

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

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

**Monday, July 28, 2025**

**6:30 PM**

**Council Chambers,  
City Hall**

**Members Present:**

Harold Farrington, Chair  
Mayor Jay V. Kahn  
Councilor Michael Remy  
Sarah Vezzani  
Armando Rangel  
Ryan Clancy  
Kenneth Kost  
Michael Hoefer, Alternate (Voting)

**Staff Present:**

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

**Members Not Present:**

Roberta Mastrogiovanni, Vice Chair  
Tammy Adams, Alternate  
Randyn Markelon, Alternate  
Stephon Mehu, 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. Hoefer was invited to join the meeting as a voting member.

**II) Minutes of Previous Meeting – June 23, 2025**

A motion was made by Mayor Kahn to accept the June 23, 2025, meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Councilor Remy.

Chair Farrington raised the following correction to Lines 140 and 141: change the sentence to indicate that SWRPC had already had their quarterly meeting and the Chair had already attended the meeting. Councilor Remy noted the Planning Board meeting was actually three days before the roundtable. It was agreed the sentence would be left as is. The motion carried on a unanimous vote.

### **III) Final Vote on Conditional Approvals**

Chair Farrington stated this is a new, standing agenda item. 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. He asked staff whether there were any applications tonight that were ready for a final vote.

Ms. Brunner stated there is one application tonight that is ready for a final vote. Boundary Line Adjustment Project PB-2025-10 for 37 and 38 Grimes Road. There were four precedent conditions, including the owner’s signature appearing on the proposed plan; Submittal of four full size paper copies and a digital copy of the final plans; Submittal of a check to cover the cost of recording; Inspection of lot monuments by the Public Works Director or their designee. All of these conditions have been met.

A motion was made by Councilor Remy that the Planning Board issue final site plan approval for PB-2025-10. The motion was seconded by Mayor Kahn and carried on a unanimous vote.

### **IV) Extension Request**

- a) **PB-2025-03 – Major Site Plan – Douglas Company Inc., 0 Black Brook Rd -**  
**Owner Douglas Company Inc., requests a first extension to the deadline to satisfy the precedent conditions of approval for the proposed construction of an ~98,323-sf office and warehouse building on two parcels at 0 Black Brook Rd (TMP#s 221-023- 000 & 221-024-000). The parcels are a combined ~5.33-ac in size and are located in the Corporate Park District.**

Mr. John Noonan of Fieldstone Land Consultants addressed the Board on behalf of Douglas Company. He stated his client, Douglas Company, was looking for a time extension on the conditional approval. He stated the applicant has almost all of the necessary items to meet the conditions of approval; however, tariffs have impacted their business, and they are waiting to see how much more of an impact tariffs are going to have on their operations.

A motion was made by Councilor Remy that the Planning Board grant a six-month extension to satisfy the precedent conditions of approval for PB-2025-03. The motion was seconded by Mayor Kahn.

The Mayor stated he has been in contact with the applicant and felt this is an unfortunate situation that the applicant is facing. The Mayor continued by stating this is a concern that has been shared with the congressional delegation and the Governor’s Office. He hopes this situation would be resolved soon, because Douglas Company is an important business in Keene and has a huge economic impact for the City.

The motion for extension carried on a unanimous vote.

- b) **PB-2024-23 – Major Site Plan & Surface Water Protection Conditional Use Permit – Shooting Range, 19 Ferry Brook Rd – Owner Cheshire County Shooting Sports Education Foundation Inc.,** requests a first extension to the deadline to satisfy the precedent conditions of approval for the proposed modification to the approved site plan for the shooting range at 19 Ferry Brook Rd (TMP #214-021-000). A Surface Water Protection Conditional Use Permit was requested to allow a gravel shooting berm and other existing site features to be located within the 75' surface water buffer. The parcel is 55-ac in size and is located in the Rural District.

The Chair asked to be recused from this application.

A motion was made by Armando Rangel to elect Councilor Remy to serve as the Chair Pro-Tempore. The motion was seconded by Kenneth Kost and was unanimously approved.

Ms. Liza Sargent of SVE Associates, representing the Cheshire County Shooting Sports Education Foundation (CCSSEF), and Mr. Otto Busher of CCSSEF addressed the Board. Ms. Sargent stated that the applicant has met three out of the five conditions precedent and are looking for a time extension, particularly for financial reasons, so that they can pay for the expense of the landscape security. She also added they could not replicate the wetlands in the winter and are going to address that during the summer.

A motion was made by Councilor Remy that the Planning Board grant a six-month extension to satisfy the precedent conditions of approval for PB-2024-23. The motion was seconded by Sarah Vezzani and was unanimously approved.

Chair Farrington rejoined the Board.

Item VI was moved up in the agenda.

- V) **Correspondence & Board Discussion – Alleged Violation of the Earth Excavation Regulations** – Mr. James Manley of 67 Tyler Lane in Sullivan has submitted a complaint related to the visibility of the gravel pit located at 21 & 57 Route 9 (TMP#s 215-007-000 & 215-008-000) from the adjacent state highway. The Board will consider whether further investigation of the alleged violation is warranted and whether to delegate enforcement to Code Enforcement staff.

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner, addressed the Board and stated the Planning Board is the Regulating Body for earth excavation regulations, as stated in State Statute and the Local Ordinance, specifically in Article 25 of the Land Development Code. She stated the City received this complaint in May, which is for five separate sections of the earth excavation regulations that are cited in the complaint. She stated Staff recommend that the Board delegate its authority of enforcement to Code Enforcement Staff, because there is an ongoing and active application for an expansion of the same gravel pit. She stated the reasoning for that is to keep the two items separate and reduce any potential conflicts of interest.

Alternatively, the Board could choose to adjudicate the complaint, in which case the Board would need to make a decision as to whether or not the Board wants to continue looking into this and set a public hearing for the next meeting date. If the Board takes this approach, there would be a deliberation about the complaint as to whether or not there is a violation, and, if so, what the remedy would be.

Councilor Remy felt this Board is not set up to do enforcement. He continued by stating the City does have full time Code Enforcement Staff and felt it made sense to assign this task to Staff.

A motion was made by Councilor Remy that the Planning Board authorize Code Enforcement Staff to enforce the earth excavation regulations in Article 25 of the Land Development Code, including the current complaint and all future complaints in the chapter. The motion was seconded by Sarah Vezzani.

Mr. Clancy agreed with Councilor Remy. Mr. Clancy added if the Board does choose to delegate the enforcement of the current complaint to Staff, would Staff mention how the public can follow along for the minutes and to anyone watching at home. Ms. Brunner responded by saying to check the status, there is an online portal that the public has access to, and the public can also reach out to Community Development Staff as to an update.

