



MUNICIPAL SERVICES, FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE  
Council Chambers B, Keene City Hall  
April 23, 2025  
6:00 PM

**A. AGENDA ITEMS**

1. Stephen Bragdon and Cheryl Belair - Safety Issues Associated with the Driveway at 82 Court Street
2. Ian D. Matheson - Court Street Pedestrian Safety Risks
3. Adam Toepfer - Request to Add Audio and Data Cables as Part of Downtown Infrastructure Project
4. Proposal to Add the Necessary Infrastructure to Accommodate Banners Across Main Street
5. Verbal Update: Downtown Infrastructure Project - Public Works Director
6. Relating to the Installation of a Stop Sign on Wilber Street at Water Street Ordinance O-2025-14 - City Engineer
7. Relating to an Amendment of the City Code, Regarding Yield Signs Ordinance O-2025-11A - City Engineer
8. Relating to an Amendment of the City Code, Regarding Traffic Signals Ordinance O-2025-12 - City Engineer
9. Relating to an Amendment of the City Code, Regarding Vehicle Turning Limitations Ordinance O-2025-13A - City Engineer
10. Relating to an Amendment of the City Code, Regarding Stop Signs Ordinance O-2025-10A - City Engineer

**B. MORE TIME ITEMS**

1. Carl Jacobs - Installation of a Peace Pole - Central Square

**NON PUBLIC SESSION**

**ADJOURNMENT**



March 31, 2025

TO: City Council, City Manager, City Attorney, City Engineer and Mayor of Keene

RE: Safety Issues Associated with the Driveway at 82 Court St.

Dear Interested Parties,

Since 2021 we have been requesting that the parking spaces in front of our office building located at 82 Court St. be changed to eliminate at least 3 or 4 spaces to the north of our driveway. Our specific request in 2024, when we came before the Municipal Facilities, Service & Infrastructure Committee, was to have a minimum of a 30 ft. setback on the northern side of our driveway as a no parking area.

We would like to bring to your attention the fact that on Thursday, March 27, 2025, a 3-car accident occurred in front of 82 Court Street, with one of the passengers being a small child.

Upon speaking with the driver of the car exiting our driveway, she was very clear that she checked for traffic at least twice in both directions but could not see the small car coming south because of all the parked vehicles.

This continues to be a daily danger that is faced by every person exiting our driveway, including all the staff and clients of the 2 businesses located in our building. The accident today is not the first to occur over the last few years due to the same circumstances.

**Visibility to the north of our driveway caused by parked cars is terrible.**

When we addressed our concerns previously, there was discussion that any change in the parking configuration would have to apply to all parking from Main St. to School St. and "exceptions can't be made per property". We would STRONGLY disagree with this statement when safety is the concern.

We would also argue, that 82 Court Street is different than other properties near us and therefore should be treated as such when it comes to parking and public safety.

- We are a business with 15+ people coming in and out multiple times a day. On an average day I would estimate that cars are pulling out of our driveway no less the 25-30 times.
- We are the only **business** on the west side of Court Street north of our location
- Our driveway sits at the bottom of the incline on Court Street which makes visibility much worse than other Court St. properties
- Because we are at the bottom of the incline, we believe by the time traffic comes to our location, it is moving faster than the northern part of Court St.

Respectfully,



Cheryl A. Belair

Stephen B. Bragdon



## Ian D. Matheson, CFI

15 April 2025

(Via email to [plittle@keenenh.gov](mailto:plittle@keenenh.gov))

The Honorable Jay Kahn  
Mayor of the City of Keene  
3 Washington St. Keene, NH 03431

### Re: Court Street Pedestrian Safety Risks

Dear Mayor Kahn and Councilmembers,

I am writing to you regarding my growing concerns with pedestrian safety on Court Street – specifically from Central Square to Mechanic Street – and the risks presented to pedestrians using the crossings. The concerns are not only for my safety but also for the safety of our most vulnerable populations. Moreover, these concerns are further exacerbated by the excessive speed of most motorists operating along Court Street. To be clear, this request is not for additional police enforcement of speed or yielding to pedestrians. While enforcement does have a place in mitigation, this will not address the underlying safety and community concerns alone.

The core concerns and issues live with the lack of visible signage and infrastructure to alter motorists of upcoming pedestrian crossings. Both pedestrians and drivers share a balanced responsibility for roadway safety; it is nearly impossible for this to occur when motorists are unaware of an upcoming crossing due to a lack of signage and clear markings in the roadway. Pedestrians are placed in a dangerous position when they must physically enter the roadway for a motorist to see them crossing and then stop within time. On more than one occasion, I have observed and experienced the fear of standing in the middle of the roadway, hoping that motorists will stop as they race to your front and rear. This is not a singular problem that blame can be cast upon one group over another – this is a societal problem, one that cannot be solved with some signs and enforcement. However, it can be mitigated.

