

City of Keene
New Hampshire

JOINT PLANNING BOARD /
PLANNING, LICENSES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, January 12, 2026

6:30 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Planning Board

Members Present:

Harold Farrington, Chair
Roberta Mastrogiovanni, Vice Chair
Mayor Jay Kahn
Michael Hoefer
Kenneth Kost
Andrew Madison
Councilor Molly Ellis

Planning Board

Members Not Present:

Stephon Mehu, Alternate
Tammy Adams, Alternate
Joseph Cocivera, Alternate

Planning, Licenses &

Development Committee

Members Present:

Randy L. Filiault, Chair
Philip M. Jones, Vice Chair
Edward J. Haas
Robert C. Williams
Laura E. Ruttle-Miller

Planning, Licenses &

Development Committee

Members Not Present:

All Present

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Senior
Planner
Megan Fortson, Planner

1) Roll Call

Planning Chair Farrington called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and a roll call was taken.

2) Approval of Meeting Minutes – October 14, 2025

A motion was made by Councilor Jones to approve the October 14, 2025 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Councilor Haas and was unanimously approved.

3) Adoption of the 2026 Meeting Schedule

Councilor Williams noted the September meeting falls on a Monday after the PLD Meeting and felt the Joint Meeting should happen prior to that meeting and asked that it be given some consideration.

A motion was made by Mayor Kahn to approve the 2026 meeting schedule. The motion was seconded by Councilor Williams and was unanimously approved.

4) **Public Workshop:**

- A) **Ordinance - O-2025-40 – Relating to Setback Exceptions, Accessory Dwelling Units, & Parking Regulations.** Petitioner, the City of Keene Community Development Department, proposes to amend Sec. 1.3.3.4.a of the LDC to clarify that retaining walls are exempt from setback requirements; modify Sec. 8.4.2.A by removing the requirement for an interior door and access to City utilities for Accessory Dwelling Units; amend Sec. 9.2 to increase the percentage of parking spaces that can be reduced administratively from 10% to 25% and prohibit the creation of remote parking spaces on parcels with a residential primary use; and update Table 9-3 to include parallel parking.

Planner, Megan Fortson, addressed the Committee. Ms. Fortson stated this Ordinance proposes a few changes to the Land Development Code related to structure setbacks, accessory dwelling unit requirements, as well as parking regulations.

The first slide Ms. Fortson referred to was in reference to retaining walls. She explained that retaining walls are considered structures under the Land Development Code. She indicated one of the issues the City has had is some property owners are not able to comply with setback requirements when it comes to things like retaining walls due to the size of their property, the topography of the site, or the layout of the parcel. Under the current building code, a building permit is only required for a retaining wall if it is going to be greater than four feet tall (from the footing to the top of the retaining wall), or if it is going to be subject to any horizontal or vertical forces.

The second proposed change is related to Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) standards. One of the proposed changes is to remove the requirement for an interior door to be provided between the Accessory Dwelling Unit and the main house if they are attached. The second proposed change is to remove the requirement for ADUs to have access to City water and sewer utilities. She noted that the intent behind these proposed changes is to bring the current regulations into compliance with updated state law, which was passed during the 2025 legislative session.

The next proposed change is to increase the percentage of parking spaces that can be reduced administratively by Zoning staff. Under current regulations, if a property owner is unable to provide all required parking on their site, they can go to the Zoning Administrator and request a 10% reduction. Staff realized that offering a 10% reduction is not really enough to meet the needs of applicants. Ms. Brunner noted that this is especially true for projects where the total number of parking spaces required is fewer than 25.

The next step above a 10% administrative parking reduction would be to request a 50% reduction from the Zoning Board through a Special Exception Application, which Ms. Fortson noted has proved to be cumbersome for some people. Applicants in situations like this sometimes decide not to move forward with the project or decide to seek a variance instead, which could grant them a parking reduction greater than 50%.

As part of the updated regulations, any requests for an administrative parking reduction greater than 10% for residential uses would require that applicants provide a “reserve area,” which is an

area of land that could be used for future parking spaces. The City would also include a requirement that applicants for all administrative parking reduction requests greater than 10% submit a traffic and parking analysis. Ms. Fortson explained that this would not be a full traffic study, but rather, a memo from a traffic engineer explaining how the proposed use does not require as many parking spaces as required under Article 9 of the Land Development Code (LDC).