The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **VI) Public Hearings**

- a) **SPR-440, Mod. 1 – Major Site Plan - Veterinary Hospital Addition, 686 Court St – Applicant HDA Architects, Inc, on behalf of owner Court Street Veterinary Hospital, proposes to construct an ~2,092-sf addition and renovate the existing veterinary hospital located at 686 Court St (TMP# 228-008-000). The parcel is 4.2-ac in size and is located in the High Density District.**

#### **A. Board Determination of Completeness**

Planner Evan Clements stated the applicant has requested exemptions from submitting a grading plan, landscape plan, lighting plan, and all technical reports. After reviewing each request, Planning Staff have made the preliminary determination that granting the requested exemptions would have no bearing on the merits of the application and recommend that the Board accept the application as complete.

A motion was made by Michael Hoefer to accept Application PB-2025-10 as complete. The motion was seconded by Councilor Remy.

The Mayor stated he agrees with Staff in waiving these three requirements. He drives past this site often and notices grading, landscape and lighting are in place and understands the request for this waiver.

Completeness waiver carried on a unanimous vote.

B. Public Hearing

Mr. Peter Hill from HDA Architects and Mr. Timothy Russett, one of the owners, addressed the Board. Mr. Hill stated the existing concrete block façade has faded and they would like to replace it with siding. The building would also have a new entrance, and the overall exterior of the building is being enhanced. The site would offer services, such as physical therapy, which is not available in the area right now.

Mayor Kahn stated one of the concerns many pet owners have in the community is relative to after hour calls for emergency services. He asked whether this expansion is something the applicant was planning on offering. Mr. Tim Russett, one of the owners, stated the Veterinary Hospital doesn't offer emergency services after hours currently and the proposed addition would not provide that service. This is not a service any facility in the area offers. He stated they have a working program with a Telemed company if someone chooses not to take their pet to emergency care. He stated the Telemed is referred to as Vet Triage and is a site that is available on their website. This site enables you to talk to a live veterinarian.

The Mayor asked whether this site expects to see an increase to traffic. Mr. Hill stated the volume will remain neutral. He stated this site has a grooming facility that is being taken out and explained grooming services brings in a lot more traffic compared to a typical vet service.

Staff comments were next. Mr. Clements addressed the Board and stated the subject parcel is an existing 4.2-acre lot located on the western side of Court Street and approximately 0.5 miles from the Cheshire Medical Center roundabout. The property abuts the Ashuelot River to the rear and contains an existing 7,106 square foot one story building that serves as the location of Court Street Veterinary Hospital. He noted the associated site improvements on the property include two street access points with driveways and a parking lot that wraps around the building and provides 33 parking spaces.

He went on to say that the existing non-conforming use of the property is a veterinary hospital, which is considered an Animal Care Facility under Article 8.3.2.B of the Land Development Code. The use is considered non-conforming as an Animal Care Facility is not normally allowed in the High-Density District. In 1984, the property received approval from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) for a change of Nonconforming Use from a tree service business to a veterinary hospital.

In 1989, the property received approval from the ZBA for an Enlargement of a Nonconforming Use to build an addition. In 2020, again the property received approval from the ZBA for another Enlargement of a Nonconforming Use and in 2025 the property received approval from the ZBA for a third Enlargement of a Nonconforming Use, which is the reason the applicant is here before the Board this evening.

Mr. Clements went on to say the purpose of this application is to seek approval for the 2,100 square foot addition. No additional changes to the site are proposed besides the construction of the addition. The project meets the threshold for major site plan review, because this addition is greater than 15% of the gross floor area of the existing principal building.

With reference to drainage, sediment and erosion control, snow storage, landscaping, screening, lighting, sewer and water, filling and excavation, surface water and wetlands, hazardous and toxic materials and noise, the proposed changes to the site are minimal. Those standards are either not applicable, or they meet the requirements as needed.

The traffic and access management, with the removal of the pet grooming facility that the applicant referred to, would result in a minimal net change in trips. The site is well designed to handle vehicular and pedestrian traffic through the site itself. The standard appears to be met.

Mr. Clements stated architectural and visual appearance is the focus of this application. The applicant has stated in their narrative that the proposed addition was designed to preserve the harmonious character of the existing building. The gable entry that is supported by tapered columns and large windows are incorporated to promote visual interest on the street facing facade. The applicant also notes that the design reduces the massive aesthetic effects and is harmonious with the City's distinctive architectural identity, unique character, and prevailing scale. Proposed materials include vinyl siding, fiber cement trim and decorative wood trusses.

He added the proposed color palette is a muted gray and cream. He noted:

*21.14.2 Visual Interest - 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.*

*Architectural features shall conform to accepted architectural principles of design and construction.*

*Exterior materials, textures, and colors shall minimize visual aggressiveness and shall harmonize with the City's distinctive architectural identity and unique character. Surfaces with glossy finishes, reflective glass or dark tinted exteriors, or untreated aluminum, stainless steel, or metal exterior finishes shall be discouraged.*

*Modifications and additions to existing structures shall be harmonious with the character of the existing structure.*

Mr. Clements stated Staff doesn't really weigh in on this but would encourage the Board to discuss the proposed architectural changes in the addition to see if those standards are met. He added Staff is recommending final approval on this application this evening, considering the nature of the lot, the minimal amount of earth work that will be required to construct the addition, no additional landscaping, no work in the public right of way, and no normal securities. The only outstanding item was the final plan sets signed by the property owner, which Staff did receive this evening. He added that as long as there are no changes necessitated from the Planning Board, Staff believe this application is ready for final approval.

The Chair asked for public comment. Ms. Paula Souza, Director of Sophia's Hearth and abutter to the north, addressed the Board. Ms. Souza stated, as a neighbor, they are in support of this

application and wish the applicant well. With no further comments, the Chair closed the public hearing.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Councilor Remy that the Planning Board approve SPR-440, Mod. 1 as shown on the plan set identified as “Court Street Vet Hospital” prepared by HAD Architects, Inc. at varying scales dated June 20, 2025 and last revised July 10, 2025 with no conditions.

The Councilor stated he sees no regional impact from this application.

The motion was seconded by Sarah Vezzani.

The Chair stated he agrees with Councilor Remy that there is no regional impact and felt this was an attractive building.

Ms. Vezzani stated this site fits in with the neighborhood and is happy to see it come to fruition.

The motion carried on a unanimous vote.

