. Kost stated he does not feel the color looks aggressive at all and felt it was a very soothing color. He felt the landscaping looks good as well and was happy to move ahead with the final approval.

Chair Farrington stated he has seen a refurbished Applebee's in other parts of the country and what he has seen looks attractive.

The motion made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni carried on a unanimous vote.

V. Master Plan Update (www.keenemasterplan.com)

Ms. Brunner addressed this item. She stated that the Master Plan is still in the phase one, which is the visioning phase of the project; however, this phase is going to be coming to a close shortly. The Steering Committee's next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 1st and on Saturday, October 5th a Community Forum will be held in Heberton Hall at the Keene Public Library from

9:00 AM to 12:00 PM. At the October 5th meeting, the community vision will be unveiled to the public.

Ms. Brunner stated that at the October 5th meeting, there will be some breakout groups for participants to dive into specific topic areas and the next phase will be to come up with an actual plan on how to achieve that vision. Ms. Brunner stated she will send the Board a link to the next Steering Committee agenda packet. She noted some of the themes the Steering Committee has identified are housing, transportation, economy, workforce, environment, and a healthy vibrant community and neighborhoods. Each of these themes will have a task force assigned to come up with specific actions and strategies.

Mr. Clancy asked whether the state requires any specific themes to be part of a master plan. Ms. Brunner stated the state requires two sections in a Master Plan - a vision for the community and a land use plan.

The Mayor noted that this is a City Master Plan, but it will have regional impacts as well on the regional economy and regional transportation. Ms. Brunner agreed the Mayor is correct, the Steering Committee has really been talking about Keene being the hub of the region as well as the economic, social and education center. The area that draws people. For example, when regional impact is referred to by Cheshire Medical Center, they describe expanding their recruiting territory into Massachusetts and Vermont.

It was noted that the Master Plan provides us with terminology, a vision, and goals. It was also noted that having some data that supports that vision will be important. Mr. Rounds stated they did something called a Community Snapshot Report, which is available on the project website and it addresses this issue to some extent. He added after October 1st, once all the pillars are solidified, there will be someone assigned to lead that process and do a more in-depth analysis.

VI. Training on Site Development Standards: Drainage & Stormwater Management / Sediment & Erosion Control

Ms. Brunner stated staff last month touched on the site plan review process in general. She indicated that this evening she was planning on reviewing the first couple of site development standards.

Standard 1 – General: Review of Board’s authority, the purpose and applicability of the Board’s regulations.

Standards 2 and 3 are related to drainage, stormwater management and sediment and erosion control, which are interrelated.

Ms. Brunner stated the Board’s authority is given to them by both City Council and through State Statute. The Board has authority to adopt and amend their site development standards under both of these sources of authority. State Statute 674:44 requires that the Board outline what their review procedure is, the purpose of its standards, and specify what the standards are and include provisions for guarantees.

Performance – This includes requiring a security for projects, such as a check or letter of credit.

Provisions – This Board offers applicants the option to waiver for most portions of their regulations. Ms. Brunner noted that the Board has to offer some sort of relief if an applicant is not able to meet the standards.

Ms. Brunner explained the other items that must be submitted by an applicant as part of a complete application, including a notice list, abutter labels, fees, etc.

In the Board’s regulations, the stated purpose of the Site Development Standards is for the safe and orderly development of the community; sustainable design and development, protecting water quality and preventing stormwater runoff; promoting high quality site and building design; and protecting against hazards, unsightliness, and nuisances to abutting property owners.

The purpose statement must also include having development that is appropriate for public and private services and utilities that are available to support that development. Making sure services can access the development, such as fire rescue, is an important component of site plan review. Additionally, other factors must be evaluated, such as whether a development is going to increase traffic significantly, etc.

The statement also refers safe pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation; the preservation or enhancement of historic and cultural character; and development that maintains the quality of life and will not impose unreasonable costs upon the city. An example would be evaluating whether a development is going to require a large expenditure of public money. If so, this should be part of the Board’s review to make sure the cost of development is borne by the developer and not the general taxpayer.

Ms. Brunner noted these standards are applied to all development in Keene, unless it is a single-family or a two-family home or site work for as part of an investigation done in support of the proposal. For example, digging test pits to get data to support an application is allowed; however, site work as part of a development is not allowed until an applicant is received approval from the Planning Board. In this context, development means any form of land improvement or construction involving land structures or infrastructure, as well as any change of use.

Standard 2: Drainage and Stormwater Management: This standard is split into four sections: (1) Run off volume and velocity – The Board’s regulations state that you cannot increase the amount of runoff or velocity of runoff moving off of a site. You can decrease it, but you can’t increase it. This can be determined through a drainage report, which is reviewed by Engineering Staff as part of the Planning Board application review process.