Ms. Fortson went on to state that the next proposed change is related to remote parking. Specifically, the proposed change would be to allow the creation of remote parking spaces on any non-residential parcel, regardless of the underlying zoning designation. She explained that current regulations for remote parking spaces specify that they must be within 1,000-ft of the boundaries of the subject parcel. Additionally, remote parking cannot currently be created on a property located in a residential district. For example, in the High Density District, buildings can have up to between four and six units. In this instance, an applicant might not be able to provide all necessary parking on their site. If the subject parcel is located within 1,000-ft of a commercial use located in a residential district, they would not be able to obtain parking from that lot under the existing regulations.

Ms. Fortson explained that under the proposed regulations, applicants would be able to obtain remote parking spaces from any commercial parcel, even if it is located in a residential zoning district, which would provide applicants with more flexibility.

She went on to state that the last proposed change is related to travel lane dimensions. She explained that Table 9-3 in the LDC outlines the requirements for travel lane width for four types of parking spaces. Parallel parking is not currently included in the table, so this update is proposed. This concluded Ms. Fortson's presentation.

Mr. Kost asked for clarification on the width for a parallel parking space. Ms. Fortson stated regardless of the angle of a parking space, it has to be 8-feet wide by 18-feet long. Mr. Kost referred to remote parking and asked if a City parking lots or City garages could be used as remote parking. Ms. Fortson stated it could be used, but noted that those spaces would have to be rented from the City.

Councilor Ruttle-Miller asked how the parking requirements are formulated. Ms. Fortson stated Article 9 of the LDC outlines all parking regulations, including calculations for minimum parking requirements based on the proposed use of a site.

Councilor Haas asked City staff to clarify how retaining walls are measured: When it says four feet tall, is the height measured from the bottom of the footing or from the finished grade to the top of the wall? Ms. Fortson stated the height would be measured from the bottom of the footing. Councilor Haas went on to say a building permit is required if the retaining wall is over four feet or if it is subject to any vertical or lateral forces. He felt any retaining wall would be subject to lateral forces, so any retaining wall would require a building permit. Ms. Fortson stated retaining walls in the traditional sense are for stopping erosion or for drainage or storm water purposes. In this definition, they are also trying to capture stone walls or other aesthetic retaining walls. In the

case of a decorative retaining wall, a building permit would not be required unless it was over four feet tall.

Councilor Haas stated he would like to see the traffic analysis requirement for 10% administrative parking reductions removed. He felt a parking analysis should be good enough. Ms. Fortson stated the City would not be looking for a full traffic study, but rather a letter prepared by a local traffic engineer stating that the proposed use is not going to generate as much traffic or require as many parking spaces as outlined in under the LDC parking requirements or ITE Trip Generation Estimates.

Councilor Jones, for the benefit of the new members, explained that the petitioner for this Ordinance is the City. When the petitioner is the City, the Ordinance can be amended at this Joint Committee level to create an "A" version of the document. He added that if it were a private petitioner, they would be entitled to have their motion go to the City as presented.

With reference to parking studies, Mayor Kahn stated that the Planning Board recently had an application where the applicant submitted a letter prepared and stamped by a licensed traffic engineer indicating there would not be more than 100 trips per day to and from the site for a proposed development. He felt obtaining a letter is not a very high standard to meet.

With reference to the retaining wall setbacks, Mayor Kahn felt that the Ordinance language should be updated to state that the height of walls is measured starting at the finished grade. He did not feel this was too much of an issue to consider. Ms. Brunner explained that the proposed change in the Ordinance does not have anything to do with the height of the retaining wall. It is just saying that the City would allow retaining walls to be constructed with the typical building structure setback requirements. She noted that the height requirement is from the Building Code, which the Joint PB-PLD Committee does not have purview over.

Mr. Kost noted that at the last Planning Board meeting, there was discussion relative to the cumulative traffic impacts from multiple developments being constructed in the same area over time. He asked how this will be handled, given that each project's traffic impact is evaluated separately. Ms. Fortson stated staff are aware of this issue, but are not exactly sure what the solution is at this time. Ms. Brunner noted that while a full traffic study looks at the existing and proposed traffic impacts for a proposed use, it does not take into account other proposed developments that have yet to be constructed, unless City Staff is aware of it and asks the applicant to include this information in the analysis.

