

City of Keene
New Hampshire

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, November 24, 2025

6:30 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Harold Farrington, Chair
Councilor Michael Remy
Armando Rangel
Ryan Clancy
Kenneth Kost
Michael Hoefer, Alternate (Voting)
Joseph Cocivera, Alternate (Voting)

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner

Members Not Present:

Roberta Mastrogiovanni, Vice Chair
Mayor Jay V. Kahn
Sarah Vezzani
Tammy Adams, Alternate
Stephon Mehu, Alternate

1) Call to Order – Roll Call

Chair Farrington called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and roll call was taken. Michael Hoefer and Joseph Cocivera were invited to join the session as voting members.

2) Minutes of Previous Meeting – October 27, 2025

A motion was made by Councilor Remy that the Planning Board approve the October 27, 2025 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Armando Rangel and was unanimously approved.

3) Final Vote on Conditional Approvals

Chair Farrington stated this is a new, standing agenda item in response to the recent City of Dover decision issued by the NH Supreme Court. 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.

Ms. Brunner stated there were no items ready for final approval.

- 4) **Public Hearing: Amendments to the Planning Board Regulations** – The Planning Board proposes to amend its Subdivision Regulations, Site Development Standards, Earth Excavation Regulations, and Application Procedures in the Land Development Code, including Sections 20.2, 21.6, 25.3, 25.5, 26.10, 26.12, 26.14 and 26.19. The proposed amendments are intended to clarify language within the code, correct errors with respect to wording, update submittal requirements to match current practice, and reflect recent changes to state law regarding the timeframes for “Active and Substantial Development” and “Substantial Completion” of subdivision and site plan applications. In addition, the proposed amendments would modify the Board’s Site Plan Review Thresholds to create new thresholds for commercial and multifamily street access permits, modify the threshold for new additions, and establish thresholds for proposals to create new residential dwelling units.

Ms. Brunner addressed the Board and stated she is going to start the presentation by giving some context and background about where the Land Development Code came from and what the goals of that project are. Ms. Brunner stated this project started in 2017 and it was the main implementation action that came out of the 2010 Master Plan: to review all land development codes, regulations, and zoning and clean them up and locate them in one place. The Land Development Code the City has today was formally adopted in 2021.

The tagline of this project was Building Better Together. The project goals were to make the City’s regulations easier to navigate, reduce confusion, increase efficiency and streamline wherever possible. Ms. Brunner stated throughout the Land Development Code process, the City conducted monthly developer round tables and did a lot of one-on-one outreach to developers to try and understand their main barriers to developing in Keene. The biggest themes that came out of this process is that anything that increases time, increases cost. More importantly, anything that increases uncertainty will make or break whether they decide to pursue a project in Keene.

The idea behind the project was to put all regulations into one place, make them easy to navigate, make the document user-friendly with reference to codes, reduce confusion and help developers understand exactly what is expected of them. As part of this overall effort, the City also created the Minor Project Review Committee and raised the thresholds for projects that go to the Planning Board.

Ms. Brunner noted the Minor Project Review Committee was really intended to be middle tier of review. Projects that previously went to the Planning Board could theoretically go to this Minor Project Review Committee and expect a shorter turnaround time, reducing the cost of the project and incentivizing developers to come up with projects that meet the City’s regulations so that they can go through this quicker and cheaper process.

However, what is being found is that very few projects are qualifying to go to the Minor Project Review Committee based on the thresholds that currently exist. Ms. Brunner stated the feedback staff has received from those that have qualified regarding this Committee has been very positive.

Ms. Brunner next reviewed the Proposed Amendments.

1. Taking the statement that staff found in the Public Improvement Section of the Land Development Code - Public Works Regulations Article 23. This Article has a requirement for subdivisions that are not mentioned in the subdivision regulations. The intent here is to build that connection.

The language says as follows: *“In accordance with Article 23 of this LDC, the owner/developer shall provide permanent reference monuments and final subdivision plans shall not be signed and recorded until after the monuments have been installed by the developer and verified by the Public Works Director, or security in amount deemed satisfactory to the Public Works Director is posted, ensuring the monuments will be set.”*

Councilor Remy stated in the interest of simplicity and not having to track this in two locations at any given time and asked if it should be deleted from Article 23.