Recently, I approached the Public Works department with these concerns. I was encouraged to send my concerns to them, and they would look into them to determine the best course of action. My request was for “some sort of pedestrian beacon or other traffic calming measure (to) be implemented”. I have attached several photos of the specific intersection of concern (Court Street and Mechanic Street). I was provided with the following response from the Public Works staff, “*The City has adopted the Federal "Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices" as our standard for signs and traffic controls. Traffic volume on Court Street in proximity to Mechanic Street is roughly 9,100 vehicles per day during the workweek based on the traffic data that is available to the City. The MUTCD recommends consideration of crosswalk enhancements (i.e. curb extensions, raised medians, pedestrian beacons, etc.) where "The road has four or more lanes of travel without a raised median or pedestrian refuge island and an ADT of 12,000 vehicles per day or greater" Court Street at this location has two lanes of traffic and does not exceed the threshold and Public Works does not recommend that the installation of a pedestrian active Rectangular, Rapidly Flashing Beacon (RRFB) be installed at this locations based on the Engineering Review of the location, the site specific traffic data and the MUTCD specified warrants.*”

I appreciate the adherence to the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices; however, this response fails to address the lack of basic pedestrian crossing signage and alternative safety improvements. The lack of clearly visible cues (something that is present on other similar motorways in the City) to alert motorists and pedestrians leaves this section of the street unnecessarily dangerous to all.

Court Street Pedestrian Safety Risks  
The Honorable Mayor and Council  
15 April 2025

Therefore, I would appreciate time before you all to discuss this matter further. I fear that if this section of Court Street – and the various pedestrian crossings – are not reviewed further through additional consideration and dialogue, the outcome may be grave.

Very truly yours,  
*Ian Matheson*  
Ian Matheson

Encl.

Court St Crosswalks - Attachment 1



8 January 2025

**Re:** Court St Crosswalks - Attachment 1

Image 1: The red arrow indicates the crossing in question.



Image 1-a: Crosswalk at Court and Mechanic Street.





8 January 2025

- 2 -

**Re: Court St Crosswalks - Attachment 1**

Image 2: Facing north from the odd side of Court Street at the corner of Mechanic Street.



Image 3: Facing north from the even side of Court Street.





Image 4: Facing south from the even side of Court Street.



Image 5: Facing south from the odd side of Court Street, at the corner of Mechanic Street.



8 January 2025

- 4 -

**Re:** Court St Crosswalks - Attachment 1

Image 6: Pedestrian crossing from odd to even side.





8 January 2025

- 5 -

**Re:** Court St Crosswalks - Attachment 1

Image 7: Pedestrian crossing from odd to even side.







Mayor Jay Kahn & Keene City Council  
3 Washington St.  
Keene, NH 03431

April 10, 2025

Dear Honorable Mayor Jay Kahn and City Council Members,

Dear Members of the Keene City Council,

On behalf of Keene Pride and several other local event organizations, I write to respectfully request the City of Keene consider incorporating XLR audio cables and fiber data cables, terminating to multiple RJ-45 jacks, into the downtown infrastructure. This investment would significantly enhance the capacity and quality of festivals and events held in our vibrant city center.

We propose that these cables be run through the following areas:

- Around Central Square
- Down Main Street, ending at Emerald Street
- Railroad Square
- Gilbo Avenue, extending to St. James Street
- Roxbury Street to the Hannah Grimes parking lot

These locations represent key spaces where many of Keene's most cherished public events take place. By installing this infrastructure, the city would enable seamless access to audio, music, data, and video connections—streamlining logistics, improving accessibility, and enhancing the overall experience for residents, visitors, and organizers alike.

We would also like to encourage the city to include some sort of ballast system that can be automatically deployed to close streets quickly and inexpensively in the downtown area for festivals and other events.

Moreover, the addition of fiber data lines could potentially support free public Wi-Fi in the downtown area, offering a valuable amenity that benefits businesses, tourists, and the community at large. This initiative has the full support of the following local organizations, whose signatures are also included on this letter:

- Keene Pride, organizers of the Keene Pride Festival



603-696-2927



[www.keenepride.org](http://www.keenepride.org)



25 Roxbury St. #114  
Keene, NH 03431



- The Keene Downtown Group, organizers of the Keene Ice & Snow Festival
- Let It Shine, organizers of the Keene Pumpkin Festival
- Keene Young Professionals Network, organizers of the Keene Food Festival

Together, we believe this infrastructure will have a lasting, positive impact on the success and sustainability of downtown events. We would be glad to work with city staff to discuss the technical requirements or help coordinate implementation.

Thank you for your consideration and continued support of Keene's dynamic and inclusive event community.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

*Adam Toepfer*

908C1FA08751476...

Adam Toepfer  
President, Keene Pride

Signed by:

*Alana Fiero*

FA70AA43E27D49B...

Alana Fiero  
President, Keene Young Professionals  
Network

Signed by:

*Mark Rebillard*

A3931C892EA9461...

Mark Rebillard  
The Keene Downtown Group

Signed by:

*Mike Giacomo*

A184CCD1151E46A...

