

City of Keene
New Hampshire

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, February 23, 2026

6:30 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Harold Farrington, Chair
Roberta Mastrogiovanni, Vice Chair
David Bergeron
Michael Hoefler
Kenneth Kost
Mayor Jay V. Kahn
Councilor Molly Ellis (Remote)
Joseph Cocivera, Alternate

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner
Evan Clements, Planner / Zoning Administrator

Members Not Present:

Andrew Madison
Stephon Mehu, Alternate
Tammy Adams, Alternate

1) Call to Order – Roll Call

Chair Farrington called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM. The Chair alerted the public on behalf of Staff regarding permit-related wire fraud scams, in which scammers impersonate City Officials to trick applicants into wiring money for fake permit fees. The Chair continued by stating the City of Keene will never request wire transfers and to verify, in-person or by phone, if you receive a request for payment that is suspect.

Joseph Cocivera was asked to join session as a voting member. Councilor Ellis joined the meeting remotely from Savannah GA. She indicated her friend and their dogs were present in the room with her.

2) Minutes of Previous Meeting – January 26, 2026

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni that the Planning Board approve the January 26, 2026 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mayor Kahn and was unanimously approved by a roll call vote.

3) **Final Vote on Conditional Approvals**

Chair Farrington stated as a matter of practice, the Board will now issue a final vote on all conditionally approved plans after all of the “conditions precedent” have been met. This final vote will be the final approval and will start the 30-day appeal clock. The Chair asked whether there were any items ready for final approval.

Ms. Brunner stated there was one item ready for final approval, project PB-2025-20, which is a Major Site Plan for a solar array at 0 Rose Lane. The following are the conditions of approval: Owner’s signature appears on the final plans; Submittal of paper copies and digital copy of plan sets; Submittal of an updated proposed conditions plan stamped by a wetland scientist licensed in the State of New Hampshire; Submittal of security to cover the cost of sediment and erosion control measures; Revegetation of the site following construction and as built plans; Submittal of an approved Alteration of Terrain Permit. All conditions have been met.

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni that the Planning Board issue final site plan approval for PB-2025-20. The motion was seconded by Kenneth Kost.

The Mayor asked whether there has been any progress made with the abutter (Davis Oil). Ms. Brunner answered in the affirmative. She indicated there were two things that were brought up. One of them was related to the fire safety plan for the oil company, which has been worked out. The applicant followed up and worked with the Fire Marshal to submit sufficient information to demonstrate that they won’t be impacting the adjacent property owners fire safety plan.

Regarding the other property that had the driveway and drainage issue, Ms. Brunner stated she does not recall what the status of the drainage issue is. Planner, Evan Clements, stated he had some additional information. The Board had directed Staff to look into this. Staff looked at the Site Plan for the adjacent property and discussed it with the City Engineer and Code Enforcement to look at the site. Staff were able to visit the site in the middle of a rainstorm to get a good idea of how everything was flowing. Staff felt the existing stormwater management system on the adjacent property seemed to be functioning appropriately and the major portion of the runoff going into the Davis Oil site appeared to be coming from that shared driveway and the road itself.

Mr. Clements noted Davis Oil’s site is dirt and is in the lowest point in that area. Hence, the large amount of ponding was coming from the road, not the adjacent property.

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

4) **Public Hearings:**

- a. **PB-2026-01 – Cottage Court Conditional Use Permit – 87 Water St – Applicant and owner, Elm City Properties, proposes to convert a carriage barn into a dwelling unit on the single-family property located at 87 Water St (TMP #585-059-000). The parcel is ~0.15-ac and is in the Residential Preservation District**

i. Board Determination of Completeness

Planner, Evan Clements, stated the applicant is requesting exemptions from submitting grading, landscaping, and lighting plans as well as 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 Roberta Mastrogiovanni that the Planning Board accept this Application as complete. The motion was seconded by Kenneth Kost.

The Mayor questioned the lighting exemption. He asked what kind of lighting the applicant intends to install at the rear of the site. Mr. Clements noted there is one motion sensor light proposed to be installed along the north of the main façade. However, because this is a Cottage Court Conditional Use Permit and not a Major Site Plan, the lighting has not been completely analyzed. This exemption is related to photometric plan, which is usually seen for larger developments. This application is going to be a single-family home and don't fall under the usual site plan regulations.

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

ii. Public Hearing

Mr. Zach Bunch addressed the Board representing the applicant. Mr. Bunch stated the proposal before the Board is a remodel of an existing carriage house into a one-bedroom apartment. There will be no major changes to the building façade. The existing parking remains with no proposed changes.

