

City of Keene
New Hampshire

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, July 27, 2026

6:30 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Harold Farrington, Chair
Michael Hoefer
Kenneth Kost
Mayor Jay V. Kahn (Remote)
Councilor Molly Ellis
Joseph Cocivera, Alternate (Voting)

Staff Present:

Mari Brunner, Senior Planner
Megan Fortson, Planner & Deputy Zoning
Administrator

Members Not Present:

Roberta Mastrogiovanni, Vice Chair
David Bergeron
Andrew Madison
Stephon Mehu, Alternate
Tammy Adams, Alternate

A. Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Farrington called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and a roll call was taken. Joseph Cocivera was invited to join the meeting as a voting member and Mayor Jay Kahn was attending the meeting remotely via Microsoft Teams.

B. MINUTES FROM PRECEDING MEETING – JUNE 22, 2026

Chair Farrington offered the following corrections:

Line 160 – the word should be changed from “*peer*” to “*pier*.”

Lines 572 and 574: Conditions subsequent #3 and 4 should be renumbered as 2.E and 2.F.

A motion was made by Kenneth Kost that the Planning Board approve the June 22, 2026 meeting minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Joseph Cocivera and was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

C. Extension Requests

None

D. FINAL VOTE ON CONDITIONAL APPROVALS

None

E. BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT

1. **PB-26-18 – Boundary Line Adjustment** – Applicant Ashley Fetchero, on behalf of owners Ashley and John Fetchero and Charles Henry, proposes to transfer ~0.09-ac of land from the ~0.58-ac parcel at 35 Kendall Rd to the ~0.45-ac parcel at 39 Kendall Rd (TMP#s 540-013-000 & 540-012- 000). Both properties are in the Low Density District.

a. Board Determination of Completeness

Planner Megan Fortson stated the applicant has requested exemptions from submitting separate existing and proposed conditions plans and all technical reports. After reviewing each request, Planning Staff have made the preliminary determination that granting the requested exemptions would have no bearing on the merits of the application and recommend that the Board accept the application as “complete.”

A motion was made by Kenneth Kost to accept the application as complete. The motion was seconded by David Bergeron and was unanimously approved on a roll call vote

b. Public Hearing

Mr. Jon Lefebvre of Fieldstone Land Consultants addressed the Board on behalf of the property owners. Mr. Lefebvre stated this request is to adjust the common lot line between the two properties. He stated this application was before the Board a few months ago, but his team missed the deadline for addressing the precedent conditions of approval prior to the expiration of the conditional approval. He stated adjusting the lot line would actually bring the lots into more conformity. This also provides more yard space for the two properties. He added he also has copies of the Mylar should the Board wish to sign them tonight. This concluded the applicant’s presentation.

Staff comments were next.

Ms. Fortson stated this application was before the Board in October of last year and explained that when a project is conditionally approved, the applicant has 180 days to meet their precedent conditions of approval. For the previous application, the conditions were the submittal of mylars and recording fees; having the property owners sign the plans; and the completion of a lot monument inspection. The conditional approval expired on April 26, 2026 and the only condition that had been met was the inspection of the new lot monuments. She explained that the applicant has come back to the Board with the exact same application, which involves the transfer of ~0.10 acre of land one parcel to the other.

Ms. Fortson noted both properties are located in the Low Density District. Staff has made the preliminary determination that this application does not have the potential to be a development of regional impact.

She next reviewed the subdivision and boundary line adjustment standards as follows:

- Both parcels are going to be in compliance with all necessary zoning dimensional requirements.
- There is no development as part of the application that would affect the character of the land for the subdivision.
- There is no scattered or premature development.
- There are no existing features that need to be preserved.
- The monumentation requirements have been satisfied with the setting and inspection of the new lot monuments.
- Ms. Fortson added that although the southwestern corner of both parcels is located within the 100-year floodplain, there is no development proposed, so this is not a concern.
- There are no concerns related to fire protection and water supply.
- There are no concerns related to utilities.

Ms. Fortson went on to say the motion before the Board this evening is to approve the application with three conditions precedent. Staff has received the mylars, the plans, and the check, so staff's recommendation would be to conditionally approve the application subject to having the owner sign the plans.