Mike Giacomo  
Let It Shine, Inc.

DocuSigned by:

*Alex Trombly*

1FEC8F42A8B9401...

Alex Trombly  
AMT Productions



603-696-2927



[www.keenepride.org](http://www.keenepride.org)



25 Roxbury St. #114  
Keene, NH 03431



## CITY OF KEENE NEW HAMPSHIRE

ITEM #A.4.

**Meeting Date:** April 23, 2025

**To:** Mayor and Keene City Council

**From:** Municipal Facilities, Services and Infrastructure Committee, Standing Committee

**Through:**

**Subject:** **Proposal to Add the Necessary Infrastructure to Accommodate Banners Across Main Street**

---

**Council Action:**

**In City Council April 3, 2025.  
More time granted.**

**Recommendation:**

On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee voted unanimously to place this item on more time with the intent that staff return with an update at the next meeting.

**Attachments:**

None

**Background:**

Chair Greenwald stated that this is a discussion brought forward by Ted McGreer and Tim Pipp. He asked them to speak.

Tim Pipp stated that he owns Beeze Tee's on Main St. He continued that he and Mr. McGreer came a couple months ago to talk about pole infrastructure for banners over Main St. Ideally, they are looking to promote events and things happening downtown. Many cities in NH, VT, and MA have banners over their main streets. Such a banner would drive foot traffic to events. For example, if you leave a banner up for two weeks before an event, people will know about it. It would support the local economy, bringing more people downtown who recognize what is going on, and strengthen the community identity. They could have a "Welcome to Keene" message on a banner, or holiday greetings, or that sort of thing. It is a flexible communication tool that could promote tourism or increase visibility for underserved organizations. There would be minimal ongoing costs. The only real cost is hanging up banners, which could possibly be taken over by an organization. They (he and Mr. McGreer) talked about it with the City and they are trying to figure it out. It shows that the City is business friendly. By promoting these events, they are welcoming people into the city. Many times, people come into his store and say they did not know there was an event that day. That is probably the biggest thing they hear when there is a big event, such as Wizarding Week or Pumpkin Festival - people coming in and saying they did not know. He always asks if they are from around here and



whether they ever drive downtown. Even if they drive downtown, sometimes there is nowhere to figure that out.

Mr. Pipp continued that as he said, these (banners) are very beneficial for other cities and towns around New England. They (Beeze Tees) have worked with the City of Manchester frequently to do their banners, and it is an easy process. The City has all the requirements for that.

Ted McGreer of 115 Main St. stated that he echoes what Mr. Pipp said. He continued that he would also say that Keene used to have one of these (banners across Main St.) and it has a level of nostalgia to it. He was at Market Basket on Tuesday around 1:00 PM and could not find a parking spot. That side of town was packed. He came back to Main St., and it was “a ghost town.” He does not want this ghost town to feel to continue. Concord and Manchester both have (banners across Main St.). He knows that the two poles that are designed to support this banner in the wind and the loads on it are substantial. There might be some discussion about having issues with changing the way the town looks and losing the side of the church because there is a banner across Main St., but he really endorses this and he hopes the Committee will, too. The two poles supporting the banner could even be beautiful peace poles.

Mr. Lussier stated that the City Manager directed staff to look at this issue from several different perspectives. He continued that staff met with Mr. McGreer and Mr. Pipp to discuss it a couple weeks ago. The engineering Mr. McGreer mentioned is kind of the easy part. The poles that would be necessary are large, steel poles 18 to 24 inches in diameter. They are more substantial than streetlight poles and are supported underground by concrete bases approximately 42 inches in diameter. Thus, these are large poles, which is necessary because of the wind forces the banner would be subject to. Yet in many ways, that is the easy part of this question.

Mr. Lussier continued that the more interesting and complicated questions are related to legal issues like freedom of speech. There are questions about who would get to use the poles for their banner, who would get to decide who was allowed to use the banner and who was not, what kind of messaging would be allowed, and how much of the messaging could be commercial in nature. All of those sorts of issues get very hairy, very quickly. For these reasons, staff have significant reservations regarding those issues, as well as concerns about aesthetics, as Mr. McGreer mentioned. It would definitely change the perception and look of the downtown as you approach Main St. from the south.

Mr. Lussier continued that they would most likely be looking at a 35-foot-wide banner. Staff looked at different options, such as one that was centered over the roadway, over the median, or one that was centered over the northbound lane, for example. Then it would be in one direction only. Either way, it will change the way you can perceive the downtown, the church, the tree canopy, and so on and so forth, as you approach downtown. Those aesthetics are a real concern.

Mr. Lussier continued that if the City Council wants to move forward with this, his recommendation is that it be used only for City-sanctioned events, either City-sponsored events that are official community events receiving funding from the City, or events that receive a license from the City Council. That way, they can have a little control over the messaging and content. Or it could be official communications – banners put up by the City itself. He would imagine that when it was not in use for a community event, it could say “Welcome to Keene” and maybe some seasonal message from the City.