- b) PB-2025-14 – Surface Water Protection Conditional Use Permit – Eversource T198 Transmission Line – Applicant Normandeau Associates, Inc, on behalf of owner Public Service Company of New Hampshire (dba Eversource Energy), proposes to replace twelve structures along the T198 Transmission Line. The proposed work area begins north of NH Route 101 and continues south to the Swanze town border. This project will temporarily impact ~102,332-sf of the Surface Water Protection Buffer for temporary access and work pad placement.**

A. Board Determination of Completeness

Planner, Megan Fortson, stated the applicant has requested exemptions from submitting a grading plan, landscaping plan, lighting plan, and all technical reports. After reviewing each request, Planning Staff have made the preliminary determination that granting the requested exemptions would have no bearing on the merits of the application and recommend that the Board accept the application as complete.

A motion was made by Councilor Remy to accept Application PB-2025-14 as complete. The motion was seconded by Sarah Vezzani and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Elizabeth Oliver, Normando Associates, and Jeremy Fennell, Licensing and Permitting for Eversource Energy, addressed the Board. Ms. Oliver stated they are before the Board regarding the T198 structure line maintenance project. She indicated they would like to replace 12 existing utility structures, which have reached the end of their expected lifespan. Impacts are related to

the removal of the pole butts for the existing structures and the replacement of those poles with weathered steel metal structures. All other impacts will consist of temporary timber matting to allow access and construction of work pads necessary to complete the structure replacements.

Councilor Remy clarified the applicant just mentioned weathered steel and asked whether this was going to be different from what is seen today. Ms. Oliver stated what they have today are wooden poles and these are being replaced with weathered steel poles. There will be some visual differences but not a lot. Mr. Fennell added the wooden poles in existence have been around since the 60's and are now weathered to a lighter brown, so the new ones will blend well. Mr. Kost asked whether the steel poles would add to the resiliency of the system. Mr. Fennell answered in the affirmative and stated the hope is that these new poles would have a life span of 50 years. The wood poles are susceptible to things like insects over time.

Councilor Remy asked whether there would be any interruption to service during construction. Mr. Fennell stated they are not anticipating any outages.

Chair Farrington noted the narrative indicated the work extends to the Swanzey border but noted 133 and 132 actually are in Swanzey. Mr. Fennell stated not all poles are being replaced; specifically, they are starting at structure 145, which is on the north side of Route 101, and ending on structure 133, which straddles Swanzey. The Chair asked whether the applicant anticipates any impacts to accessing the Keene State College athletic fields or the Rail Trail. Mr. Fennell stated they will be accessing Krif Road, and they are working with Keene State College to minimize impact. He added this project has quite a few "time of year" restrictions for wildlife, which is pushing the project into the fall and winter seasons. He added there will be no impact on the rail trail.

Councilor Remy asked whether the impacted wetland area will be brought back to its original condition. Ms. Oliver answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Kost clarified that the impact to the 300 square feet of 75-foot wetland buffer wetland will not be mitigated. Ms. Oliver stated those are associated with placement of the poles and they are assuming a certain square footage of permanent disturbance for each pole footing; in addition, each structure has two pole footings.

The Chair commended the applicant for working with Keene State and encouraged them to do the same with the group who represent the Rail Trail.

Mayor Kahn asked what happens to the wires and whether they would be crossing the road. Mr. Fennell stated structure work is being done on both sides of the road but are not anticipating any kind of disruption to those roads. He added they might retain the service of police detail on Route 101 when transferring wires but are not anticipating replacing wires on those roads. The Mayor stated he is referring to the dashed line. Ms. Oliver stated the yellow dashed line represents the center line of the access route that the construction teams will follow for building the access roads. This has nothing to do with the wires. The plans do not represent wires as they are overhead and won't have any impact on road closures.



Staff comments were next.

Ms. Fortson stated, as was mentioned by the applicants, that the T198 transmission line runs through portions of Keene, Swanzey, Marlborough and Troy for about 11 miles and has a right-of-way width of 150 feet. Within the City of Keene, the proposed project area will cross through several different zoning districts, including the high density, commerce, industrial and agricultural districts. These different districts require different buffer widths from surface waters and wetlands. They range from 30 feet up to 75 feet.

Ms. Fortson noted this project is for the replacement of 12 existing utility structures and there are temporary impacts proposed of around 56,000 square feet to wetlands, 102,000 square feet to the surface water buffer area, permanent impacts of about 140 square feet in the wetlands and 300 square feet in the surface water buffer.

This application required the submittal of a conditional use permit under two different sections of Article 11, which are the surface water protection overlay district standards. One of the standards is for the construction of the temporary access roads. The applicant would use this to access the work areas. The other standard is for the removal and replacement of new structures within the surface water buffer. Ms. Fortson noted that any impacts to actual wetlands are reviewed through wetlands permits by the State. The Board has purview over the surface water buffer, either 30 feet or 75 feet, and for consistency's sake, the applicant has provided a blanket 75-foot buffer through the entire work area.

In terms of regional impact, although the project is going to span municipal boundaries, this is an ordinary maintenance and repair project. Hence, Staff do not feel this project had the potential for regional impact.

Ms. Fortson stated the only departmental comments the application received were that under the State of New Hampshire Regulations, public utility transmission line associated structures are exempt from the local building permit process. However, portions of the structure are located within the floodplain, which will require the submittal of a floodplain development permit.

Ms. Fortson next reviewed the applicable standards. The first standard states that the *proposed use and/or activity cannot be located in a manner to avoid encroachment into the surface water protection overlay district*. Because this is an existing transmission line where work is being done, due to site constraints and the existing structure locations, it would be unreasonable to ask the applicant to relocate the entire utility line.

The second standard states that *encroachment into the buffer area has been minimized to the maximum extent possible*. Ms. Fortson stated the applicant has indicated in the narrative that because the proposed project area is located within an existing right of way and current utilities are at the end of their life expectancy, there are inherent limitations in terms of the changes that can be made. The applicant will be using timber matting to establish temporary work pads and access routes to minimize impacts to the wetlands and upland structures. Access routes will be created to follow existing upland walking trails and structures will be shifted further away from the wetlands when possible.

The third standard relates to minimizing impacts to the surface water buffer. The applicant has provided several examples of where they are trying to create wetland crossings in areas where there are already walking trails. They plan to move structures out of the surface water buffer. They are also going to be using timber matting to minimize disturbance, and the wetlands areas will be reclaimed with an appropriate native seed mix.

Ms. Fortson stated the applicants did attend the Conservation Commission meeting last Monday and the feedback provided by the Conservation Commission was that they recommend that a pollinator friendly seed mix be used and that any material brought onto the site be checked for invasive species.