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

c. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Kenneth Kost that the Planning Board approve PB-26-18 as shown on the plan identified as "Lot Line Adjustment Plan" prepared by Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC at a scale of 1 inch = 20 feet on August 25, 2025 and last revised on February 2, 2026 with the following conditions precedent to final approval and signature of the plans by the Planning Board Chair:

1. Owners' signatures appear on the proposed BLA plan.
2. Submittal of two (2) mylar copies of the plans.
3. Submittal of a check in the amount of \$51 made out to the City of Keene to cover recording fees.

The motion was seconded by Michael Hoefer and carried on a unanimous roll call vote.

F. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. PB-26-16 – Cottage Court Conditional Use Permit – Applicant Zack Leroy, on behalf of owner Michael Evan, proposes to convert a two-family home into a triplex by adding a dwelling unit to the second story of the attached barn. The ~.21-ac parcel at 128-130 School St (TMP# 555-001- 000) is in the Low Density District.**

a. Board Determination of Completeness

Planner Megan Fortson stated the applicant has requested exemptions from submitting separate existing and proposed conditions plans, a grading plan, a lighting plan, a landscaping plan, and all technical reports. Staff recommend that the Board grant these exemptions and accept the application as complete.

A motion was made by Kenneth Kost to accept this application as complete. The motion was seconded by Councilor Ellis and was unanimously approved on a roll call vote.

b. Public Hearing

Mr. Zack LeRoy, representing the owner, addressed the Board. Mr. LeRoy stated this request is for the addition of a third unit on this existing property. He stated currently there is an existing two-family house with an attached barn on the property. He noted there is a large living space already in the barn and the applicant would like to convert it into an actual living space by adding a bathroom, kitchen and bedroom. He noted there is plenty of parking on the property. This concluded the applicant's comments.

Mr. Kost asked whether the existing parking is adequate for what is being proposed. Mr. LeRoy stated they have space to reconstruct the driveway to add spaces, but currently as it stands, there is adequate parking. He noted there is a parking plan included in the Board's packet. He referred to the five spaces shown on the plan.

Mayor Kahn stated parking was the issue raised by neighbors and he questioned how many tenants are in the current residence. Mr. LeRoy stated the current residence has two adults in each unit and one child. The Mayor asked whether this property was owner-occupied. Mr. LeRoy answered in the affirmative. Mr. LeRoy went on to say that under the Cottage Court Ordinance, they are allowed to have fewer parking spots per unit. There are currently seven existing bedrooms with and a total of four parking spaces.

The Mayor asked whether this necessitates a Cottage Court application. It was indicated this question would be addressed during staff comments.

Staff comments were next.

Ms. Fortson stated this property is located in the Low Density District and the only way for a triplex to be developed would be to go through the Cottage Court process because this use is not permitted by right in the LD District.

Ms. Fortson went on to say that this is an existing 2.1-acre residential lot located on the western side of School Street approximately 130 feet south of the intersection with Leverett Street. She indicated that this property contains an existing duplex, which was built in 1880 and has approximately 2,800 square feet of living area. Attached to the rear of the duplex is an approximately 600 square foot barn, which is connected to the main building by an above-ground breezeway.

The property also contains a driveway with four parking spaces. The purpose of this application is to convert the second floor of the barn into another dwelling unit, which would be approximately 600 square feet in size. This unit would only contain one bedroom. The exterior of the barn is proposed to be changed by installing a door to provide access to the unit. She noted that there are no other changes proposed to the building exterior or the site itself.

In terms of regional impact, Ms. Fortson stated staff did not feel the proposal had the potential for regional impact.

In regards to departmental comments, staff did hear back from the City Engineer. As required by the State Building Code, a meter pit and a back flow preventer will need to be installed at the property line.

Ms. Fortson stated because that this application involves the creation of fewer than five units, it is not subject to Major Site Plan Review. She next reviewed Cottage Court Conditional Use Permit standards outlined under Article 17 of the Land Development Code (LDC).

She stated that as mentioned earlier, this application proposes to convert an existing duplex into a triplex by converting the loft in the attached barn. The new unit will be attached horizontally to the existing duplex, thereby meeting the triplex definition. That standard has been met.

In terms of development types that are allowed, the project is going to be developed on a single parcel of land with a property management entity to manage the rental units. That standard has been met.