Ms. Brunner stated that was a good point and added staff will be bringing a second ordinance forward to City Council that changes the portions of the LDC that are not within the Planning Board’s purview. Article 23 is outside of the Planning Board’s purview. The Planning Board cannot change it, but City Council can. There is going to be a separate ordinance through the City Council, a companion to this item, which will address that.

#2 - Is to define a term that is used in the site development standards multiple times, but is not defined anywhere within the Land Development Code. The term is “primary entrance.” Ms. Brunner stated this came up during site plan review a couple years ago. Staff felt it would be helpful to include a definition. She indicated because this is a niche definition, it could potentially have unintended effects if it is made a definition for the whole document, so staff opted to just keep it as a definition for the specific section which is the screening standard in the site development regulations.

Currently, the screening regulations already state that you cannot have a service area or drive through windows and lanes etc. on a facade with a primary entrance, but it does not define what a primary entrance is. What staff is proposing is under the general standards for screening, add a new Section E, which says, *“... wherever possible, service areas drive through windows and lanes, mechanical equipment, parking areas and other areas likely to generate noise, dust traffic or other disruptive conditions should not be located adjacent to a primary entrance. For the purposes of this section, primary entrance shall mean, the front and or street facing points of ingress and egress to a building...”*

Ms. Brunner stated this does not change anything other than creating a definition of what we think primary entrance means or what was intended with that. Chair Farrington referred to the McDonald’s and Wendy’s sites on Winchester Street - their front facades do not have any doorways. The doorways face the street, but they are on the side of the building. Ms. Brunner stated this would be allowed, because it has to be a street facing facade. As long as the drive through window and lane is not parallel to Winchester Street it would be allowed. The Chair felt this language would indicate that McDonald’s has no primary entrance. Chair Remy agreed with the Chair and added there could be other cases that do not have a street facing entrance. Ms. Brunner agreed and added hence the reason staff wanted to define it, because you could interpret primary entrance to mean the main entrance to the building, which may or may not have been the intention of this standard. Otherwise, saying that you can’t have a drive through window or that you can’t have service areas adjacent to it would be restrictive. She added this issue came up

with 310 Marlboro Street where the main entrance to the apartments was going to be on the side of the building set back 200 feet from the road. Councilor Remy stated he reads the language to say that the City does not want to see the dumpster right next to a main entrance.

Ms. Brunner asked whether the Board agrees that the primary entrance should be narrowed to just entrances along street facing facades. Councilor Remy suggested deleting the words *primary entrance* because that implies the main entrance.

Mr. Hoefer felt there could be a flexibility in an undefined primary entrance. For example, for buildings like McDonald's the primary entrance is off the parking lot.

Mr. Clancy asked whether there was a specified distance for a location of a dumpster. Ms. Brunner stated that was part of the reason, to make it clear to somebody when they are trying to design their site what the City is looking for. She added the term primary entrance is used several times in this section of the code. It is also used elsewhere in the code in a different way. Ms. Brunner stated she would be open to changing the term based on the Board's preference, but it would be helpful to clarify for developers what the Board is looking for.

Mr. Kost stated the desire is for street facing facades and not having dumpsters when you enter a site. He stated street facing is what the City wants to protect and felt that should be emphasized. Mr. Kost also referred to the term "wherever possible" and was not sure if this was a necessary term. Ms. Brunner stated specifically service areas, drive-through areas and parking areas, are already in other sections that are stronger that would prohibit it without a waiver or variance. Mechanical equipment that does not have a hard and fast rule, because there are times when due to the feasibility and technical constraints, it may have to be located on a street facing facade. For instance, in the downtown, where some parcels have three street facing facades. She added on the list wherever possible would only refer to mechanical equipment.

Councilor Remy stated he only sees two places in this chapter where we call something else a primary entrance. He referred Section 26 A.1: *"waste collection, waste compaction, recycling collection and other similar service areas shall not be located along the business frontage building frontage or along a building facade with a primary entrance and shall be screened from view from adjacent property."*

Section 26 2.B.1 *"drive through businesses, drive through windows and lanes shall not be located along the building frontage or along a building facade with a primary entrance."*

He felt both of these sections are trying to clearly differentiate between frontage and primary entrance. He felt if the City's concern is frontage or street facing points of ingress, then there needs to be a broader change as this language clearly says if there is a main entrance we do not want this type of use next to it. Ms. Brunner stated she interprets this slightly differently. When we talk about frontage, we always identify one frontage and then you might have a street facing façade that is technically not the frontage. She went on to say at the time 310 Marlboro Street was constructed the Planning Board concluded that the dumpster could be next to that door without a waiver because they did not feel like that door was a primary entrance. She indicated that is where she took the cue for the proposed language.