Ms. Brunner explained that the purpose of a traffic study is to evaluate the level of service of a road, which measured on a scale and assigned a letter grade. As development happens in an area, the final project proposed could be the one that decreases the level of service on a road from a C to D grade. She noted that in this instance, the developer of this project is the one who would end up having to pay for the necessary offsite improvements to address this issue. Other states have handled similar issues by implementing impact fees. New Hampshire allows municipalities to implement these types of fees in a very limited manner. In this state, the collected fees have to be spent within three years, which Ms. Brunner stated is not a realistic option.

Councilor Jones asked for clarification about the retaining wall process and setbacks. Ms. Fortson stated that under the current zoning regulations, any category of wall would be subject to the setback requirements of the underlying zoning district. He asked how potential issues with stormwater runoff and drainage from a retaining wall would be addressed. Ms. Fortson stated that any potential impacts of runoff would be reviewed by the Plans Examiner as part of the building permit process and would need to comply with the Anti-Nuisance Standards outlined under Article 18 of the LDC.

Chair Farrington asked about the proposed change removing the requirement for ADUs to be connected to City water and sewer utilities. Ms. Brunner explained there were two changes proposed to the ADU regulations. The first change is proposed in order to comply with state law and is related to requirement that there be an interior door between the primary residence and an attached ADU. Last year, updated legislation was passed stating that this is no longer a requirement.

Mr. Brunner went on to explain that the second change the Chair is referring to is a local requirement that all ADUs must be connected to City water and sewer. She noted that this requirement further states if a property does not have access City sewer, then the owner is required to provide a septic system. The requirement for City water and sewer access is already addressed under the base zoning district requirements. Staff suggested that this language be removed and updated to indicate that a property owner providing a septic system design approved by the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services is sufficient. The Chair asked for the number of ADUs someone can have on their property by right. Ms. Brunner stated property owners can have one ADU on any single-family property in the City.

Councilor Haas asked about the distance for remote parking spaces, which states that all spaces must be located within a 1,000-ft walking distance. He asked why it could not be 1,500 feet. Ms. Fortson stated the 1,000-ft radius is currently specified in the remote parking regulations, but stated she did not know what the thought process was for choosing that number. Ms. Brunner stated it used to be 300 feet, but with the adoption of the Land Development Code it was increased to 1,000 feet. City Staff had felt that a 300-ft radius was too restrictive, however, they also wanted remote parking to be located within a reasonable distance so that people would actually use the spaces.

Councilor Ruttle-Miller referred to the proposed changes to the administrative parking reduction regulations and asked whether the basis for a 25% was normal for other municipalities, or if it was based on other calculations. Ms. Brunner stated she came up with this percentage based on the inquiries that staff had received recently. She stated she could not think of an instance where City staff have granted a 10% reduction because it has never been enough to actually help an applicant. She noted that applicants have had to go down other routes, such as finding remote parking or seeking a 50% reduction from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. She added that paying for a full traffic study can be very expensive, especially for smaller projects. This is a way to provide more flexibility to help applicants find parking solutions without requiring a full traffic study.

The Chair asked for public comment. With no comments from the public, he closed the public hearing.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Roberta Mastrogiovanni that the Planning Board find Ordinance, O-2025-40, consistent with the 2025 Comprehensive Master Plan. The motion was seconded by Michael Hoefler and was unanimously approved.

A motion was made by Councilor Jones to request the Mayor set a public hearing on Ordinance, O-2025-40. The motion was seconded by Councilor Haas and was unanimously approved.

5) Discussion Items:

A) Proposed Follow Up on HB 457 from the 2025 Legislative Session Relative to Zoning Restrictions on Dwelling Units (Effective 9/13/2025).

Ms. Brunner addressed the Committee next. She stated this item also came out of the 2025 legislative session. There was a bill that passed in last year's legislative session that says that you cannot restrict occupancy of a dwelling unit to less than two people per bedroom, and you also cannot regulate based on familial relationships. For example, the City definition for family is people who are related to each other. The City's current definition of family does not comply any longer as of September 13, 2025, which is the effective date of that bill. Ms. Brunner stated this presentation is to give some background information on the issue in general.