She then reviewed the Conditional Use Permit Standards outlined under Section 17.5.3 of Article 17 of the LDC:

- Dwelling Unit Size: The proposed 600-sf unit is well below the 1,250-sf gross floor area (gfa) maximum required for Cottage Courts and is also below the 900-sf building footprint that is required. That standard has been met.
- Parking: She explained that a maximum of one parking space per bedroom or a minimum of one space per unit could be provided. For this application, the minimum number of parking spaces required would be three and the maximum that could be provided would be seven for the proposal. The applicant is proposing four parking spaces, so this standard appears to be met.
- Building Separation: She noted that this standard is not applicable to the proposal because the barn is already attached.

- Driveways: The existing driveway will continue to be utilized in its current configuration. That standard is met.
- Screening: She explained that this standard is not applicable in this situation, given the fact that it is an existing barn that is proposed to be converted. It is not being enlarged or increased in height. The intensity of the building form on the property will not be changed as there are no additional structures or exterior building additions that may alter the existing form. However, the Board will need to determine if additional screening may be needed.
- Architectural Guidelines: Not applicable because again, this is an existing building that is being converted.

In terms of a recommended motion, Ms. Fortson stated this application is ready for final approval. In the staff report, staff included two precedent conditions of approval. The first was the submittal of five copies of the final plans and the second was the submittal of revised plans showing the correct number of proposed dwelling units. Ms. Fortson noted that the applicant has satisfied both of those conditions and the property owner has signed the plans. Staff would recommend that the Board issue final approval this evening. This concluded staff comments.

Councilor Ellis noted that one of the abutter letters indicates that this property was located in the Historic District and asked for clarification. Ms. Fortson stated that this parcel is located in close proximity to, but not within, the Downtown Historic District.

Mr. Hoefer asked if there was some sort of a connector between the main house and the barn for fire safety issues. Ms. Fortson stated the floating hallway is what makes this a triplex and noted that she has not heard any concerns regarding life safety issues. From looking at the plans, she stated she wasn't sure if the hallway was going to be accessible from the new unit. Ms. Brunner stated that it was and noted the area in the breezeway is going to be utilized as a laundry facility. She added that the separation between the units is subject to the building and fire code. She went on to explain this application was reviewed by Building and Fire Department Staff, who did not express any concerns during their review of this application. She added that these aspects of the project would be reviewed as part of the building permit process.

Mr. Kost referred to the letters submitted by abutters and asked if there were any standards with which the applicant did not comply.

Ms. Fortson stated this was a difficult application; All Standards in the Land Development Code as it pertains to the Cottage Court Conditional Use Permit (CUP) have been met. This is why staff is recommending final approval tonight; however, she noted that staff has heard from members of the public, are concerned about the proposal based on the behavior of individuals who have lived in these units previously. She noted this is not something that is under the purview of the Planning Board. If there are verbal altercations, those are issues that would need to be reported to the Police Department and are not addressed under the Cottage Court Standards.

Similarly, if there were to be issues with property maintenance, it would be addressed by the City's Code Enforcement Officer, Ryan Lawless. This again would not be addressed under the Cottage Court Standards.

Ms. Brunner added there are two areas in the Cottage Court ordinance where there is some discretion on the Board's part. The first is the screening standard, which has been reviewed by Ms. Fortson. There are also architectural guidelines. Ms. Brunner noted the applicant is not really proposing to change much to the exterior of the barn. She indicated those two areas are where there is some level of discretion for the Board.

Councilor Ellis referred to the abutter letters where it is indicated there is the potential for the owner to vacate the main residence and rent it out, which she indicated they could do after living in the main residence for one year. She asked whether living in the main residence is a condition. Ms. Fortson stated that with an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) you could technically have two units on any property where there is a single-family home and one of the units is owner-occupied in Keene, but there is no timeframe attached to it.

Ms. Brunner added that in a residential zoning district, you can have a single-family home by right without having to go through a Planning Board process. An ADU is considered to be "accessory" to the primary single-family residence, but only if one of those two units is owner-occupied in perpetuity. You cannot lose owner occupancy and still keep the status of an ADU. At that point, a property would become a duplex or 2-unit rental.

Chair Farrington referred to page 33 of the agenda packet, which showed aerial imagery and asked whether there was enough room at the end of the driveway if a car is parked for other cars to make the turn and enter the other spots. Ms. Fortson felt this was nebulous. She did not feel somebody would have room for 5th parking spot because typically a parking spot has to be eight feet wide by 18 feet long. The spot on the southernmost area near the property boundary is probably not eight feet wide. She added they could use it as a parking space but whether or not it would actually function as a proper parking space, she wasn't sure. However, the other spaces should be able to function properly.