Mr. Lussier continued that his other recommendation, if this moves forward either through an Ordinance or just directives from the City Manager's Office, is for them to develop a clear set of guidelines for how this is going to be implemented, in terms of the management. For example, they need to determine how long before an event someone is allowed to put the banner up, how long it is allowed to stay up, and who is eligible and qualified to put the banner up. Installing the banner is not just a matter of having a volunteer with a stepladder. It will be more like a bucket truck parked in traffic with traffic controls, to protect the work area and avoid liability for someone getting hurt. Staff would need to develop those controls in the form of an administrative directive or City Ordinance.

Chair Greenwald stated that a question came to him. He continued that the Rotary Club puts up banners on the light poles. He asked how they would differentiate the ability to put up a banner on the light pole from a banner across the road. He clarified that he is referring to the banner's content, not the logistics of how it is hung. Mr. Lussier replied that he thinks the Rotary Club controls the content. Chair Greenwald replied that his question is how they would determine when to say "No, you cannot put that up" on a banner on a light pole, if it is for some downtown event.

The City Manager replied that it was before her arrival, but it was her understanding that the City created an agreement with the Rotary Club that gave them control of those light poles and those banners, and the City was not monitoring or controlling the content. This banner (across the road) is very large, and she does not recommend that (the City be uninvolved in the content). She thinks the City Council will want to have some control, and they will want to have it in a way that does not get the City into trouble or predicaments when people are competing for time to use those banners. That is why, when they were having the conversation with Mr. Pipp and Mr. McGreer, they were talking about how if this were to move forward, they would potentially start with government speech. (That means) things that are City-sanctioned events, things that come through the community event process, or something that the City is putting out there. Even just with that, there would be a banner there nearly every month, if not multiple banners a month. Then there is the process of figuring out who puts it up. She does not recommend using City staff and a bucket truck. There are many other competing needs for those staff members, in the Fire Department in particular. There would then need to be an understanding of who is doing it and who pays for it.

The City Manager continued that staff looked at many elements of this. Terri Hood and the City Clerk's Office did a great job looking at how Manchester, Concord, and other municipalities do it, finding that they also limit it to some degree. Different municipalities do it in different ways, depending on their requirements. Some have a list of people who can be hired to put the banners up, while others are a bit more lenient, and they do it themselves at the city. Thus, there are options, but what staff wanted to emphasize most with the Council are the look and size of these poles, and the infrastructure that will be up all year long, even when a banner is not in place, to be sure the Council realizes that when they make the decision. The other (thing that staff wanted to emphasize) is that if they choose to do this, they need to have a good program in place that does not get the City into predicaments where they have people competing for time on the banner system.

Chair Greenwald thanked the City Manager for touching on all those issues. He continued that he still has the question of how a banner could be allowed on a light pole and then denied on the big banner. That could become a real problematic speech issue.

Amanda Palmeira, City Attorney, stated that she is glad to jump in here, as the First Amendment is her favorite area. She continued that her understanding is, as the City Manager said, that the City gave the Rotary Club permission to do the whole thing themselves. The City does not look at what

goes up on those light poles. For the banner across the street, being much larger infrastructure, the City would obviously be much more involved. There are safety concerns, issues of rights-of-way, and things like that. As far as the speech goes, government speech, the government cannot be regulating speech when it is somebody from the public and saying, "This speech is acceptable, but not this type." That is where they get in trouble. The alternative for that is the government speech doctrine, which would mean the City controlling all of the speech. Therefore, they would not be picking and choosing; all of the (banner content) would be coming from the City. That is why it would make the most sense. If it is just going to be government speech, the City is putting content out about things the City is already involved in, like community events.

Councilor Favolise stated that he has not yet heard the installation cost addressed. He continued that that question was on the Committee's mind the last time around. Mr. Lussier replied that the materials cost is about \$25,000, for the systems themselves. He continued that to include the cost of installation he would probably double that. For the system to be installed – the poles, wires, and everything else – would be about \$50,000. Regarding the banners, he has heard quotes between \$1,500 and \$2,500 for each banner.

Councilor Filiault stated that he has lived in Keene his whole life and has been a Councilor for many years. He continued that they are still known as "the City that says 'no,'" finding a reason to say no, and he thinks they need more of an attitude of finding a reason to say 'yes.' It is easy to say 'no' to things, but they should think about what they can do to say 'yes.' Other NH communities have banners like these. He and his wife drove by the banner in Concord and thought to come back the following weekend for the event the banner was promoting. He works part time at the Colonial Theater, where 700 to 900 people per night come to the shows. He engages with them and asks them if they have been to Keene before, and when they ask him what else is going on here, he tells them about what he knows is going on. Having a banner across the roadway would inform those 900 people who are popping into Keene (about other events). Most people going to the Colonial Theater shows are not from Keene, so if they see that banner, it could draw another 100 or 200 people to Keene. That increases revenue. The Colonial Theater fills up, and the restaurants and retailers are full. When a Colonial Theater show sells out, the downtown hotels are completely full.