Ms. Brunner noted there are a few relevant laws the Committee should keep in mind throughout this discussion. The Fair Housing Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of a few different factors. One factor is that you cannot discriminate based on disability, which includes people who are recovering from addiction and alcoholism. Local government that utilizes the definition of family that would otherwise restrict groups of people with disabilities or others who are protected by the Fair Housing Act have to be prepared to grant reasonable accommodation where necessary in order to maintain compliance with the Fair Housing Act.

The State Law that recently passed was HB 457. This, again, restricts the number of occupants to less than two per bedroom and you cannot have a regulation or a Zoning Ordinance that is based on the familial or non-familial relationships or marital status, occupation, employment status or educational status of the occupants of the dwelling unit.

Mr. Kost asked, when they say that you cannot restrict occupants to less than two per bedroom, does this mean you can have 10 per bedroom. Ms. Brunner stated that this law is trying to say that you could restrict it to two per bedroom, but you cannot restrict it to be less than that. She added that most municipalities don't deal with occupancy on a bedroom basis, so that portion of the law might not have any impact on Keene.

Mr. Madison asked for clarification on whether this law applies to the following scenario: a three-bedroom house advertised in Airbnb for 12 people. Ms. Brunner stated it depends on the municipality, and if they permit Airbnb, which Keene does; therefore, this law would apply to that scenario as well.

Chair Farrington asked whether this law applies to that area or does it refer to new construction or alteration to properties. Ms. Brunner stated this law affects how we regulate occupancy of dwellings. She referred to the definition Keene currently has for “family” – *“families shall mean one of the following two or more natural persons related by blood marriage, civil union, adoption or foster care, living together as a single housekeeping unit, with or without customary household helpers in a developing unit or a group of four or fewer natural person who are not related by blood marriage, civil union, adoption or foster care, living together as a single housekeeping unit in a dwelling unit. This term shall not preclude one natural person from being the sole occupant of any dwelling unit.”* Ms. Brunner noted Keene’s definition includes familial or non-familial status. We are no longer allowed to have that portion of the definition.

She went on to say Keene has other definitions that rely on the definition of family. For example, the definition of “single family” is a *“free standing building with one dwelling unit on a single lot which is designed, occupied or intended for occupancy by one family.”* To answer the Chair’s question, Ms. Brunner stated the law impacts how many people can live in a dwelling unit, or who can live in a dwelling unit.

Councilor Haas clarified removing the definition of family is what is happening here, and essentially everything becomes a rooming house, and we can define the number of people that can go into a bedroom as two or more. However, we can’t define who they are. Ms. Brunner stated she would like to go through the rest of the slides, as there are some examples of how other communities have addressed this and what Staff are recommending. However, if the Committee would like, it could be just pure numbers. For instance, every square footage of space there can be one person, and it could be a calculation in that manner. She stated, she however, does not recommend that option.

Councilor Jones stated the City has a better definition for family under the City Council Rules of Order “conflict” section, and he felt that it should be reviewed. Ms. Brunner stated she could certainly check with the City Attorney to get that definition from her, but the City is no longer allowed to regulate based on how people are related to each other and wanted the Committee to keep that in mind.

Ms. Brunner went on to say she wanted to illustrate how other communities have approached this with something called a “functional family” definition. Instead of trying to define a family by who the people are, it looks at characteristics and how they behave as a unit. Most of the “functional family” definition use phrases such as “single housekeeping unit,” “stable rather than transient living arrangement,” “lives and cooks together,” and “share budget.”

In Nashua, they define it as *“a group of non-relatives living together in a non-traditional group. Can be the functional equivalent of a more traditional family unit. The factors that must be considered by the authority having jurisdiction are whether the group shares the entire house other than individual bedrooms, lives, cooks and functions together as a single housekeeping unit and is primarily non transient.”*

Wethersfield, Connecticut defines it “*as any number of individuals living and cooking together as a single housekeeping unit whether related to each other legally or not, and shall be deemed to include domestic help, but not to include paying guests.*”

Ms. Brunner noted Mansfield, Connecticut, has a very long and involved definition. What she referred to on the screen was just a partial definition, but it included a lot of the same things. “Functional family” - They share the entire dwelling unit, living, cook together as a single housekeeping unit. They share expenses. They are permanent and stable. Ms. Brunner stated this municipality goes into a lot more detail, which she didn’t feel Keene needs.