The Chair asked for Mr. LeRoy's comment on this issue. Mr. LeRoy stated the architect's plan does not accurately depict the space they really have. He stated that there was actually more space closer to the barn. He stated currently five cars have parked in the lot and are able to move in and out. He added it could be tight if someone parked a large truck.

Mr. Hoefer referred to Section 17.5.3 of the LDC, "*Parking Minimums*," which states that one space per unit is required. He asked whether this would mean only three spaces are required for this property. Ms. Fortson agreed it does.

The Chair asked for public comment.

Ms. Mary Ida Kendall of 127 School Street addressed the Board first. Ms. Kendall stated she is concerned how this additional unit would devalue the neighborhood and noted this is a Low Density neighborhood. She noted there are a few duplexes, but said she felt this triplex would be too much density for the neighborhood. She called the Board's attention to this property being located next to a school. Ms. Kendall noted she paid half a million dollars for her property to be

located in a Low Density neighborhood, but that won't be the case with a triplex across the street.

She added that once this property is not owner-occupied, the living situation could change and stated that this property has had troublesome tenants in the past. She felt what is proposed on this property negates the values of the other residents.

Ms. Ruth Venezia of 138 School Street was the next speaker. She stated she has lived in her property for 44 years. She stated that many years 43 years ago she came before the Board and asked to turn the ell in their home into an apartment and it was denied because of Low Density zoning designation. Ms. Venezia stated when this property was owner occupied the living arrangements were acceptable, but since the landlord does not live there anymore she has had to call the police.

Ms. Venezia stated she has met the new owners and does like them but does not want to see a third unit added to this property. She questioned how the City would protect the value of other properties on School Street. She did not feel adding Cottage Court as an overlay, thereby causing spot zoning was fair.

Councilor Tobin stated she too lives in this neighborhood. She stated she understands the concerns about the number of people living in this property. She felt having this unused building occupied would make the neighborhood safe and felt it would be used appropriately.

Ms. Linda Boisvert of 23 Castle Court addressed the Board next. She stated that as a neighboring property owner, she is concerned about this proposal on a property that already has history of maintenance and upkeep issues. She stated over the years she has experienced ongoing problems with debris and leaves from trees onto her property as well as a tree falling on her house and taking down her fence. With these issues, she questions whether the property can adequately support a more intense use.

Ms. Boisvert stated she is also concerned about the impact that adding more residents would have on the neighboring properties. She indicated this property generates noise that can be heard during all hours of the day. Vehicle headlights entering and exiting the driveway at night also affect her property. She stated the residents leave their cars running for close to an hour and this is directly next to where her kitchen is located. She felt a fence could help with noise and trash coming onto her property. She indicated adding more units would add noise and light pollution and felt this addition would affect the quality of life for the neighborhood and asked that the Board deny the application.

Mr. Owen Harvey of 108 School Street stated he too was not in favor of this Cottage Court application. He felt this proposal would change the nature of the neighborhood.

Ms. Venezia addressed the Board again. Ms. Venezia suggested the barn could perhaps be used for storage. As far as the topography of the property, she stated that the land has a steep slope into the abutting property which is not reflected on the plan.

With no further comment, the Chair closed the public hearing.

c. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Kenneth Kost that the Planning Board issue final approval for PB-26-16 as shown on the plan set identified as “Evan Michael Barn Renovation” prepared at varying scales on July 20, 2026 with no conditions. The motion was seconded by Councilor Ellis.

Councilor Ellis thanked the neighbors for attending tonight’s meeting. She stated she has reviewed the application and it seems to meet all the standards and did not feel the Board had any basis for denying this application. She further stated this type of infill development and making use of an empty barn is exactly the type of development the City is looking for. She stated she was in favor of this application

Mr. Kost stated he understands the concerns raised by the neighbors. He explained what the Board looks at is the Land Development Code and he also could not find any basis on which to deny this application. He added that not all renters come with a bad reputation.

Mr. Hoefer stated the addition of one unit to a two-unit property does not meet the standards for regional impact and also does not require notification to surrounding communities. He went on to say all requirements for meeting the conditional use permit application have been satisfied by the applicant. He stated this is a new standard for Keene. He stated he would have like to have seen an elevation of the architectural plans for the barn because the barn is in a state of disrepair.