Councilor Filiault continued that instead of just talking about how much the banners and poles will cost, they should consider the return on investment. Thirty years ago, when the City brought Jumanji to Keene, there were many negative naysayers saying that it would not work, it would cost a fortune, it would shut down businesses in downtown, and everyone who wanted it was crazy. Now, they have a major event coming up for Jumanji's 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary because it went so well. Thus, he thinks they should be approaching the banner across Main St. not from a 'why should this not happen?' mindset but a 'why can't we make this happen?' mindset. They would not be creating something new. Other communities have this. They should see what they can do to get it done. If it is cost prohibitive, they can talk about that down the road. He wants them to have the mindset of "we can do this," until they find a reason they cannot.

The City Manager stated that she agrees that the City tries to find ways to do things, and they try to be creative, but it is also (staff's) job to make sure the Council is thinking about all sides of an issue. She continued that the way this was presented tonight was, 'here is the size of the pole, here is how much the City would need to have to put it in place, and here is the program the Council would need to think about.' Never once did someone say they should not do this. Staff were not advocating for or against it. It is staff's job to make sure the Council understands that the poles and infrastructure Keene would need in place is much larger than in Concord or some other communities, due to the



width of Keene's Main St. She agrees that the banners are very visible and can be very effective for people who go downtown and might otherwise not know an event is happening. She also agrees that having people come downtown and support local businesses is very important. Staff are not saying the Council should not do this. They are just providing all the information Council needs to think about when they are making their decision.

Councilor Filiault stated that he agrees with everything the City Manager is saying. He continued that it could be cost prohibitive, but until it is shown to be so, he thinks they should move forward in a positive direction. If something comes up and they realize they cannot do it for some reason, then so be it; they will look at an alternative route.

Councilor Tobin stated that for her to feel comfortable saying yes, she would need to see what the program is and how the payment would work. She continued that if this were going to be, say, specifically for festivals, she assumes the person or organization hosting the festival would be paying. She would want to see a lot of support from organizations that are hosting festivals saying that they are willing to pay the \$1,500 per banner or whatever it costs, and that this would be really helpful (to have). She would have trouble considering it until she knew those things.

Chair Greenwald asked Mr. Lussier if they considered having a pole in the middle, so the banner spanned half the road, not the full road. Mr. Lussier replied yes, they did. He continued that if they were to do just the northbound half of the roadway, for example, they would put a pole in the median and one on the outside. That lessens the span, but it is still a 35-foot-wide banner, which is catching the wind. It makes it a little bit easier, but it is still a substantial piece of infrastructure. They could potentially do two banners, one on each side. It would complicate the installation, because they would have to install them from each side, basically installing two separate banners.

Chair Greenwald replied that that was his thought. He continued that they could have (two banners for) two different events, or just the banner split in half, but it would cut down the span. His concern is there will be a cable there all year, whether there is a banner or not. Mr. Lussier replied yes, the way the systems work is the guy wires would be continuously in place. He continued that the banners themselves hook onto them on the top and bottom and a pulley system deploys the banner across the street and retracts it.

Mr. Pipp stated that he wants to clear something up. He continued that the banners are more than \$1,250. The way he saw this was for an organization to take over this like the Rotary Club does and then report to the City, and the City would use the permitting for events for this. It would directly correlate. If you have a permit to do an event in the city, you would be allowed to hang a banner, otherwise, no. He thinks that is fair. Another option they discussed before is putting it from building to building, which would make it private. That was originally what he was thinking, but he was told that the City should take care of it and put poles up. However, if the banners were tied from building to building, it would be less of a distraction. He does not really love the idea of three poles on Main St. He thinks there are options other than just a big pole.

Chair Greenwald asked what Mr. Lussier thinks about the building-to-building idea. Mr. Lussier replied that it potentially eliminates the issue with the poles being visible, but it does not really eliminate the government speech concerns, because that messaging is still over the public way. He continued that if there is no control over that, then they have to worry about distracting messaging that will create traffic problems, whether the messaging is appropriate for the public way, and that sort of thing. Theoretically, he thinks that it could work through an air rights license, but there would

still have to be some sort of restrictions on the content.

Chair Greenwald asked if the buildings line up appropriately. Mr. Lussier replied that he is not sure about the height, but regarding horizontal alignment, he thinks it would work. He continued that north/south, he thinks it works out okay using Ted's Shoes as one side. He cannot visualize right now whether the building across the street is high enough to meet what they would need. The bottom of these banners would be about 17 feet off the ground. The tops would be 20 to 22 feet off the ground. He is not sure if the building on the east side is tall enough to work.

Councilor Workman stated that they talked about the advertising above the light posts being overseen by the Rotary Club. She continued that she has not heard about the message boards that are put up usually by the Post Office and maybe up by Central Square. They have used those frequently for event promotions. She asked if Mr. Lussier could provide a little history on that, such as how one goes about getting their event advertised there. Mr. Lussier replied that his understanding is that that is managed by the City Clerk's Office, and he believes it is only for City-licensed events.