Ms. Brunner stated staff’s recommendation is to keep it short and say a “*group of individuals living and cooking together as a single housekeeping unit that is primarily non-transient.*” She felt this was in keeping with what some other communities have. Ms. Brunner continued by stating that Staff recommend avoiding long definitions and trying to not regulate just based on square footage, because of the trend towards tiny houses and micro apartments. Assigning a certain square foot area to each person is likely not to be the best way to approach this. She indicated Staff are open to comments or suggestions. The goal is to try and submit something next month to get the process started, because, as mentioned earlier, this State Bill went into effect on September 13, 2025 and Keene currently does not have a definition that really works with our Code that is legal.

Mr. Kost referred to the property owned by Mr. Freeman where rooms are rented out but common areas are shared. He asked whether Ms. Brunner’s presentation refers to this situation. Ms. Brunner answered in the affirmative and went on to say that the City, however, does not plan on inspecting properties if they are meeting these definitions. This proposed change is something for the City to fall back on should there be a need.

Councilor Ruttle-Miller asked whether “cooking together” serves any legal purpose. She stated she understands this is language to fall back on. However, “*living together as a single housekeeping unit that is primarily non-transient*” essentially does the same thing and added she did see the examples that are included. Ms. Brunner in response stated she added the language around cooking because of those other examples and went on to say if you have separate cooking facilities for each person, then you start to get into a situation where they are operating less like a family. She indicated there is no formal ordinance yet submitted and it can be changed.

Mr. Hofer asked about the impacts, regardless of what definition the City comes up with; for example, other than complying with state law, how does it get used during the day-to-day functions of the City. Ms. Brunner stated it is likely not going to change the day-to-day functions of the City, except when there is a complaint. She added that the history of the City’s current definition of family goes back to when Keene State College was much bigger than it is today, there were many more students living in neighborhoods, and there was conflict between party houses and the neighbors living next door. This issue has gone away with Keene State College building more student housing on campus. What it will affect are other definitions in the Code. The definition of family is foundational to the whole Land Development Code for residential uses.

Ms. Brunner went on to say the City Attorney is planning to talk to the City Council about the Congregate Living and Social Services Ordinance. This is one area where there could be an impact and another area could be short-term rentals, which, again, is not regulated at the present time by the City in any way; this could have a ripple impact on that as well.

Mr. Madison, with reference to the living and cooking language, suggested changing it to “*group of individuals residing together.*” He felt *residence* is a legal term. There is a legal definition for what a residence is; it is a place you use to receive mail, to register to vote, to register your car. It implies your legal address. By saying, it is group of individuals residing together as a single housekeeping unit, it refers to people who are staying at this property as their primary domicile.

Councilor Jones felt the City should encourage the common kitchen, as we don’t want to encourage people using hot plates in their bedrooms for safety reasons.

Mr. Kost asked whether there is an occupancy concern here; a residence could have too many people, which ends burdening the neighborhood. Ms. Brunner stated that is a concern, hence the reason why many communities have the definition the way that Keene has it, in which there is either a natural family or an occupancy limit is place, but this is no longer allowed. Ms. Brunner felt the only way to regulate occupancy if we were to go with this route would be through the Building and Life Safety Code.

Ms. Mastrogiovanni stated there was some discussion about many of these larger homes being divided into more dwelling units to address the housing crisis. In doing so, the City placed a lot of regulations for those homes as soon as they get over the five-unit limit. At that point they have to install sprinklers, etc. She asked how that would affect a unit that would encourage a large amount of people and would regulations be imposed. Ms. Brunner stated the City is preempted by the State on that specific issue. The City, for a single family and two family, cannot require sprinklers. If there is an existing building and it is four units or less, then you don’t necessarily have to provide a sprinkler as long as you meet other Fire Code requirements, which is dictated by the State and is not a local regulation.

Ms. Brunner referred to Ms. Mastrogiovanni’s question. If there was a single dwelling unit where there were a large number of people, a sprinkler would not be required. Ms. Mastrogiovanni noted by requiring owners of these very large homes to install sprinklers, it could be cost prohibitive, as opposed to turning it into a rooming house, in which they wouldn’t have those types of regulations.