Ms. Brunner went on to say that drainage reports use a model called Hydrocod. This system anticipates the conditions for a 25-year rainfall event using data from Cornell University. What is more common or typical is for communities to look at a 10-year storm event; however, Keene requires a 25-year storm model. If someone is looking at developing on a hillside, a 50-year storm

event calculation is required. Ms. Brunner referred to a recent example of a car wash application.

Mr. Kost asked if the City would be looking for either the same amount or less water runoff from a site. Ms. Brunner answered in the affirmative. Ms. Brunner also talked about Low Impact Design (LID) measure requirements in the code, which state that treatment systems and contamination prevention measures shall be utilized during and as part of construction. This is required to assure proper discharge of surface waters into flood plain compensatory storage basins.

She further noted that any new drainage grates have to be bike friendly by being designed so that the grates are not parallel to the wheels.

Sediment and Erosion Control: She explained that the goal with this standard is slightly different. It focuses on preventing erosion and sedimentation, which is carrying of sediment off site, both during construction and after.

Ms. Brunner noted that there are varieties of ways this can be done. The City refers to the New Hampshire Storm Water Manual for best practices. Minimizing the area of disturbance is probably the number one thing to do. Making sure that you are not disturbing an area larger than what you need to. Other goals of this standard include making sure that we are protecting water bodies, wetlands, storm sewer inlets, etc.

She explained that if you have disturbance uphill from a surface water body, applicants must making sure that there are perimeter controls in place and that they are installed properly and maintained. Making sure slope stabilization happens within a reasonable time frame is important, especially when you have stockpiles of materials on the site.

Additionally, any trees that are to remain on the site have to be protected. The Board's standards require construction fencing is put around the root system of the trees to make sure that construction vehicles don't park right up against the trunk of the tree. Pre-treating stormwater runoff using some of those LID design features and following the Best Practices from New Hampshire Storm Water Manual is also required.

Ms. Brunner indicated that the Board's regulations allow them to require the submittal of a security deposit for sedimentation and erosion control measures, especially for larger projects. This is for the purpose of assuring that erosion control measures work properly and to ensure that revegetation and slope stabilization take place in timely manner.

She explained that Planning Staff have are continually working to increase collaboration with the Commercial Building Inspector to make sure site inspections are performed frequently throughout the duration of the project to ensure that sedimentation and erosion control measures are working continuously. In certain situations, the City may require that inspections be done by a qualified firm or individual. One example of that would be when the City had the Earth Excavation Permit application. The applicant started work before they received a permit and they cut into the wetlands buffer, which they were not allowed to do. A remediation plan had to be put in place and the City brought in a wetlands scientist at the applicant's expense to look at the site and come up with an effective remediation plan.

Ms. Brunner went on to state that mulching can also be used as a temporary or permanent feature in addition to installing temporary vegetation, which can be done for longer projects. She referred to a rendering included a handout given to the Planning Board members, which showed the installation of an erosion control blanket, which can be used on slopes during construction.

Diversion – This standard entails making sure you are diverting water away from areas that are vulnerable to erosion using a slope drain. Diversion is used in tandem with sediment and erosion control measure to make sure you are not sending water over a slope that has exposed soil. She explained that measures like silt fencing should be installed in areas where water will flow.

Filter sacks can also be used and are similar to roles of fabric that help filter water. Sediment traps and sediment basins can also be used.

Mr. Hoefler noted that he has seen silt fencing left on a site years after the project has been completed. Ms. Brunner agreed it is supposed to be removed unless the material they are using is compostable or biodegradable. In that case, silt fencing can be left out until it biodegrades naturally.

This concluded the presentation from staff.

VII. Staff Updates

a. InvestNH HOP Grant Application Update

Ms. Brunner addressed this item as well. She indicated the Planning Board voted to issue a letter of support for the InvestNH HOP grant applications at their last meeting. After this meeting, Planning Staff went before City Council with two different grant options and asked for support for both items. The first one was related to short-term rentals and the second one was related to housing opportunity zones, which would take advantage of a tax credit opportunity. After discussion, the City Council voted to support both applications and authorize the Mayor to write a letter of support for both. She noted that they will not be including the letter of support from the Planning Board for the short-term rentals application.

Councilor Remy stated the Board was not necessarily opposed to submit an application related to short-term rentals. He felt that the issue was whether this was the really the right use of these funds. He recalled that the Board voted to write a general letter that would be signed by the Planning Board Chair to give staff flexibility. Staff agreed this is what they now recall as well.

Mr. Rounds indicated that tonight will be his last Planning Board meeting as he will be leaving his position with the City. He extended his appreciation to the Board.

VIII. New Business

None

IX. Upcoming Dates of Interest

- Joint Committee of the Planning Board and PLD – Tuesday, October 15th, 6:30 PM
- Planning Board Steering Committee – October 15th, 11:00 AM
- Planning Board Site Visit – October 23rd, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed
- Planning Board Meeting – October 28th, 6:30 PM

There being no further business, Chair Farrington adjourned the meeting at 8:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Megan Fortson, Planner