Mr. Bohannon stated that there is an application. He continued that any organization can utilize that. There is a \$15 fee to post for your banner for 10 days, he believes it is. Councilor Workman asked if it is correct that the City has no control over that aspect of it. Mr. Bohannon replied that the City licenses it. The City Attorney stated that she thinks the City Clerk's Office does review it ahead of time, although she does not know exactly what that review is.

Chair Greenwald stated that it sounds like there are many options that need to be explored, such as the building-to-building idea, the building heights, and two poles versus three poles. He asked if they should place this item on more time. Other Committee members replied yes. Chair Greenwald asked if there was anything further from the public or the Public Works Director. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

Councilor Workman made the following motion, which was seconded by Councilor Filiault.

On a vote of 5-0, the Municipal Services, Facilities, and Infrastructure Committee placed this item on more time with the intent that staff return with an update at the next meeting.



## CITY OF KEENE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and \_\_\_\_\_ Twenty-Five

AN ORDINANCE \_\_\_\_\_ Relating to the installation of a Stop Sign on Wilber Street

***Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Keene, as follows:***

That the City Code of the City of Keene, New Hampshire, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the bolded underlined text to the provisions of Section 94-321, "Stop Signs" in Division 5, "Specific Street Regulations", in Article IV of Chapter 94, entitled "TRAFFIC, PARKING AND PUBLIC WAYS" as follows.

**Wilber Street for southbound traffic at the intersection with Water St.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jay V. Kahn, Mayor

In City Council April 3, 2025.  
Referred to the Municipal Services,  
Facilities and Infrastructure Committee.

  
City Clerk





# CITY OF KEENE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and \_\_\_\_\_ Twenty-Five

AN ORDINANCE \_\_\_\_\_ Relating to the Amendment of City Code for Yield Sign Locations

*Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Keene, as follows:*

That the City Code of the City of Keene, New Hampshire, as amended, is hereby further amended by deleting the stricken text from the provisions of Section 94-346, "Yield Signs" in Division 6, "Specific Street Regulations" in Article IV of Chapter 94, entitled "TRAFFIC, PARKING AND PUBLIC WAYS" as follows.

Sec. 94-346. - Yield signs.

**At all approaches into a roundabout intersection.**

**Key Road for eastbound traffic at Winchester Street**

**Pearl Street for eastbound traffic at Winchester Street**

**Island Street for southbound traffic at Winchester Street**

~~**Roxbury Street Robinhood Lane**~~ for southbound traffic at **Roxbury Street**  
~~**Robinhood Lane**~~

**Roxbury Street for eastbound traffic at Water Street**

~~**Victoria Court for westbound traffic at Victoria Street.**~~

~~**Washington Avenue and Gilsum Street for southbound traffic on Washington Avenue.**~~

~~**Wells Street parking lot at exist to Roxbury Plaza.**~~

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jay V. Kahn, Mayor



# CITY OF KEENE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and Twenty-Five

AN ORDINANCE Relating to the Amendment of City Code for Yield Sign Locations

***Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Keene, as follows:***

That the City Code of the City of Keene, New Hampshire, as amended, is hereby further amended by deleting the stricken text from the provisions of Section 94-346, "Yield Signs" in Division 6, "Specific Street Regulations" in Article IV of Chapter 94, entitled "TRAFFIC, PARKING AND PUBLIC WAYS" as follows.

Sec. 94-346. - Yield signs.

**At all approaches into a roundabout intersection.**

**Key Road for eastbound traffic at Winchester Street**

**Pearl Street for eastbound traffic at Winchester Street**

**Island Street for southbound traffic at Winchester Street**

**Robinhood Lane for southbound traffic at Roxbury Street**

**Roxbury Street for eastbound traffic at Water Street**

~~**Victoria Court for westbound traffic at Victoria Street.**~~

~~**Washington Avenue and Gilsum Street for southbound traffic on Washington Avenue.**~~

~~**Wells Street parking lot at exist to Roxbury Plaza.**~~

---

Jay V. Kahn, Mayor



# CITY OF KEENE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and \_\_\_\_\_ Twenty-Five

AN ORDINANCE Relating to the Amendment of City Code for Traffic Signals

***Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Keene, as follows:***

That the City Code of the City of Keene, New Hampshire, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the bold text and deleting the stricken text from the provisions of Section 94-34, “Red, Yellow, Green Traffic Signals”, Section 94-35 “Flashing yellow or red signals”, in Division 1, “Specific Street Regulations” in Article IV of Chapter 94, entitled “TRAFFIC, PARKING AND PUBLIC WAYS” as follows.