Mr. Hoefer asked whether there is a list of definitions versus building this into a Section E. Ms. Brunner stated this option was discussed but there is one other location in the Land Development Code where the term primary entrance is used and staff did not want to cause complications

elsewhere in the code by creating a definition that might conflict with what is meant in that section.

Councilor Remy suggested deleting: *“or along a building facade with a primary entrance”* from Section 21. 6. 2.A.1 or where it says, *“waste collection waste, compaction, recycling collection and other similar service areas should not be located along the building frontage and shall be screened from view from adjacent property or public rights away, not including alleys”* - it would remove a section where it says *“and along a building facade with a primary entrance”* AND *“drive through business, drive through windows and lanes shall not be located along the building frontage”* (This would be the end of the sentence).

Ms. Brunner suggested the following language: *“service areas and drive through windows and lanes shall not be located adjacent to a primary entrance for the purposes of this section. Primary entrance shall mean the main point of ingress or egress for pedestrians entering the building.”*

Ms. Brunner asked permission to take a straw poll and asked how many Board members would want to allow service areas and drive through windows and lanes to only be restricted from the front. The alternative vote is to say that they are restricted from the front and primary entrances.

Chair Farrington and two others voted for the street facing version. The others did not want a drive through at the main entrance. Mr. Hoefer and Mr. Rangel agreed to that. Ms. Brunner asked whether Mr. Clancy and Mr. Cocivera had a preference. Mr. Clancy asked whether this section was for staff purposes or for the Board. Ms. Brunner stated these are the Board’s site development standards. Mr. Clancy asked whether it needs to be defined here or whether it could be defined in the definition section as suggested by Councilor Remy. Ms. Brunner stated it could be defined in the definition section, but she will need to review in other sections of the code where this term is used to avoid confusion.

Mr. Kost referred to a shopping center such as Hannaford’s where there is parking by the main entrance where it can very hazardous and this proposal can’t do anything about such a situation. Ms. Brunner stated this is the reason to keep primary entrance and have it mean the main entrance into the building that most people use. She stated she would just keep it to service areas, drive through windows and lanes, and remove the other items. Right now, in the code, it already says that you cannot have parking between the building and the street; it has to be either to the side or behind the building.

The Board discussed the different scenarios with drive thru lanes in Keene. Ms. Brunner referred to the Burger King and the Tito’s building and stated she does not consider the part that goes by the entrance to be a drive through lane. The drive through lane is the lane that is just for the cars to go around and has the window with menu boards and microphones.

Mr. Hoefer agreed and added he would not want a new fast-food place to locate a drive through window right next to their main door. Councilor Remy suggested defining primary entrance in the code and put it in the definitions as the entrance that people use to enter and exit a building because it applies to both this section and Section 9.

Ms. Brunner stated this language should then be removed entirely from the Planning Board’s changes and then add the definition to the definition section, which is technically not in the

Board's purview. Staff will then be bringing an ordinance forward to City Council and will include it in that.

Ms. Brunner moved forward with the next change.

#3 - Amend the Earth Excavation Regulations - To reflect a vote that the Board has already taken. She reminded the Board that at a meeting several months ago, the Board voted to delegate enforcement authority to staff, and this change is just codifying it in the LDC.

#4 - The code still says it requires the submittal of seven full size copies. Ms. Brunner explained the reason for this is that historically, copies of the plans were sent to the various departments that review them through interdepartmental mail. COVID put an end to that practice. Digital copies are used now.

Mr. Kost asked if the City still requires Mylar copies. Ms. Brunner stated this is a requirement at the end of the process once everything is approved.

#5 – Submittal Requirement – A request from one of the planners, because they often have to request this information and they would prefer that it is articulated in the submittal requirements, so applicants are aware that they are going to need the zoning information on the plan. Mr. Hoefer confirmed the information on a plan such as this would only refer to lot sizes and not about the number of bedrooms or bathrooms, etc. Ms. Brunner answered in the affirmative and added zone dimensional requirements typically include lot size, frontage, and lot width at the building line, setbacks, impervious coverage, and building height. It is about comparing numbers to make sure they meet the standards.