Mr. Hoefer went on to say that after hearing comments from the neighbors on Castle Court, he felt it would be under the jurisdiction of the Board to suggest some sort of fencing along the rear of the property.

Chair Farrington noted that the Cottage Court Ordinance is a result of the City Council prioritizing infill development in order to provide additional housing units to meet the demand identified as part of the Housing Needs Analysis. He stated with each application the Board would learn from it and “fine tune” the regulations as needed.

Mayor Kahn stated there is no clear basis to deny this application, but there is historic character to this street. He expressed concern about the density of the number of bedrooms and questioned if there would be sufficient parking on the site. The Mayor stated he was not sure he was prepared to vote in favor; however, he would vote in favor of adding a condition of approval related to adding additional screening to the property.

Ms. Brunner stated she has heard two amendments to the proposed motion so far and advised the Board that they would need to make a motion to amend the motion to add those two items, vote on it, and then vote on the original motion.

The Chair reopened the public hearing and invited Mr. LeRoy to speak again.

Mr. Kost asked whether there was going to be any changes to the barn's exterior façades. Mr. LeRoy stated the long-term plan is to match that façade to the house, but for budgetary purposes the property owner did not want to commit to as part of this application. Mr. Kost asked whether this would be completed before someone moves in. Mr. LeRoy stated that decision would be based on the budget.

A motion was made by Michael Hoefer to amend the motion to include the following:

1. The submittal of an architectural drawing of the façade of the unit to make sure it fits in with the character and nature of School Street.
2. The installation of screening along the western portion of the property to shield the neighbor at 23 Castle Court from the additional traffic entering the site.

The amendment was seconded by Joseph Cocivera.

Mr. Kost stated he wasn't sure what the Board was asking for; how high should the fence be? Would it be sufficient to block the light trespassing onto the abutting property as was indicated by the neighbor? Regarding the potential façade modifications, the applicant has indicated the work may not be completed right now, but the Board may want to see these changes included as part of this application.

Councilor Ellis noted she has a neighbor who has a tree and leaves blow into her yard and she was not sure how you solve an issue like this.

Ms. Brunner noted that in looking at the online contour map, it does look like the parking area for this property is about 10 feet higher than the western property line and she wasn't sure if the fence would necessarily block the lighting, if this was the intent with the screening.

Mr. Hoefer stated he was thinking of stockade fence, potentially 10 feet high. If the property is higher than the stockade fence, an eight-foot stockade fence along the western front would block all the headlights coming in and out of that driveway. He added that he was looking for staff's advice on the architectural standards that could be applied here to protect the values of the neighborhood. The Chair reminded the Board that screening can also be vegetation.

The Chair asked staff whether there was a screening provision under the Cottage Court standards. Ms. Brunner stated the way it is worded is when the type of development is more intense than the surrounding uses of the property, screening could be required. This neighborhood has single-family homes, so the proposed triplex could be considered a more intense use; however, there is some gray area with this application, which is why the staff report was not very direct. She noted the built form of the barn is not changing. There is an existing semi-attached barn that is being converted. The actual buildings on the site are not changing, but the intensity of the use is higher than the surrounding uses. As a result, the Board has the ability to require landscaping in the form of a stockade fence or vegetation.

Mr. Cocivera felt screening would be helpful because of the lighting issue raised by the abutter. He stated the screening could also perhaps address the noise issue.

Mr. Kost stated he has some knowledge about noise abatement and noise walls and noted a stockade fence would not prevent noise.

The Mayor stated in this case perhaps vegetative screening would be better. He also added that without input from the property owner, it may be prudent to put this item on more time.

Mr. Hoefer felt the application is lacking the standards to be approved under Cottage Court Ordinance and added it was not the role of the Board to design what type of screening should be provided.

Councilor Ellis stated she agreed with Mr. Kost that the proposed screening options are not going to solve the concerns. She added that if the building facade is not going to be changed at the present time, that item does not need to be part of the application. However, if they are going to change it in the future, she felt it needs to be part of the proposal. She asked for the applicant to provide clarity on this issue.

Mr. Hoefer withdrew his motion to amend. Mr. Cocivera withdrew his second.

Mr. Kost withdrew his original motion. Councilor Ellis withdrew her second.