Sec. 94-34. Red, Yellow, Green Traffic Signals

**Ash Brook Road at Ash Brook Court.**

~~Court Street at Maple Avenue.~~

~~Main Street, Marlboro Street, and Winchester Street.~~

~~Main Street pedestrian light at St. Bernard’s Church.~~

~~Route 101 (12) and Winchester Street.~~

~~Winchester Street and Key Road.~~

Section 94-35. Flashing yellow or red signals

~~Park Avenue at Arch Street, and a red flashing light for traffic on Arch Street at such intersection.~~

~~Winchester Street at Ralston Street for traffic on Winchester Street, and a red flashing signal for traffic on Ralston Street at such intersection.~~

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jay V. Kahn, Mayor

In City Council April 3, 2025.

Referred to the Municipal Services,  
Facilities and Infrastructure Committee.

  
City Clerk



# CITY OF KEENE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and \_\_\_\_\_ Twenty-Five

AN ORDINANCE \_\_\_\_\_  
Relating to the Amendment of City Code for Turns

*Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Keene, as follows:*

That the City Code of the City of Keene, New Hampshire, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the bold text and deleting the stricken text from the provisions of Section 94-266, "Limitations", Section 94-268 "Medians and Islands", in Division 3, "Turns" in Article IV of Chapter 94, entitled "TRAFFIC, PARKING AND PUBLIC WAYS" as follows.

Sec. 94-266. Limitations

~~Marlboro Street. Right turn lane 7:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. from Main Street to a point 200 feet east of the Post Office driveway~~

~~Park Avenue at Arch Street, and Arch Street at Park Avenue. No right turn on red signal.~~

Section 94-268. Medians and Islands

**At all approaches into a roundabout intersection.**

**Ash Brook Road.**

**Ash Brook Court.**

**Base Hill Road.**

**Island Street.**

**Key Road.**

**Marlboro Street.**

**Old Walpole Road.**

**Production Avenue.**

**West Surry Road.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jay V. Kahn, Mayor



# CITY OF KEENE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and \_\_\_\_\_ Twenty-Five

AN ORDINANCE \_\_\_\_\_  
Relating to the Amendment of City Code for Turns

***Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Keene, as follows:***

That the City Code of the City of Keene, New Hampshire, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the bold text and deleting the stricken text from the provisions of Section 94-266, "Limitations", Section 94-268 "Medians and Islands", in Division 3, "Turns" in Article IV of Chapter 94, entitled "TRAFFIC, PARKING AND PUBLIC WAYS" as follows.

Sec. 94-266. Limitations

~~Marlboro Street. Right turn lane 7:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. from Main Street to a point 200 feet east of the Post Office driveway~~

~~Park Avenue at Arch Street, and Arch Street at Park Avenue. No right turn on red signal.~~

Section 94-268. Medians and Islands

**At all approaches into a roundabout intersection.**

**Ash Brook Road.**

**Ash Brook Court.**

**Base Hill Road.**

**Island Street.**

**Key Road.**

**Marlboro Street.**

**Old Walpole Road.**

**Production Avenue.**

**West Surry Road.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jay V. Kahn, Mayor





# CITY OF KEENE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and Twenty-Five

AN ORDINANCE Relating to the Amendment of City Code for Stop Sign Locations

*Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Keene, as follows:*

That the City Code of the City of Keene, New Hampshire, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the bolded underlined text to the provisions of Section 94-321, "Stop Signs" in Division 5, "Specific Street Regulations", and deleting the stricken text from the provisions of Section 94-321, "Stop Signs" in Division 5, "Specific Street Regulations" in Article IV of Chapter 94, entitled "TRAFFIC, PARKING AND PUBLIC WAYS" as follows.

Sec. 94-321. - Stop signs.

~~Arch Street for eastbound traffic at Park Avenue.~~

Appleton Street for eastbound traffic at Main Street.

Base Hill Road for northbound traffic at West ~~Hill Road Street.~~

Black Brook Road for westbound traffic at Wyman Road.

Burdett Street for westbound traffic at Washington Street.

~~Bruden-Bruder Street for eastbound traffic at Main Street.~~

Carpenter Street for southbound traffic at Water Street.

Chase Place for eastbound traffic at Washington Street.

Church Street for westbound traffic at Norway Ave and 93<sup>rd</sup> Street.

Community Way for southbound traffic at Water Street.

Gates Street for westbound traffic at Main Street.

Harrison Street for northbound traffic at Church Street.

King Court for eastbound traffic at Main Street.

Kit Street for eastbound traffic at Winchester Street.

Lynnwood Avenue for eastbound traffic at Edgewood Avenue.

Matthews Road for north-westbound traffic at Winchester Street.

Martel Court for eastbound traffic at Main Street.

New Acres Road for southbound traffic at Allen Court.

~~Norward-Norway~~ Ave for northbound traffic at Roxbury Street.

Robbins Road for westbound traffic at Starlight Drive.

Roxbury Road for westbound traffic at Peg Shop Road.

School Street for northbound traffic at Leverett Street.

Schulyer Way for southbound traffic at Daniels Hill Road

Skyline Drive for southbound traffic at Stonehouse Road.

Skyline Drive for northbound traffic at Stonehouse Road.

Silent Way for northbound traffic at Main Street.