Mr. Kost noted there is one change being proposed, which is that doors will be installed instead of a garage. Mr. Bunch agreed that it was correct, and he stated that the garage door would be covered and made into the front entry door as well as the roof added over it. This concluded the applicant's comments.

Mr. Hoefler felt everything seems to be in order to move forward with this application.

Staff comments were next. Mr. Clements stated the subject parcel is 0.15-acre in size and is located on the southern side of Water Street between Crossfield Street and Grove Street. The parcel is developed with an existing 1,450-sf single-family home, a 550-sf detached barn, a shared driveway and associated site improvements. Although this area of Keene has historically experienced flooding, this site is not currently in a flood hazard zone. The surrounding parcels are mostly residential in use with densities ranging from two to four dwelling units.

Mr. Clements stated this property would qualify for an accessory dwelling unit if the owner-occupancy requirement could be achieved. The reason why this application is before the Board this evening is because the property owner is choosing not to use this property as their primary residence and is still looking to add the extra dwelling unit to the property.

In regard to regional impact, Staff have made the preliminary evaluation that this project does not constitute a regional impact. However, it will be the Board's responsibility to make the final determination.

Mr. Clements noted this application meets the dimensional standards within the Cottage Court Conditional Use Permit.

In regard to dwelling size for a Cottage Court Development, Mr. Clements stated the footprint of the barn is about 550 square feet and the gross floor area of the new unit will be approximately 922 square feet, which meets the 900 square foot building footprint and the 1,250 gross floor area of the dwelling unit itself. This standard has been met.

There are two parking spaces provided on site, one for the new unit and one for the existing single-family residence. This standard has been met.

Building separation will be evaluated when this application comes to the City for a building permit. This standard has been met.

The existing driveway is adequate and is not being proposed to be altered.

Drainage – The project narrative states that there are minimal changes proposed to drainage and stormwater management on the lot. Additionally, the narrative states that the intent is to maintain existing drainage patterns. This standard appears to be met.

Screening – Mr. Clements stated adding the second dwelling unit does not increase the density of the development on this property in relation to adjacent properties and hence additional screening is not necessary. This standard is not applicable.

Sediment & Erosion Control – There are no new sediment or erosion control measures proposed. This standard is not applicable.

Snow Storage & Removal – A snow storage area is identified on the south-central portion of the site between the two structures. This standard appears to be met.

Landscaping – No modifications are proposed to existing landscaping, and no new plantings are proposed. This standard is not applicable.

Screening – The project narrative states that trash receptacles will be located along the east façade of the barn and will be screened from view of the existing single-family home. This standard appears to be met.

Architectural Guidelines – The project narrative states that the existing wood-framed barn will be modified to have an exterior appearance that is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. As the applicant had stated, the changes are minimal and are mostly related to the conversion of a garage into a living area with covered entryway. This standard appears to be met.

With reference to Site Development Standards, this application won't be bound by them as this is a single-family use.

The lighting proposed is one motion activated light.

The applicant states, in their narrative, that the new unit will be tied into existing City water and sewer services.

Regarding traffic and access management, the existing driveway will be used to access the site and has room to provide sufficient parking. A note has been added to the proposed conditions plan stating that any future modifications to the driveway will require a review through the City Engineer's office. That standard has been met.

Filling and Excavations are not applicable.

Surface Waters are not applicable.

Hazard and toxic material standards are not applicable.

Noise – The narrative states that noise impacts for the proposed project will be minimal and consistent with adjacent residential uses. That standard appears to be met.

Mr. Clements stated the applicant is looking for final approval tonight. He noted the applicant has submitted five full-size plan sets with the owner's signature on them, which was the only proposed condition of approval in the Staff Report. This concluded staff comments.

The Mayor asked if the required column of square footage dimensions is a Cottage Court requirement, being 8,000 square feet. Mr. Clements stated this appears to be the Zoning Dimensional Table for the Residential Preservation Zoning District. This would be if someone was creating a new lot. The existing lot is legal nonconforming.

Mr. Kost referred to the standards for ADUs in which you are required to live in a unit and build a second unit and asked for clarification about whether this was a State or local requirement. Mr. Clements stated the State gives the municipality the choice to require owner occupancy or not. The City's regulation currently requires owner occupancy. One of staff's concern with ADUs is that at least one of the ADU units would be used for long-term occupancy and not be used for short-term rental units. Mr. Kost clarified the Cottage Court, however, does not have this requirement. Mr. Clements agreed.