Ms. Fortson reviewed the Board's last standard, which states that the Board can use certain items to determine whether or not the proposed encroachment will result in adverse impacts on the surface water resource. In that section of their narrative, the applicant provided an interesting breakdown of the wetlands that run through this area. They indicate that the wetlands consist of scrub shrub emergent and wet meadow wetlands. The wetlands north of Krif Road are hydrologically separate from the Ashuelot River due to the surrounding development. The wetlands south of Krif Road are part of the complex of flood plain wetlands contiguous to the Ashuelot River, which makes them more valuable.

Ms. Fortson stated the recommended motion included in the staff report is for final approval. The department has received final plan sets that have been signed by the property owner. She noted this type of application is not something the City would typically require security for due to the size of the area that is going to be affected as part of this work. She reviewed what is outlined in the motion.

Mr. Clancy asked whether it would be the City's responsibility to make sure the proper plantings have been planted at the conclusion of the project, or whether it would be up to the State. Ms. Fortson stated this would be the City's responsibility.

The Chair asked for public comment, with no comment from the public, the Chair closed the public hearing.

### C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Councilor Remy that the Planning Board issue final approval on PB-2025-14 as shown on the plan set identified as, "T198 Maintenance Project" prepared by Normandeau Associates Environmental Consultants at varying scales on June 17, 2025 with the following conditions subsequent to final approval and signature of the plans by the Planning Board Chair:

1. Prior to the commencement of work, the following conditions shall be met:
  - a. The submittal of approved permit numbers for all necessary local, state, and federal permit applications, including but limited to:
    - i. An approved Floodplain Development Permit from the City of Keene Community Development Department.

- ii. Temporary Street Access Permits for each access point from the public right-of-way from the City of Keene Public Works Department.
- iii. Approved Wetlands, Alteration of Terrain, and Shorelands Permits from the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services.
- iv. An approved General Permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers and a 2022 General Construction Permit from the US Environmental Protection Agency.
- v. Any other local, state, or federal permits deemed applicable to the proposed scope of work by the appropriate decision-making authority.
- b. The submittal of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan to the Community Development Department for review and comment by the City Engineer.

The motion was seconded by Sarah Vezzaani.

Councilor Remy stated he agrees with the recommended conditions of approval. He felt the last pole is outside the Swanzey line and hence there was no regional impact.

The Chair asked whether the Conservation Commission's recommendation should be included in the recommended motion. Mr. Clancy felt this was a standard recommended motion but felt the applicant has worked in the State and is probably aware of what should or should not be planted and did not feel that recommendation needs to be included.

Mr. Kost stated this was standard operating practice but adding the pollinator friendly seed mix would be helpful. He noted the statement regarding invasive species and felt that should be included.

Councilor Remy amended his motion to add the following language: During construction, all materials brought in are inspected for invasive species of plants and animals and that remediation is done with local pollinator friendly seed mix. The amendment was seconded by Sarah Vezzaani. The applicant was in agreement to the amendment. The amended motion carried on a unanimous vote.

The Mayor asked the applicant for the status of approvals from the other communities.

Ms. Oliver stated they received special exception to work in the floodplain in Swanzey from their Zoning Board of Adjustment. They will be attending a public hearing in Troy at their Planning Board meeting in August. The Mayor asked for the timing of this project. Mr. Fennell stated some structure work would start in October and continue through the end of the year. Once the wetland permits are obtained, they will continue with the rest of the work next year, and finish around 2027. The agreement with the wildlife group is that there will be periods when the work is stopped.

The Mayor asked whether the Board has a basis to include some kind of acknowledgment from the college regarding the scope of work. Councilor Remy stated the applicant has indicated they are working with the college and that any impact to access will be mitigated. He added if the lines are not coming down, he wasn't sure how much impact there would be to this access. The

Mayor felt there are cross-country paths along that way and there is a parking lot that could be impacted due to the proximity to those lines and did not feel this is an onerous request to ask for this acknowledgement.

Ms. Fortson, in response, stated in 2021–2022, Keene had a few surface water protection applications for different transmission lines to replace wires and poles similar to what is proposed today. She stated it is not standard practice that the City would facilitate that type of communication between a property owner and another property owner who is doing the work. She noted Eversource is not the property owner, but there are easements in place. She stated it is not the role of the Planning Board to try to facilitate communication between two different parties. She felt the Board can make it a recommendation as it is being discussed but did not feel it was appropriate to make it a condition of approval.

Councilor Remy agreed with Staff and felt the Board will be singling out this one user. He agreed that this project has a very large impact, based on the footprint, but stated he does not feel comfortable adding a condition.

Ms. Brunner stated, in looking back at applications before this Board, one application the Board had approved on Old Gilsum Road functions as a trail and is a popular Class 6 Road. She stated the City worked very closely with Eversource to understand the schedule and communicated that information to the public. She stated a potential motion could be to recommend clear communication with the City and then the City, when appropriate, could provide communication to the public in general, which would include Keene State College.

Chair Farrington stated he agrees with Staff and Councilor Remy, and felt it was comparable to the application the Board recently approved on Island Street on a parcel of land which was used for construction storage. This was an area where kayakers would usually walk through so a note to communicate was not made a condition, but signs were located to warn the public.

A motion was made by Mayor Kahn that the Planning Board add an additional condition that the schedule of work be shared through public announcements and communication to abutters. The motion was seconded by Councilor Remy.

Mr. Rangel clarified Ms. Brunner had indicated communication would be provided to the City and the City would then notify abutters. However, the motion seems to indicate the applicant would notify the public and asked whether this was the Mayor's intention. Councilor Remy felt the motion leaves it open to the applicant to notify the City and then the City to notify the public or the applicant would notify the public. The Mayor stated that was his intention.

The motion failed 1-7 vote with Mayor Kahn voting in favor.

The original motion for PB-2025-14 carried on a unanimous vote.

- c) **PB-2024-20 – Earth Excavation Permit Major Amendment & Hillside Protection Conditional Use Permit – Gravel Pit, 21 & 57 Route 9 – Applicant Granite Engineering LLC, on behalf of owner G2 Holdings LLC, proposes to expand the existing gravel pit located at 21 & 57 Route 9 (TMP#s 215-007-000 & 215-008-000). A Hillside Protection CUP is requested for impacts to steep slopes. Waivers are requested from Sections 25.3.1.D, 25.3.3, 25.3.6, and 25.3.13 of the LDC related to the 250’ surface water resource setback, excavation below the water table, toxic or acid forming materials, and the 5-ac excavation area maximum. The parcels are a combined ~109.1-ac in size and are located in the Rural District.**

Chair Farrington addressed the public and indicated all comments would be directed through the Chair. He indicated he would first invite direct abutters to address the Board, followed by residents of Keene and Sullivan, and then other interested parties. He stated, because of the number of people present today, he will be setting a three-minute limit for each speaker. Once everyone has had a turn, he would provide an opportunity for a speaker to address the Board a second time, only if they have new information to share.