#6 – In the application procedures, applicants have the ability to request an exemption from a submittal requirement; all other items require a waiver. There is a requirement for just boundary line adjustments in the filing section, which is not in the BLA submittal requirements, to submit an updated survey showing the metes and bounds of the revised parcels. For example, for a lot that is 50 acres and another lot that is 1/4 of an acre and a lot line is being adjusted between those two lots, all that should be required is a metes and bounds in the vicinity of where the lot lines are changing. Ms. Brunner noted that to require a survey of the entire 50 acres is cost-prohibitive. When applicants try to request an exemption, they are technically not permitted to because this is not in the submittal requirements. Instead, they have to request a waiver, which is a separate process before the Board. What staff is trying to require is just the metes and bounds for portions of the parcels that are changing.

#7 – addresses HB413, which was signed into law and is retroactively effective. This applies to anything from July 1, 2023 on. It changed the time frame for active and substantial development to be three years instead of two years. Substantial completion went from five years to seven years. Once an applicant gets final approval from the Planning Board, they have three years to start the project and seven years to complete the project. If they meet this timeframe then their rights are vested. Future changes to zoning, subdivision or site plan will not affect the applicant. The current code refers to two years.

Staff also wanted to clarify because the language currently states, “*within two years, starting the day following the Board's decision to approve or conditionally approve.*” Ms. Brunner stated now that the Board goes through the final approval process, staff wanted to make it clear that it is the vote on the final approval that starts these clocks.

#8 – To add a new Section D referred to as Substantial Completion. The reason for this is that the current language does not define what Substantial Completion means. The same language as Active and Substantial Development, but then items For Substantial Completion would be roadways to be installed and paved through the base course - this does not necessarily have to be accepted by City Council, but it has to meet the conditions for acceptance, which would be determined by the Public Works Director. Utilities have to be installed and ready for hookup. Lot monuments, driveways and other site features are installed or completed. All permanent on site, storm water management, erosion control, etc. are installed. Buildings and structures, off-site improvements, if they are required. Ms. Brunner noted this refers to “hard infrastructure” and major site features being installed.

Mr. Kost asked how a phased plan works in this instance. Ms. Brunner stated 90% of the plans the Board approve are not in phases. In the case where there are phases, the Board has leeway to determine what the time frame for Active and Substantial Development will be for the subsequent phases. Substantial Development would be based off that time frame set by the Board.

Councilor Remy talked about staff approved changes that would not come back before the Board and asked that this be kept in mind. Ms. Brunner stated if an applicant wants to modify their plan before final approval, they are required to come before the Board. If staff does approve a change after final approval, Substantial Completion would be reviewed using the most current approved version of the plan.

Mr. Hoefer felt there should be one definition of what Substantial Completion is and then all sections refer to that definition versus having to define it multiple times throughout the code. Ms. Brunner in response stated Active and Substantial Development and Substantial Completion are specific to whether it is a site plan or subdivision. There could be one definition for both, although there are some slight differences. For instance, for subdivision, it includes lot monuments. For site plans, it includes some other site features that you would not normally see in a subdivision. She added Section 26-10 is the Board Subdivision Application procedures and Section 26-12 are the Site Plan Application procedures.

Mr. Kost felt for a user everything that needs to be used for a subdivision application should be in one location and it would be true for site plan application and liked how it was structured.

Ms. Brunner next reviewed Site Plan review thresholds that were reviewed last month. She noted to one change from last month, which was to split out the thresholds for additions between downtown districts and all other districts.

Currently, Site Plan review thresholds for a new principal building or structure is anything greater than 5,000 square feet of gross floor area is considered a major site plan. Between 1,000 square feet and 5,000 square feet is considered minor site plan.

For Additions - In the Downtown District it will remain as it is outlined today, which is anything greater than 15% of the gross-floor area of the principal building would be a major site plan. Between 10% and 15% would be a minor site plan.

Outside of downtown districts, that threshold would be raised to increase the number of projects that could go to the Minor Project Review Committee.

New residential units, 25 or more would go to Major Site Plan. Between 10 to 24 would go to Minor Site Plan.

Vehicle trips - Increase of 100 per day or 50 per peak hour would be Major Site Plan, which is how it exists today.

New impervious surfaces – would remain as they are outlined today.

No proposed changes to land disturbance.