Mr. Kost noted the first-floor plan (Sheet A1) refers to second floor and indicated it is 461 square feet and asked for clarification. The Chair felt this is something that needs to be clarified by the applicant. Ms. Brunner noted the applicant had submitted updated plans after the Staff Report went out and Staff noted the error and asked for an updated plan.

Mayor Kahn asked whether Mr. Bunch was a representative of Sampson Architects. Mr. Bunch stated he works for Sampson Architects.

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

iii. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Roberta Mastrogiovanni that the Planning Board issue final approval PB-2026-01 as shown the plan set identified as, “Carriage House; 87 Water St; Keene, NH 03431” prepared by Sampson Architects at varying scales on January 6, 2026 and last revised on February 4, 2026.

The motion was seconded by Mayor Kahn.

Mr. Kost stated he was happy to see more housing being offered in Keene. Mr. Hoefler did not feel this application had any regional impact. Mr. Bergeron felt this was a good repurposing of an existing building.

The motion was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

The Chair asked to be recused from the next application as he is an officer of a charitable organization that participates in charitable gaming and receives funds from Revo Casino. Mr. Hoefler stated there are many organizations that likely receive funds from this entity and did not see the reason to be recused. Ms. Brunner stated the advice she gives is that if a Board member can be unbiased and fair with their decision and no one is objecting, they could participate. The Mayor stated the City receives funds from Revo Casino as well and he would need to be recused as well.

Mr. Clements offered that this proposal has to do with exterior modifications to the shopping plaza. The question for this business itself to be located here has already been decided upon. As Ms. Brunner had stated it is ultimately up to the Board member to decide but the application is really more about parking spaces and aesthetic changes.

The Mayor asked to be recused from this application.

Mr. Hoefler stated he is happy to stay on as a voting member, but without full list of all entities who might have received these funds, he won't be able to know if he has served on any of those organizations. He felt the Board was being very thorough with its duties.

- b. PB-2025-18, Mod. 1 – Major Site Plan – Revo Casino, 109-147 Key Rd - Applicant Concord Bingo Too LLC, on behalf of owner Key Road Development LLC, proposes to modify the architectural features and parking area associated with the charitable gaming facility located at 109-147 Key Road (TMP# 110-022-000). The parcel is ~5.8-ac and is in the Commerce District**

i. Board Determination of Completeness

Planner, Evan Clements, stated the applicant has requested exemptions from submitting a drainage report, soils analysis, and an historic evaluation. 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 Roberta Mastrogiovanni that the Planning Board accept this Application as complete. The motion was seconded by Kenneth Kost and was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

ii. Public Hearing

Mr. Brian Pratt of Fuss & O’Neill addressed the Board on behalf of the applicant, Revo Casino. Mr. Pratt stated the proposed property is located at 133 Key Road. He stated the changes being proposed are minor in nature. He stated, since the last time they were before the Board, they had completed the architectural plans and are now back with minor revisions to the building itself and the Plaza. He noted the demolition plan and explained that the red areas are what is being demolished. There is an addition at the rear of the building being constructed for utilities and at the front, a safer, aesthetically pleasing entrance vestibule.

Mr. Pratt went on to say the existing plaza has the brick facade and the mansard roof above it. The front of the applicant’s site would also have the brick facade with the glass and a sign on it. They are also proposing to refresh the whole building itself by painting with a dark grey color. With the bump out, some of the parking spaces will be lost, but the applicant will be creating a much better sidewalk with an ADA ramp.

Mr. Pratt referred to the rear of the building where there is going to be an addition for utilities, but this area is close to the flood plain, hence, the floor will be raised. Minor paving improvements will be done around the corner to help make sure a truck can circulate. The dumpsters in this area will be placed on pads and would have enclosures. There are also a transformer and a generator being added.

Utilities – Mr. Pratt noted there is a grease trap being added as there is going to be a restaurant use at this site as well as new water services.

The entire front parking lot will be stripped and resealed.

Lighting and Landscaping – The lighting in the entire plaza will be redone with downcast, dark skies compliant, LED fixtures to produce soft and uniform light. There are also 18 trees being added to the site.

Mr. Pratt stated there were minor comments from Staff on drainage, lighting, sewer and water, which have been addressed.

With reference to the charitable portion of the discussion, Mr. Pratt stated the facility itself has provided \$1.3 million annually to local charities and, with this improvement, that amount would increase to around 3 million.