Attorney Ariane Ice, representing G2 Holdings, addressed the Board first and stated she was surprised to hear all of the instructions about how the hearing will be moving forward tonight. She stated her understanding was that Staff were recommending a continuance of the application. She stated they have also submitted their own request for continuance. Attorney Ice explained Code requirement in Keene indicates if you are submitting an earth excavation permit, the applicant is required, at their expense, to pay for third party reviewers to assist Staff and the Board in reviewing the application. She noted they were before the Board a couple months ago and the applicant is anxious to get this completed application submitted with all the required information. However, at the 11th hour, the third-party reviewer, Fieldstone Land Consultants, has indicated that certain elements of the application were not under their purview and has requested a different third-party reviewer to be brought on board, which is a hydrogeologist. This work has begun but is not complete yet.

Attorney Ice noted the applicant has paid nearly \$20,000 to these reviewers to complete the technical elements of this application. She indicated the new third-party reviewer, Sanborn, is still asking for additional data, and this is the reason for the continuance. She noted the applicant is not present today as they were requesting continuance. Attorney Ice asked that the continuance be granted and that no testimony is taken from members of the public. She noted one of the waivers as part of this application has been withdrawn, based on feedback from the third-party reviewers. She felt taking comments from the public is premature as they are not ready to response to those comments.

The Chair stated he is sympathetic to the applicant’s situation and the additional cost being incurred. He stated the reason the Board is permitting public comment is because this meeting was noticed prior to becoming evident a continuance was going to be requested by the applicant. Attorney Ice felt this would be very unfair to the applicant, and stated this continuance was

requested by staff. She felt they would now need to rebut testimony made tonight at next month's meeting. She felt it was prejudicial to hold a hearing and not permit the continuance, which the Board's Staff is recommending. She felt taking testimony from the public is denying the continuance. The Chair disagreed and added public comment is not a debate. She questioned if the Board was moving forward with a hearing, even though they were advised the application was going to be continued. She asked for Staff comment on this issue.

Councilor Remy felt it wouldn't be prejudicial to see what the concerns the public has and give the applicant a month to respond to those concerns.

Attorney Ice stated the application is in flux and is constantly changing based on the third-party reviewers' comments. She stressed, again, that the applicant is not present, and their engineers are not present. The public has made their concerns known in the paper and felt the Board should tune out that noise and have it heard at the proper time. She felt the applicant has done everything the City has asked, and it seems extremely punitive for the Board to go against what Staff has recommended. She stated elements of this application could change based on the City's reviewers who are also not here tonight.

Attorney Ice continued by stating when the public raise their grievances, there should be somebody in the room to address those concerns. She stated it seems like the only purpose is punitive to the applicant and to give a forum for the public to air grievances, which she felt was not the purpose of a public hearing that has been asked to be continued when all experts can be present at the next meeting.

The Chair asked for Staff comments. Ms. Brunner addressed the Board and indicated that Ms. Fortson was also present and is the Staff person who has been working closely with the applicant. Ms. Brunner stated the only update from the last meeting, as the applicant indicated, is that the City's third-party reviewer, Fieldstone Land Consultants, an engineering and land surveying firm, made a recommendation in their review of the application materials. Fieldstone Land Consultants recommended the City hire an independent third-party hydrogeologist to review a couple aspects of the application, because they were outside their realm of expertise. Even though this consultant has expertise with earth excavation projects that they have reviewed for other applicants, in this instance there were questions around the water table heights, as well as the potential for acid or acid forming compounds being present in the material to be excavated. Those are areas that were outside of Fieldstone's realm of expertise.

Hence, on the Board's behalf, as required under the Board's regulations, the City contracted with Sanborn and Associates to do the hydrogeologic review. They started their work very quickly, but they haven't quite been able to review everything. As a result, Staff do recommend that the Board continue the application to allow time for that review to conclude. In addition, Staff is still waiting on information related to a revised stormwater management report.

Ms. Brunner noted each Board member has been provided with a packet that includes all of the waivers that were requested and the applicant's rationale for each waiver. There is a request to withdraw the waiver for the water table height. Staff has asked the hydrogeologist from

Sandborn to review to make sure this is no longer needed. Staff is waiting on that analysis as well. Ms. Brunner added it sounds likely that this waiver can be withdrawn.

Mr. Clancy, with respect to regional impact, stated that last month, it was noted that the Town of Sullivan and Southwest Region Planning Commission were notified and asked if other communities were also notified. He felt with Roxbury, especially with water and the perennial streams, might also be included in regional impact and was wondering if they have been contacted.

Ms. Brunner stated the issue with regional impact was raised at the January Board meeting and at the time, the Board determined that the Town of Sullivan should be given abutter status due to the fact that it was proposed to be expanded into the Town of Sullivan. Southwest Region Planning Commission and the Town of Sullivan have been given abutter status. The Town of Roxbury was not included in that. She stated if the Board was to revise its determination of regional impact at this point, it would require additional notice.

The Chair asked if there was some definitive way to determine if Roxbury is impacted. Ms. Brunner stated there is some basic guidance in the State Statutes, but it is up to the Board to decide and noted this question has already been discussed by this Board. Councilor Remy stated he agrees with Staff regarding that this issue has been discussed quite a few months ago and has received a lot of public scrutiny; he felt it would be unfair to include Roxbury at this time. Mr. Clancy stated he agrees, but because this issue has received a lot of public comment, residents in Roxbury might not have heard about this until recently and feel they could be impacted.

The Chair asked Ms. Brunner what the impact would be to add Roxbury as an abutter at this point in the process. Ms. Brunner stated the development of regional impact vote is supposed to happen before the Board opens the initial public hearing. She stated she wasn't sure what the process is for adding a town partway through the process. She stated it might involve sending notice to that town.

Ms. Brunner continued by stating as to Mr. Clancy's question about what the repercussions would be, the only body that can decide if this is a development of regional impact and who should be notified is the Planning Board. The Board has already taken a vote on the issue, even if another town feels like they should have been notified. There is no process for them to challenge that, because the Board has already considered the question and voted on it and gone through the proper procedure. If the Board were to decide to add another town, Ms. Brunner stated her best guess would be to pause the process and notify the towns. Ms. Brunner stated she would like to consult with the City Attorney. Mr. Clancy felt that because Southwest Region Planning Commission was notified, it could be up to them to notify the appropriate towns. Ms. Fortson stated that Southwest Region Planning Commission has confirmed they have been working with smaller towns in the region.