Mr. Brunner stated, under the Building Code, when you have transient guests, it moves that use to another level of review in which they have to provide more stringent Life Safety Code requirements.

Councilor Williams asked whether the City has a definition for transient. Ms. Brunner stated this is something the City would have to define if it were to be used in that definition.

Mr. Kost used the example of a large home in which about 30 friends decide to live together and share all the expenses. He clarified, in that instance, no life code upgrades would be required. Ms. Brunner stated this could potentially meet the definition of family as referenced today, whether or not the house would need to be upgraded would fall back to the Fire and Building Code. She indicated she was not sure what that threshold was. Chair Farrington noted, in that case, based on the number of persons per bedroom, that specific house would be required to have 15 bedrooms. Ms. Brunner stated if the Committee wished to have a limit per bedroom, this is something staff could start looking into.

Mr. Hoefler felt including the term “functional family” would be prudent as it speaks to the goals the City is trying to convey.

Ms. Miller stated, perhaps placing a restriction on the people per room, could become an issue if it was a family with many children. Ms. Brunner agreed, if there was to be an occupancy limit this is something Staff would need to give some thought to and bring a draft for Committee review for next month.

Councilor Haas stated he likes Mr. Madison’s suggestion. He felt this issue should also be opened to public input.

Mr. Kost felt, if there was going to be a limitation, it should be based on common practices and life safety issues.

Ms. Mastrogiovanni stated Keene has many apartments rented to students, some extremely small with eight people in two small bedrooms, and asked how this type of rental would be impacted. Ms. Brunner stated this was one of the main driving forces behind the Bill that passed, which was to prevent municipalities from developing regulations geared towards students. The way it would impact this type of student rental is that if they are operating as a single housekeeping unit and they meet Keene’s definition of family, they would be allowed. However, there are building and fire codes that they would have to meet.

Chair Farrington asked what Staff are looking for from the Board tonight. Ms. Brunner stated she would like to see if a poll could be taken to see if the Committee is in favor of what Staff proposed and Mr. Madison proposed or whether it should go in an entirely different direction.

Chair Farrington stated he was in favor of merging Mr. Madison’s suggestion and Staff’s recommendation but not going in an entirely different direction. He added he would go with the phrase “*a group of individuals residing together as a single housekeeping unit.*”

Councilor Jones asked what going in an entirely different direction would entail. Ms. Brunner stated what Staff is trying to find out is whether what Staff is referring to is the direction the Committee would like to move forward with.

Mayor Kahn stated he prefers “residing together” as opposed to “residence” as residence has other legal issues.

Councilor Filiault stated, regardless of what this Committee decides today, it is something that would eventually need the City Attorney's review and approval. He felt most everything has been covered today and commended Staff for their work on this item.

6) New Business

Councilor Haas stated he would like to accelerate discussion on short-term rental properties. He felt Airbnb and short-term rentals are becoming an issue in neighborhoods. The Mayor stated, absent a State definition for Airbnb's, short-term rentals are 30 days by statute. He stated accelerating this item comes with its challenges. The Chair felt short-term rentals don't seem to be an issue for Keene and felt it would be good to see how other communities handle this.

Mr. Madison stated there is a State of New Hampshire definition for short-term rentals. He continued by stating the state says any property that is available for rent for a term of six months or less is considered a short-term rental. This is the definition used by the Rooms and Meals Tax and this is what other communities, like Conway, have been using as their legal basis to regulate and it already made it through the New Hampshire Supreme Court. He added, even though Conway lost their case, the Supreme Court upheld their right to regulate short-term rentals. He added that the Courts ruled against Conway on how they were enforcing it. He stressed, under NH Statute, that the City has the legal authority to regulate properties that are rented for a term of lease of six months.

Councilor Ruttle-Miller stated she had attended a Housing Conference in the fall in which she had learned a legal precedence in New Hampshire for using zoning ordinances to help with cases like this. She added here is a case in Portsmouth, in which New Hampshire ruled in favor.

7) Next Meeting – February 9, 2026

8) Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Farrington adjourned the meeting at 8:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Megan A. Fortson, AICP – Planner
Emily Duseau, Planning Technician

Additional edits by,
Katrinya Kibler, City Clerk's Office