Mr. Hoefler clarified the name of this site would be Revo Casino. Mr. Pratt answered in the affirmative.

Staff comments were next. Mr. Clements addressed the Board and indicated the subject parcel is an existing 5.8-acre lot located on the north side of Key Road, approximately 1,300 feet from Winchester Street intersection. The Hampton Inn is located directly to the south and the Key Road Plaza Shopping Center to the east. The parcel contains an existing shopping plaza with several multi-tenant commercial buildings, parking areas, and associated site improvements. The plaza contains businesses such as the Keene Cinemas, Sherwin-Williams Paints, and Toy City, as well as the NH Department of Health & Human Services Keene District Office.

He stated the purpose of this application is a tenant fit up for the Revo Casino charitable gaming facility that includes architectural modifications to the existing shopping plaza as well as upgrades to the site lighting and parking areas. The proposal includes the installation of additional landscaping along Key Road and in landscape islands throughout the site as well as screening measures for dumpsters and parking areas. The charitable gaming facility will have a footprint of approximately 15,000 SF within the existing building with 190 gaming positions, a 52-seat restaurant, and approximately 1,000 SF of office and storage space.

Mr. Clements noted the Planning Board approved the Change of Use for the Revo Casino at their September 29, 2025, meeting. This use received a Variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment on September 2, 2025, to allow a charitable gaming facility to be located closer than 250 feet from a residential use.

In reference to regional impact, Staff have made a preliminary evaluation that the application does not appear to reach the threshold of regional impact. However, the Board would need to make a final determination.

Drainage – The applicant states, in their narrative, that the proposed modifications will not alter the existing drainage configuration. Runoff will continue to be captured by parking lot catch basins. The project does not propose a net increase in impervious surface. This standard has been met.

The applicant will be adding some impervious surface in the northwest corner to make the truck turning movement smoother and removing impervious surface on the eastern corner to compensate the no net increase.

Sediment & Erosion Control – The project proposes to use perimeter erosion control devices, such as silt socks, around minor excavation areas related to the building addition and site improvements. Filter socks will be utilized to protect existing catch basin from any sediment runoff. This standard has been met.

Snow Storage & Removal – The applicant states, in their narrative, that the site will continue with existing snow removal operations. There is no proposed change to the snow removal operations on site. This standard has been met.

Landscaping: The applicant states, in their narrative, that the previous Site Plan application proposed five Swamp White Oak trees to meet the requirement of the additional parking spaces that were proposed. In addition to those trees, this application proposes to install four Apple Serviceberry, five Shademaster Honeylocust, and four Tupelo Tower Black Gum trees. As part of an overall landscape improvement to the site, this application also proposes the installation of over 100 shrubs and perennials along Key Road and in landscape islands throughout the site. This standard has been met.

Screening – As the applicant noted, they will be installing two dumpster pads and enclosure areas along the western side of the property. A stockade fence is proposed along the rear of the property to screen the parking area from the property to the north. The 2025 Change of Use approval included the installation of approximately 190 feet of fencing. This application proposes to increase the length of the fence by an additional 212 feet for a total length of approximately 402 feet. This standard has been met.

Lighting – As the applicant has stated, this is a complete redo of all lighting on site. The lighting will be dark skies-compliant LED fixtures with pole mounted and wall mounted light fixtures. The pole-mounted lights will be installed at 20 feet in height. The wall mounted light fixtures will be installed 15 feet in height. A total of 34 pole lights and 16 wall-mounted lights will be either replaced or installed. All light fixtures will have a color temperature between 2700K and 3500K with a color-rendering index of 80 minimum. Average illumination levels in all parking areas do not exceed 3.5-footcandles with a uniformity ratio that does not exceed 5:1. The lighting standard discusses hours of operation and allows for one hour before and one hour after business operating hours. After this time, only security lighting that does not exceed 1-foot candle is permitted. The applicant has submitted two photometric plans, a full illumination photometric plan that meets the Planning Board’s standards and a security lighting or reduced illumination plan that meets the security lightning standards.

Mr. Clements noted it was important to keep in mind that this is a shopping plaza with different businesses and different hours of operation. The applicant will be able to adjust the lighting levels in the shopping plaza as needed to keep between the allowed illumination during hours of operation and the reduction in illumination to the security lighting minimum. The lights will never go completely out, but as businesses open and close throughout the shopping plaza, the lighting will adjust to maintain conformance with that standard. This standard has been met.