The Chair asked for public comment next.

Mr. Jim Manley of 67 Tyler Lane, Sullivan, addressed the Board and stated he shares property boundaries with G2 Holdings of approximately one mile, which splits directly on to his southern

and eastern borders. Mr. Manley referred to a mural on the north wall of the area, which dates back to 1775, honoring the men who mustered after the battles of Lexington and Concord. He referred to the history of Nims Hill and its attraction to this area and did not feel this hill should be exploited.

Mr. Manley stated he purchased his property in 2021. Prior to G2's proposal, he wanted to build his dream home on this site. This has now been put on hold. He felt 13 years of blasting would reduce his property value and he is not alone. He stated there are nearly 25 homes within the 2,500-foot radius of this proposal. If the Town of Roxbury is included, that number goes up.

Mr. Manley noted most of these 25 homes consist of retirees along with several young families with children. This proposal is a threat to children, pets, wildlife and quiet enjoyment. He notes it is disconcerting that G2 does not carry liability insurance for potential damages to foundations and wells from 13 years of blasting, as evidenced by G2 operations in Gilsum. All the residents in the impact area travel Route 9 daily. The intersection of Sullivan Road and Route 9 has been identified as a dangerous intersection, and the current improvement is quizzical at best. He added, in their initial application, G2 reported no increase in traffic to Route 9. However, at the April 15th public hearing in Sullivan, Cody Gordon stated that there will be 60 to 75 truckloads per day.

Ms. Elizabeth Newcomb of 501 South Road, Sullivan, stated she is also a resident of Keene. She stated she purchased land in Sullivan to build her dream home for her family, but her plans are on hold due to this proposed expansion, which will negatively impact her land value. She expressed her concern that the current project has many violations that were only discovered upon review of the proposed expansion. She asked if the City was not monitoring violations and getting them remedied, what will happen if there continues to be violations and the project proceeds not in accordance with the proposed plan. This is what happened originally—the project was not constructed in accordance with many elements of the approved plan.

Ms. Newcomb stated she is also concerned about noise, the impact from blasting, potential hazards to her children with the multiple 50-foot cliffs in her backyard, as well as the visual impact along the road. She stated she understands violations are not being discussed tonight, but felt it was germane to the decision that the current site is in noncompliance of multiple regulations.

The Chairman next asked for comments from residents of Keene.

Mr. Mike Perez of 419 South Road, Keene, stated he is within approximately 4,000 feet of the proposed area. He asked that the Planning Board to keep in mind language in the land development code that exists to protect homeowners like himself from hazards, nuisance and detriment to property values. Mr. Perez stated, even though he is not a direct abutter, it is clear he will still be negatively affected by G2's proposal for expansion.

Mr. Davis Jacoway of 416 South Road, Keene, addressed the Board next and stated he is concerned about his well. He lives 1/8th of a mile from this site and is concerned about the disturbance of bedrock and how that would contaminate his well. He also expressed concern



about the increase of dust that would enter his home. He questioned if blasting was permitted on Saturdays, which happened two months ago.

Ms. Jan Albano, Selectwoman for the Town of Roxbury, addressed the Board and stated they are aware that Roxbury does not have abutter status. She read the following statement on behalf of the Roxbury Select Board:

*In 2022, G2 began operations at the gravel pit in Keene. They now propose to expand the gravel pit in Keene and Sullivan, although they will not be excavating on land in Roxbury. The site includes property in Roxbury and impacts not just the adjacent properties, but any property within hearing distance. G2 asked to expand because they realize they can't extract as much gravel from their existing site as previously thought; we now realize a few things too. We reference the Fieldstone report that cites several instances of G2 failing to fulfill the requirements of their existing permit. Some of these have now been addressed or are being tended to, but would that be the case if they were not now seeking approval for their expansion? We also call your attention to G2's narrative "detailing how each development standard has been addressed. In particular, Item 11 is the means to avoid and/or mitigate adverse impacts caused by dust, noise and traffic." Their response addresses dust and traffic. There is no mention of noise. Yet, noise is of a significant concern of Roxbury residents living within earshot of the existing pit. Those people are currently subjected to constant noise that disrupts the quiet and solitude that they used to enjoy, and if the exemption is approved, they can expect more of that six days a week for the next 13 years. Other concerns that other people have talked about today include the potential for damage to foundations, contamination of wells and the failure of retention ponds.*

*We ask that you carefully weigh the impact of this proposed expansion on the residents of Keene, Sullivan, and Roxbury. There are multiple reasons to deny this request. What compelling reason is there to grant it?*

Ms. Yulia Sokol of Sullivan addressed the Board next. Ms. Sokol stated she has lived in Sullivan for the last three years. Ms. Sokol referred to an article the City of Keene had sent out asking what the City should look like in 2040. She noted the article mentions six key pillars that reflect what matters most to Keene and Sullivan residents and residents of Monadnock region.

Ms. Sokol pointed out that Route 9 and 10 are the gateways to New Hampshire. Everybody who comes to visit our beautiful region and the state comes through Keene. Route 9 and 10 bring us people from Massachusetts, Vermont, New York, Connecticut and other states. Local small-town population is declining, as per the last census. The goal of Sullivan and Keene residents and the small business community is to save our small towns from deteriorating effects of industrial scale mining and gravel operations on Route 9 and Route 10, which is ongoing by G2 Holdings and Gordon Services. The goal of Sullivan and Keene residents is, first, to make our towns a vibrant place to live healthier lives and thrive as a local community. Second, is to attract more residents, especially young families, to make Sullivan and Keene their forever home.

She noted the applicant's proposal affects nearly 31,329 residents from towns of Keene, Sullivan, Gilsum, Surry, Nelson, Munsonville, Marlow, Stoddard, Harrisville, Roxbury and Marlborough. She indicated that quality of life, health implications, property values, property tax implications and school children attendance at local schools are a concern.

Jennifer Schmidt of 39 Old County Road, Gilsum, was the next speaker. Ms. Schmidt stated her property is directly across the valley from the current excavation site in Gilsum on Route 10. She stated she wakes up to the sound of hammering, blasting, beeping of trucks that goes on all day. She stated this goes on Monday through Saturday starting at 7:00 AM.