Street Access – This is a new proposal. All street access is sent to the Planning Board. Ms. Brunner stated they would like to have flexibility to send some of those to the Minor Project Review Committee. In instances where an applicant is removing street access or narrowing it, perhaps having that reviewed administratively. Any time an exception is required from the street access standard, this would be sent for Planning Board review. If they meet all street access requirements, they can go to Minor Project Review Committee. If they are creating a new driveway or they are widening an existing driveway, but they are still staying within the requirements, they can go before Minor Project Review Committee. If they are reducing the number of curb cuts or narrowing them, it could be reviewed administratively with the caveat that the City Engineer would review it as well.

Mr. Kost referred to land disturbance of an acre and felt in the downtown an acre is a large area of land. He noted for instance a business on an acre of land downtown won't go before the Planning Board even though it is on Main Street; form-based code could also be an issue that could be considered here. He felt this is a large impact in a downtown area.

Ms. Brunner referred to the list of thresholds for Major and Minor Site Plan and stated a project that meets any one of these thresholds would have to be reviewed for Major or Minor Site Plan Review. She added modifications to the building or a site, such as facade alteration, landscaping, lighting is at the discretion of the Community Development Director and could warrant review by the Planning Board. Change of use is also another opportunity for staff to use some discretion and move items to the Planning Board. In situations like this, staff will also consult with the Board Chair to get his/her opinion. If an applicant pushes back, "Advice and Comment" is also an option that is suggested. Mr. Kost felt as long as the Board and staff are comfortable that the downtown will be properly protected, he is ok with what is being proposed. Ms. Brunner added another layer of protection for the downtown, at least for historic buildings, is the Historic District Commission. You cannot demolish a historic building that has been ranked as contributing or primary, unless you meet specific conditions. Mr. Kost referred to the Ted's site, Athens Building etc., which are not historic buildings. Ms. Brunner realistically felt most development downtown would come before the Planning Board. She indicated the instance it will not be sent to the Board, if it is adaptive reuse of an existing building.

#11 - To give the Minor Project Review Committee explicit authorization to refer projects when items come before them that do not meet zoning, or if an applicant finds out part way through the process that they need a waiver. This puts developers on notice as well as the Minor Project Review Committee members that they then can refer the project to the appropriate Board. If it does not meet zoning, or if a project requires a waiver, it is not within their jurisdiction; this is just language to help clarify that.

#12 - To specify that a final plan needs to include all professional stamps for anyone who helps prepare the plan. This is something that is required today. This is to make sure that the code reflects that. This is required in the submittal requirements, but not in the filing requirements. Hence, it is just being restated under the filing requirements.

#13 - To require a flattened PDF copy of as built plans in addition to the paper and electronic file formats and to also specify the number of paper copies. At the present time, when an applicant submits an as-built plan, the department retains a copy, and one paper copy is sent to Public Works. Planning staff review the PDF to make sure that it reflects what is supposed to be there and then engineering does a more detailed review of the actual electronic file.

#14 - Conditional Use Permit Application Procedures: At the present time, this states that applicants who are seeking a waiver for a conditional use permit shall apply to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a Variance. However, in the Telecommunications CUP, there is process for the Planning Board to issue a waiver. This change would clarify that a variance is required unless stated otherwise elsewhere in the LDC.

#15 and #16 - To remove the requirement from both the Subdivision Regulations and the Site Plan Regulations that waivers must follow the same process as the application. What this means today is when an applicant submits their application and staff is doing a review, it is a tight timeline; staff try to get projects through in one planning board meeting whenever possible. However, if a waiver is required and that is realized too late in the process, this delays the application because they have to notice the waiver within the required noticing time frame; state statute comes out to 14 days before the meeting. Staff are proposing any waivers that are identified and staff are aware of would still be included in the legal ad language. However, if a waiver is required and this is discovered after the legal ad goes out or if it is discovered during the Planning Board meeting, the Board could still have the ability to determine whether or not to grant a waiver without having the applicant go through the notice process. Ms. Brunner noted noticing waivers is a Keene issue and did not believe other communities require that.

Ms. Brunner added this would reduce the timeframe of an applicant as well as reduce the cost because when they have to do a whole round of noticing just for a waiver, which means they have to do the legal ad fee again and the abutter notice fee again.