Sewer & Water – The applicant will be using the existing facilities and run a line to feed the fire sprinkler system. A 1000-gallon grease trap is proposed to be installed, and the applicant would need to coordinate this installation with Public Works. This standard has been met.

Traffic & Access Management – The overall traffic pattern is not proposed to be changed. A total of 348 parking spaces will be provided where 315 parking spaces are required. They are improving the walkways around the casino and increasing sidewalks for pedestrian safety. This new area will be converted into a landscape island. This standard has been met.

Filling & Excavation – Any filling and excavation will be incidental. Any construction delivery to and from the site will use the highway and Staff did not feel a truck route plan was necessary for this project. As the applicant mentioned, this site is within–or very close to–the 100-year flood plain and the applicant is choosing to elevate the addition one foot above base flood elevation. Any flood permit requirement would be addressed during the building permit process. This standard has been met.

Surface Waters & Wetlands – There are no surface waters or wetlands present on the property. This standard is not applicable.

Hazardous & Toxic Materials – The applicant states, in their narrative, that there are no hazardous or toxic materials proposed in association with the use. This standard is not applicable.

Noise – The applicant states noise associated with the use will be minimal and comparative to the movie theater located in the plaza. They note that patrons for the charitable gaming facility and restaurant will be located indoors. This standard has been met.

Architecture & Visual Appearance – The applicant states, in their narrative, that the existing building façade will be enhanced with a light gray “wash” on the brick and a dark charcoal gray for the mansard roof. The proposed vestibule will include an entry canopy and storefront glazing with red brick accents. The applicant believes that these material choices are consistent with the traditional materials found through the City of Keene. The addition to the rear of the building will have a corrugated metal siding façade with metal canopy. The existing concrete block façade will be painted light gray. Additionally, there is an existing garage door that will be removed and the space filled in with concrete block.

Mr. Clements reviewed the proposed motion as outlined in the Staff Report. This concluded staff comments.

Mr. Kost asked whether the 400 feet of fencing would go all the way along the housing complex. Mr. Clements stated the fencing would be on the applicant’s property along the residential complex site at least up to the parking area and referred this question to the applicant.

Mr. Kost asked whether the trees being proposed would also be non-invasive plants. Mr. Clements answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Kost felt the architectural guidelines are not intended for this type of plaza. He also stated he wanted to clarify the glass being proposed is not a reflective type of glass. Mr. Clements stated he understands the concern with the architectural guidelines and stated that those guidelines are designed for a brand-new building; consequently, proposing a façade project and trying to refresh it while addressing each one of those standards can be challenging. He went on to say when he initially reviewed this application, he was looking for material types that were not visually aggressive, and this is what Staff are asking the Board to weigh in on–does this proposed addition with the material choices generally fit within the character of the City.

Ms. Brunner added that her interpretation of reading through the architectural and visual appearance standard is that Subsection 21.14.2H is the only standard that specifically addresses modifications, additions to existing structures. This standard states that *it shall be harmonious with the character of the existing structure* and this is all the Board would be looking at as the regulations are geared towards a new build.

Mr. Clements clarified, for next time, if it would be helpful for the Board if the Staff Report clearly identified (for architecture) which sub section the Board should be evaluating the application on.

Mr. Hoefler asked what the maximum height of a building in the Commerce District was. Ms. Brunner stated it was 42 feet and this building stands at 35 feet.

Vice-Chair Mastrogiovanni referred to the height of the sign and the brightness of the sign on the facade as well as the sign that would be located at the front of the site. She continued by stating the sign would likely be quite visible from the bypass and would be an advertisement. Mr. Clements stated the signage will need to comply with the Sign Code in the Zoning Ordinance.

The applicant was asked to comment on the question about the glass being used. Mr. Pratt stated it would be a non-reflective glazing. With reference to fencing, he stated they would be providing the fencing along the rear of the entire building where the addition will be located and beyond. He indicated there is an existing fence on the other property as well.

The Vice-Chair asked whether the other plaza tenants are in agreement with this application. Mr. Pratt stated he has not reached out to them. Revo Casino has been working directly with the landowner who has been coordinating with the other tenants.

Mr. Hoefler asked whether there is a smoking area being provided on the site. Mr. Pratt stated there will be an indoor smoking room. Vice-Chair Mastrogiovanni asked whether there will be smoking receptacles provided outside should anyone choose to smoke outside. Mr. Pratt stated he would discuss this with the owner.