Ms. Schmidt stated she moved to this area three years ago, partly because of the quiet and the beauty of this area. She stated it is unlikely that they will be able to sell their property at this time with all the noise that they have to endure. She noted the blasting activity last week caused her well to spew black water. She complained to the select board and Cody Gordon sent people over. It was discovered she had bedrock in her well water and was told it was probably from a thunderstorm. Ms. Schmidt indicated again, this was the day after the blast. In addition, she stated her pressurization tank no longer works. It worked the day before the blast but no longer worked after the blast. She cautioned allowing the expansion to move forward because of what the residents currently have to live through.

Ms. Keegan Brasso from Sullivan, NH stated the five-acre rule is what the applicant is requesting a waiver from. He noted preventing the expansion would protect nature, wildlife, people's ability to access and enjoy nature. G2 Holdings is requesting waivers to all these regulations. He stated he cares about noise and dust but specifically, the five-acre rule seems to prohibit expansion and asked that this rule stand.

Mr. Peter Vogel of Sullivan addressed the Board. He stated what concerns him is 13 years of blasting, which means 13 years of dust and disruption to wildlife, 13 years of disruption of quality of life for the residents—not just abutting properties, but in the entire area. He indicated these things are not in question. He felt this project would leave a scar in this area and sees many problems with this project, with no benefit to the community but would greatly benefit the applicant.

Ms. Amelia Perrin of 98 Apple Hill Road, Sullivan, addressed the Board next. Ms. Perrin stated she has lived in her property for nearly 12 years and also works for the Apple Hill Center for Chamber Music where she runs a summer music camp. She noted this project will profit G2 Holdings and Granite Engineering, whereas the adverse effects of this project will be borne by the local community. As such, felt there should be the highest possible standard set to mitigate these adverse impacts.

Ms. Perrin stated she is concerned about 13 years of sound and pollution for the music camp, as well as the community and neighbors. She stated she is also concerned about the air and water pollution this project will cause. Allowing this project to move forward with these waivers would be a failure to adequately protect the water and health of the local community.

Mr. Dwayne Edelson of 33 Lowell Drive, Gilsum, stated he is an abutter to this project. He stated this project has caused 64 cliffs around his property and a building that has been split in half, which the applicant won't take responsibility for. He indicated the applicant installed a blasting sensor on his property last week, which he indicated needs to be set on solid surface. Mr. Edelson stated the sensor was installed instead on his leach field, which he had requested that the

applicant does not do. He showed the public present a rendering from Route 10 as to what his backyard looks like and indicated his property is severely damaged because of this work. He noted G2 Holdings owns the land, but the blasting company has destroyed his barn and his house. They refused to admit to it and are requesting Mr. Edleton use his homeowners' insurance to cover the repairs to his property. He indicated that G2 Holding is not bonded or insured.

Mr. Edleton stated his neighbors have sinkholes on their property, damage to foundations and the noise and stress of blasting caused his neighbors to lose their exotic birds.

Attorney Friedrich Mukhal from Concord NH, representing Mr. Manley, addressed the Board next. Attorney Mukhal stated he agrees with everything that has been stated today by the other speakers. He noted excavation pits are governed by a statute, RSA 155-E, but there are City regulations that are more stringent and referred to a couple of those requirements that exist in this City: *When an issue would present a potential hazard to human health, safety and welfare, or to the environment caused by adverse impacts associated with an excavation project. Examples of such hazards include adverse visual impacts.* The attorney handed Staff copies of meeting minutes from August 2022 when the Board first approved G2 Holdings application as well as the meeting minutes from the Sullivan Zoning Board of Adjustment from April 2025. He called the Board's attention to page 15, which refers to what the applicant is indicating to Sullivan that they are going to do as part of the present application. They are going to blast this mountain down, which will result in three steps of 50-foot ledges. He noted this is what the applicant would like the Board to approve. He added what G2 does not have to do is to reclaim ledges and 50-foot slopes. Attorney Mukhal also referred to the City's Land Development Code Sections 25.2 C and E: Health, Safety, Welfare, Visual Impacts. The same would be true regarding the Land Development Code Sections 25.2-D: Noise. All abutters are complaining about noise, which is a big issue.

Mr. Andrew Newcomb of 64 Center Street, Sullivan, stated he has lived in Sullivan with his family since 2023. He stated they own a 209-year-old home on fieldstone foundation, fed by well water. He stated G2 has been expanding into the town and wants to continue to do so. Mr. Newcombe pointed out that they are now requesting waivers and exceptions so that they can essentially bypass the code that this town has when they have demonstrated in the past that they don't really care about those codes to begin with. He noted G2 has violated their plans, they have violated state law, town ordinances both in Keene and in Sullivan, and are now requesting waivers are asking that they will abide by those waivers. Mr. Newcombe indicated they have not given the city reason to trust them in the past and there is no reason to trust them in the future.

Mr. Joseph Anzo on 501 South Road, Keene, was the next speaker. Mr. Anzo stated, as Mr. Newcombe just indicated, G2 makes a lot of promises; however, G2 had repeated violations of municipal, state and federal regulations, many of which have not yet been remediated and may never be remediated. He noted they have advanced into Sullivan without seeking any approval at all. G2 is also in arrears on a number of tax obligations and, as others have noted, it is not actually possible to return the land to a pre-impact state in many cases, especially in the case of these three 50-foot cliffs, millions of tons of bedrock are being removed from the site. Mr. Anzo noted what G2 is suggesting is that they replace at least a certain portion of this bedrock with loam on the side of an extremely steep hill that descends into a ravine with a pretty significant

river at the bottom of it and into the Otter Brook watershed. The project has the potential to cause ferric oxide runoff into local and Keene waterways, especially with flooding becoming an issue nationwide.

Mr. Anzo went on to say the gravel pit would cause dust trucks, mud, noise and traffic and will be the defining feature of Keene for all visitors for decades to come. He felt what is visible now is nothing compared to what's to come. Mr. Anzo stated we can already see the scar beginning to appear on the hillside as you come into Keene. There is going to be blasting for 13 years and taking down that hillside for 13 years. He questioned whether the City can trust G2 Holdings or will this become a constant problem for the City as it is already proven to be.

Mr. Manley addressed the Board again and reminded the Board that they could deny this application and technical data is not needed as the Board can see what is already happening. He referred to a rendering of what can be seen from Route 9, which he indicated was a direct violation of RSA 155 E and Keene's Ordinances.

Mr. Manley referred to the applicant's initial application where G2 reported no increase in Route 9 traffic. However, at the April 15th public hearing in Sullivan, Cody stated that there will be 60 to 75 truckloads per day. Mr. Manley noted what Cody Gordon failed to say is that truckload consists of two trips, inbound and outbound, resulting in 120 to 150 trips each day. He noted the intersection of Sullivan Road and Route 9 was deemed hazardous. What the State implemented is not acceptable and questioned what impact this increase to traffic is going to have on this intersection.