Councilor Remy suggested that the language for the noticing say, “*waivers from requirements may be requested at the meeting up until the meeting.*” Ms. Brunner agreed and stated this could perhaps be added in the abutter notice as legal ads are charged per line. The Councilor asked whether this could dis-incentivize applicants from providing the waivers on time. Ms. Brunner stated she did not think so and added staff does an initial determination of completeness and then do a more thorough review and send the applicant a memo of comments. The applicant then has a revision deadline, and this is when they would be required to submit any outstanding items and waivers. If the application is not ready for the public hearing, the Planning Board Steering Committee has the ability to indicate whether it goes on the agenda as well.

Councilor Remy also suggested this language: “*waiver request shall be submitted prior to the revision meeting, except as exempted by the Community Development Director.*”

Ms. Brunner referred to page 31 of the Board’s packet, Section 26, 10.14, all items above Item E has to be met: Request has to be made in writing; They have to cite the specific regulation. She

added vast majority of the developers are acting in good faith and with others, there is leeway for the Board to act.

Mr. Hoefer stated as long as the Board feels good that that process to identify the need for a waiver is happening ahead of time and this is only to prevent the minor cases that might come up during the review process – he was in agreement with this amendment. Ms. Brunner stated staff also schedules a pre-submission meeting where they meet with the applicant prior to submission of the application. At times, there are significant changes between that point and when they submit the application. Staff will also at times send a Memo of all items required.

#17 – Proposal to amend the Earth Excavation Application submittal requirements. Specifically, the section refers to exemptions. This amendment is to make it specific about what section it is and where an applicant can request for exemptions. Ms. Brunner further stated Earth Excavation Regulations were written a while ago and have not been used until recently. She noted the section on security does not match other sections on security. Planning Board policy is to not accept performance bonds and to only accept checks or letters of credit. Councilor Remy asked whether it matters whom the letter of credit is from. Ms. Brunner stated she assumes it can only come from a bank and stated she would need to defer to the Finance Department.

Master Plan Consistency – This is in line with the recently adopted Master Plan. There are goals listed under Livable Housing to make sure that the housing development process is transparent, easy to navigate. The City is trying to boost infill development and redevelopment, remove barriers to housing developments.

Under the Thriving Economy - Goal 3 - An action item to review the City's regulatory processes to identify potential challenges or constraints that perspective businesses and or developers may face.

Under Flourishing Environment - Where it talks about as an aspiration, smart growth, compact, walkable development and infill are promoted to preserve green space and farms and adaptive reuse of buildings is the common building strategy over greenfield development. To make sure regulations are as clear and streamlined as possible is going to help achieve that goal.

Ms. Brunner next went over the changes from the Board.

#1 - strike the beginning and to say "*the owner shall*" instead of referring to Article 23.

#2 - to delete this item in its entirety and add the definition of primary entrance to the ordinance that goes to City Council.

Ms. Brunner reviewed the changes again:

Amendment #1 would be modified to read 20.2.5 – "*Monumentation – the owner/developer shall provide permanent reference monuments and final subdivision plans...*"

A motion was made by Councilor Remy that the Planning Board approve amendments to the Planning Board Subdivision regulations, site development standards, earth excavation regulations and application procedures, as shown in the memorandum to the Planning Board dated November 14th, 2025 with an effective date of January 1, 2026, with the exception of amendment one, striking the words in accordance with Article 23 of this LDC and capitalizing

the 1st letter of the next word; in addition, striking Amendment 2 entirely with the intent that the definition is sent forward to City Council for a different amendment.

The motion was seconded by Armando Rangel and was unanimously approved.

A motion was made by Councilor Remy that the Planning Board refer the amended regulations to City Council for incorporation to Chapter 100 Land Development Code of the City Code of Ordinances. The motion was seconded by Armando Rangel and was unanimously approved.

5) Training on Site Development Standards

Item was tabled for next month.

6) Staff Updates

Staff is working on an Implementation Plan for the Master Plan. Staff is waiting for Council to finish their goals. She indicated next meeting is a full agenda with six public hearings as well as the meeting scheduled for next year. In the New Year, the Board will be starting its review of the CIP.

7) New Business

None

8) Upcoming Dates of Interest

- Joint Committee of the Planning Board and PLD – December 8th, 6:30 PM
- Planning Board Steering Committee – December 9th, 12:00 PM
- Planning Board Site Visit – December 17th, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed
- Planning Board Meeting – December 22nd, 6:30 PM

9) Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Farrington adjourned the meeting at 8:18 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Mari Brunner, Senior Planner

Additional edits by,
Katryna Kibler, Clerk's Office