The Vice-Chair asked for public comment. With no comment from the public comment, the public hearing was closed.

iii. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Michael Hoefler that the Planning Board approve PB2025-18, Mod.1 as shown on the plan set prepared by Fuss & O'Neill at varying scales on January 14, 2026, and last revised on February 9, 2026, with the following conditions:

1. Prior to the final approval and signature of the plans by the Planning Board Chair, the following conditions precedent shall be met:
 - a. Owner's signature(s) appear(s) on the plans.
 - b. Submittal of five (5) full sized paper copies and a flattened PDF version of the final plan set.

- c. Submittal of a security to cover the cost of as-built plans, landscaping, and erosion control measures in a form and amount acceptable to the Community Development Director.
2. Subsequent to final approval and signature of the plans by the Planning Board Chair, the following conditions shall be met:
 - a. Prior to the commencement of site work, all sediment and erosion control measures shall be installed and inspected by staff from the Community Development Department.
 - b. Following the installation of landscaping, the Community Development Department shall be contacted to perform an initial inspection.
 - c. One year following the installation of all landscaping, the Community Development Department shall be contacted to perform a final landscaping inspection.

The motion was seconded by David Bergeron.

Mr. Bergeron felt this was a good update for a plaza that has been around for a while and did not feel there was any regional impact from this application. Mr. Hoefer stated this change would benefit this community and other businesses in the area. Vice-Chair Mastrogiovanni stated moving this business to this location would benefit other businesses in the area.

The motion made by Michael Hoefer carried on a unanimous roll call vote.

5) Staff Updates

Chair Farrington and Mayor Kahn rejoined the Board.

Ms. Brunner addressed the Board. Ms. Brunner reminded the Board about the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) meeting schedule for this year. The kickoff presentations are scheduled for Tuesday, March 3 at 5:30 PM at Heberton Hall (Keene Public Library) located at 60 Winter Street. She encouraged Planning Board members to attend and noted the Board will be asked to vote on the CIP at the end of the process. Ms. Brunner stated this is a great opportunity to hear from each of the departments about projects that they are proposing to include and how they are consistent with the Master Plan and community goals.

Ms. Brunner stated, if members can't attend the kickoff presentation, there are other meetings they can attend. The first one is on Tuesday, March 10 at 5:30 PM, which is a special FOP Committee meeting. There is also another meeting scheduled for March 12 at 5:30 PM, and a public hearing is scheduled Thursday, March 19 at 7:00 PM. These meetings will all be held in Council Chambers. On March 23, the Board, at their regularly scheduled meeting, will be asked to vote on the CIP.

6) New Business

Mr. Kost reminded the Board about the project that the Keene State College architecture group had undertaken on Gilbo Avenue parking lots. He stated there is a group referred to as Plan New

Hampshire, which facilitates design charrettes around the State with professional architects and landscape architects. They will run a planning charrette to see what is possible on a specific site.

Mr. Kost stated a design charette helps provide a vision of what the area could be, including parking, parking structures and development. The charette looking at that entire area, which is nearly eight acres in size, might help communicate with other developers and perhaps one or more developers might participate in developing this area in sections. He asked whether the Board had any interest in sponsoring this.

Mayor Kahn felt there could be a time to take this on. There could be current and future owners and to presume a study without their input might be preemptive.

Ms. Brunner stated she has personally not participated in one of Plan New Hampshire's charrettes but has talked to a number of people who have. The City of Keene has participated in the past. She added the role the Board would most likely play is with initial legwork of figuring out what exactly this could look like and making a proposal to City Council, as this would cost money even with the City being a member of Plan New Hampshire. The cost could be close to \$6,000. She also indicated the current landowners would also need to approve of such a study. The question is whether the Board wants to do the initial work.

The Chair felt gathering additional information could not hurt and see if the City has funding to cover this type of work. Ms. Brunner stated this funding would come out of next year's budget and the Board could make that request to the City.

The Mayor cautioned the Board not to give the public the indication the Board is pursuing this project.

Mr. Kost clarified there is no next step at this time. The Mayor stated Staff could inquire the terms of engagement for sometime in the future and then advise the Chairman.

There being no further business, Chair Farrington adjourned the meeting at 8:11 PM.

7) Upcoming Dates of Interest

- Joint Committee of the Planning Board and PLD – March 9, 6:30 PM
- Planning Board Steering Committee – March 10, 12:00 PM
- Planning Board Site Visit – March 18, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed
- Planning Board Meeting – March 23, 6:30 PM

8) Adjournment

Respectfully submitted by,
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Emily Duseau, Planning Technician