Mr. Manley noted it is a documented fact that G2 Holdings conducted forestry and excavation operations in Keene and Sullivan without permits, as well as forestry operations in Brattleboro. State and Keene regulations state clearly that a gravel pit should not be visible except for the entrance to the operation. He noted this is clearly not the case.

Mr. Manley asked the Board how approval of this proposal is going to enhance property values of property owners in the region. He also questioned why Granite Engineering drew a one-mile perimeter when the City's regulations indicate it should be 2,500 feet, and this will impact nearly 25 homes.

Ms. Yulia Sokol of 40 Mine Road, Sullivan, addressed the Board again and stated her house shakes every time there is a blast, and she is not a direct abutter. She indicated she heard a recent study that indicated the only county that gained population in New Hampshire was Carroll County, and the reason for this is natural beauty, peace and a healthy environment that people are drawn to. She stated she does not want to see people driving through Keene to get to better places and that is what this application would contribute to.

Mr. Edelson addressed the Board again and stated, with reference to blasting, blasts were felt for more than a mile and a half away and stated he has documentation indicating this. Mr. Edelson stressed that the applicant refuses to follow regulations. He talked about the lack of road maintenance from the applicant, which he has had to address with the town.

Ms. Liz referred to a few final thoughts. The original plans showed many instances of inaccuracy and misrepresentation, as highlighted in the Fieldstone report. At the meeting in Sullivan, the representatives from G2 consistently downplayed the negative impacts that residents would face from the operation and continue to need many waivers to regulations, which exist for a reason, just to be able to proceed with the operation.

She encouraged the Board to remember that these regulations are here for a reason: to protect the residents, community and wildlife. If G2 needs so many exceptions to the rules just to be able to operate, perhaps this isn't the correct location for this sort of operation, and certainly not the expansion.

Attorney Ice addressed the Board next and stated this is the most egregious example of lack of due process she has seen. She stated that they reject 99% of the complaints that have been made, as the public is raising items that have not been found to be violations. She raised her concern that the applicant was not able to make it to the meeting. She noted the process should have been the applicant's presentation, then Staff comments and opening the hearing up to the public for their comments. She indicated she spoke just to the continuance and then the public was given the opportunity to air their grievances. She felt this entire night should be stricken from the record.

She stated they will present their case in August and address the legitimate concerns the Staff and their engineers have raised and asked that the Board give this applicant the same due process afforded to other applicants.

Attorney Mukhal addressed the Board again and stated the applicant filed, at the 11th hour, a request for a continuance and then the applicant made the choice not to attend the meeting tonight. He noted the applicant's attorney is present, but perhaps the Engineers should have been here to answer questions, maybe not on the hydrology portion, but at least the portions that are before the board tonight. He added it is the applicant's burden to be ready to go and felt it was dangerous to make these arguments that it is prejudicial to the applicant for this Board to proceed when there was no decision on that motion to continue. He did not feel there was any procedural irregularity, except maybe for the hydrology component. He did not feel the testimony made today needs to be stricken and if this hearing is continued to August, the Board can hear about hydrology.

With that the Chair closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Councilor Remy that the Planning Board continue PB-2024-20 to the Planning Board meeting scheduled for August 25th, 2025 at 6:30 PM in the City Hall, 2nd Floor Council Chambers. The motion was seconded by Sarah Vezzani.

The Mayor noted, as Staff had stated, there is information yet to be brought to the Board and information will be received next month, and felt the continuation was an appropriate action.

The Chair stated public input was important to the Board but not necessarily to have the same weight as professional engineers and analysis from licensed professionals in this field of hydrogeology. He stated he appreciates everyone's patience and civility throughout this process.

The motion carried on a unanimous vote.

## **VII) Master Plan Update (KeeneMasterPlan.com)**

Ms. Brunner stated the July meeting was rescheduled for August 12. She indicated the consultants are working on a revised draft of the master plan, which will be sent out to Steering Committee members. She stated most of the edits at this point are not significant changes. It is more about reorganization, formatting items and a few "tweaks." She noted the biggest change Staff requested, with respect to the implementation section, is to make it more user friendly. She stated the draft should be ready for the next Master Plan Steering Committee meeting to get the adoption process started. She added the Board can expect, if the Master Plan Steering Committee is ready, they would send it back to the Board. At that point, the Board would refer it to Council for Council to endorse and then a public hearing will be scheduled.

Ms. Brunner called the Board's attention to a display on the second floor of different departments going back 100 years of community planning.

The Mayor stated he would not be present at the August 12th Steering Committee as this meeting falls during council break and expressed his disappointment.

The Chair asked whether the draft would be red-lined. Ms. Brunner stated it would not be red-lined but staff could submit to the Board a summary of the changes that have been made. With respect to the Mayor's comments, she apologized the way the timeline worked out and thanked the Mayor and the Chair for all their in-depth comments during the master plan process. She added when the draft is sent to the Board, the Mayor would have the opportunity to add comments that will be forwarded to the committee.

## **VIII) Staff Updates**

### **a) Overview of Administrative and Minor Project Approvals Issued from January 1, 2025–June 30, 2025.**

Ms. Brunner stated, with respect to an overview of administrative and minor project approvals, Staff have previously provided annual updates. After a previous conversation with this Board, Staff are now doing bi-annual updates of approvals that are being issued. She noted what is before the Board tonight are more administrative approvals. There are no minor project reviews for the first six months (January–June). She stated the Minor Project Review Committee sees very few items, as most projects don't qualify for minor project review. Most applications might have a waiver request, the City might be a direct abutter, the City might hold an easement, etc. and hence are getting forwarded to the Planning Board for review.

She went on to say there have been a number of comments from Board members regarding the site plan review process and an item will be brought before the Board in the next couple of months.

**b) Correspondence Received from NH Dept. of Environmental Services Regarding a Waiver Request for the Transportation Heritage Trail (Informational).**

Ms. Brunner stated if the Board had any questions regarding this correspondence the Board received, they should reach out to the City Engineer, Bryan Ruoff. The letter is on page 83 of the Board packet.

**IX) New Business**

None

**X) Upcoming Dates of Interest**

- Joint Committee of the Planning Board and PLD – September 8, 6:30 PM
- Planning Board Steering Committee – August 12, 12:00 PM
- Planning Board Site Visit – August 20, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed
- Planning Board Meeting – August 25, 6:30 PM

There being no further business, Chair Farrington adjourned the meeting at 9:17 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,  
Emily Duseau, Planning Technician