Spring Street for westbound traffic at Washington Street

Wright Street for eastbound traffic at Washington Street

~~Butler Court for southbound traffic at the Keene State College property line 682.2 feet south of Winchester Street.~~

~~Carpenter Street at Water Street.~~

~~Cottage Street for westbound traffic at Washington Street.~~

~~Cross Street for westbound traffic at Court Street~~

~~Elm Street for northbound traffic at Mechanic Street.~~

~~Elm Street for northbound traffic at Union Street.~~

~~Felt Road for northbound traffic at Arch Street.~~

~~Hitchcock Clinic for eastbound traffic at Court Street.~~

~~Island Street for eastbound traffic at Pearl Street.~~

~~Island Street for westbound traffic at Pearl Street.~~

~~Island Street for southbound traffic at Pearl Street.~~

~~Jordan Road for southbound traffic at Old Concord Road.~~

~~Kit Street at the entrance to Best Western. A stop sign as described in this section for traffic entering Kit Street from the driveway of Best Western.~~

~~Post Office exit for traffic entering Water Street.~~

~~Railroad Street for northbound traffic at Church Street.~~

~~Roxbury Road for eastbound traffic at Peg Shop Road.~~

~~Union Street for northbound traffic on Elm Street.~~

~~Union Street for southbound traffic on Elm Street.~~

~~Wells Street parking structure for westbound traffic existing onto Wells Street.~~

~~93<sup>rd</sup> Street for westbound traffic at Church Street~~

---

Jay V. Kahn, Mayor



# CITY OF KEENE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and Twenty-Five

AN ORDINANCE Relating to the Amendment of City Code for Stop Sign Locations

*Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Keene, as follows:*

That the City Code of the City of Keene, New Hampshire, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the bolded underlined text to the provisions of Section 94-321, "Stop Signs" in Division 5, "Specific Street Regulations", and deleting the stricken text from the provisions of Section 94-321, "Stop Signs" in Division 5, "Specific Street Regulations" in Article IV of Chapter 94, entitled "TRAFFIC, PARKING AND PUBLIC WAYS" as follows.

Sec. 94-321. - Stop signs.

**Appleton Street for eastbound traffic at Main Street.**

**Base Hill Road for northbound traffic at West Street.**

**Black Brook Road for westbound traffic at Wyman Road.**

**Burdett Street for westbound traffic at Washington Street.**

**Bruder Street for eastbound traffic at Main Street.**

**Carpenter Street for southbound traffic at Water Street.**

**Chase Place for eastbound traffic at Washington Street.**

**Church Street for westbound traffic at Norway Ave and 93<sup>rd</sup> Street.**

**Community Way for southbound traffic at Water Street.**

**Gates Street for westbound traffic at Main Street.**

**Harrison Street for northbound traffic at Church Street.**

**King Court for eastbound traffic at Main Street.**

**Kit Street for eastbound traffic at Winchester Street.**

**Lynnwood Avenue for eastbound traffic at Edgewood Avenue.**

**Matthews Road for north-westbound traffic at Winchester Street.**

**Martel Court for eastbound traffic at Main Street.**

New Acres Road for southbound traffic at Allen Court.

Norway Ave for northbound traffic at Roxbury Street.

Robbins Road for westbound traffic at Starlight Drive.

Roxbury Road for westbound traffic at Peg Shop Road.

School Street for northbound traffic at Leverett Street.

Schulyer Way for southbound traffic at Daniels Hill Road

Skyline Drive for southbound traffic at Stonehouse Road.

Skyline Drive for northbound traffic at Stonehouse Road.

Silent Way for northbound traffic at Main Street.

Spring Street for westbound traffic at Washington Street

Wright Street for eastbound traffic at Washington Street

~~Butler Court for southbound traffic at the Keene State College property line 682.2 feet south of Winchester Street.~~

~~Carpenter Street at Water Street.~~

~~Cottage Street for westbound traffic at Washington Street.~~

~~Elm Street for northbound traffic at Mechanic Street.~~

~~Elm Street for northbound traffic at Union Street.~~

~~Felt Road for northbound traffic at Arch Street.~~

~~Hitchcock Clinic for eastbound traffic at Court Street.~~

~~Island Street for eastbound traffic at Pearl Street.~~

~~Island Street for westbound traffic at Pearl Street.~~

~~Island Street for southbound traffic at Pearl Street.~~

~~Jordan Road for southbound traffic at Old Concord Road.~~

~~Kit Street at the entrance to Best Western. A stop sign as described in this section for traffic entering Kit Street from the driveway of Best Western.~~

~~Post Office exit for traffic entering Water Street.~~

~~Railroad Street for northbound traffic at Church Street.~~

~~Roxbury Road for eastbound traffic at Peg Shop Road.~~

~~Union Street for northbound traffic on Elm Street.~~

~~Union Street for southbound traffic on Elm Street.~~

~~Wells Street parking structure for westbound traffic existing onto Wells Street.~~



**~~93<sup>rd</sup> Street for westbound traffic at Church Street~~**

---

Jay V. Kahn, Mayor