A motion was made by Councilor Ellis to continue this application to the August 24, 2026 Planning Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kost.

Mr. LeRoy stated the applicant has spent a lot of time with staff on this application. The abutters have taken time to come before the Board tonight and he did not feel it was fair to request that everyone come back again next month. He stated they were willing to work with the abutter to address the light pollution and it is not something they were aware of. He added they are not opposed to constructing a fence or installing vegetation. He added that they could also commit to painting the barn as is in the same color. He added they provided everything the City requested and would have provided the required elevations or screening if that was something that was requested. He stressed again they are willing to work with the neighbors.

Mr. Kost stated in this application there is no proposal included to change the exterior of the barn. The discussion he heard was at some point in the future, the owner would address this issue. Chair Farrington noted architectural and visual appearance is the purview of the Board and this is something the Board could request. Ms. Brunner added that under Cottage Court standards, if the Board feels this is something that is necessary to meet the Ordinance, the Board could request a change to the façade.

Mr. Hoefer stated this could be a great addition to the neighborhood as a studio apartment but noted that he wants to make sure it fits in with the neighborhood. He felt it was within the Board's purview to deny this application based on a failure to comply with Section 17.5.4 of the LDC.

Mr. Kost noted this is not new construction. There is nothing needing to be done to the outside of the barn to accommodate the creation of the new interior apartment. The barn is an existing

structure that, in his opinion, does not need to be changed. He added the application came before the Board seeking to add a 600-sf apartment inside of a building, but now the Board seems to be requesting all these additional items.

Councilor Ellis stated her confusion is that the applicant had indicated they would be willing to make changes to the exterior. However, if they are saying they are not wanting to make changes to the exterior, she would agree with Mr. Hoefer that it would be under the Board's purview to request a change to the exterior.

A motion was made by Kenneth Kost that the Planning Board issue final approval for PB-26-16 as shown on the plan set identified as "Evan Michael Barn Renovation" prepared at varying scales on July 20, 2026 with no conditions. The motion was seconded by Councilor Ellis.

The motion was approved on a 3-2 roll call vote with Mayor Kahn and Michael Hoefer voting in the opposition.

- 2. Change of Governmental Land Use – In accordance with NH RSA 674:54, the parcels at 0 Gilbo Ave & 0 School St (TMP#s 575-016-000 & 575-017-000) are proposed to be used for temporary construction storage Page 1 of 51 on behalf of the City of Keene during the Downtown Infrastructure Project. The parcels are ~2.86-ac in size and are in the Downtown Growth District.**

Ms. Brunner explained this a public hearing for the Board and members of the public to learn about this project and for the Board to provide non-binding recommendations.

Public Works Director, Don Lussier, addressed the Board and stated the notification of governmental land use in front of Board tonight is a requirement of state law under NH RSA 674:54. When the government asserts its authority to use a property, it may not comply with all Planning Board standards. He explained that this proposal involves two vacant properties located at the corner of Gilbo Avenue and School Street that are owned by Main Street America (National Grange Mutual Insurance). Main Street America has generously agreed to allow the City to use that vacant parcels as a construction staging area during the Downtown Infrastructure Project for the next three years.

Mr. Lussier stated the City's contractor would be using the parcels for the storage of sand, gravel, stone, as well as pipes, concrete structures for storm drains, etc. There will be shipping containers stored on the property to hold materials, tools, and equipment. He added that this is for the contractor. The sub-contractor will all have their own containers and storage area on the site as well.

He explained that the paved portion of the property will be used as for parking for their employees during the workday. There will also be a job trailer located on the site.

Chair Farrington asked how many employees are expected. Mr. Lussier stated it could range between 30-40 employees (two crews working on different projects).

Mayor Kahn asked about security fencing around the site. Mr. Lussier stated they would be installing temporary chain link construction fencing around the site. Mr. Lussier added the City has asked for the fencing to be located inside the existing vegetated buffer on site.

Mr. Kost noted there are pedestrians and bicycles that travel in the area and he asked that safety be considered as trucks travel in and out of this site. He also asked that attention be paid to hazardous materials that may be used on the site. Mr. Kost asked whether the residential properties in the neighborhood have been notified. Ms. Fortson stated abutting property owners within 200 feet have been notified. Ms. Brunner noted the notice went to the property owners and the renters might not have been notified through this process and she felt that perhaps the City could reach out to them.

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

Mr. Kost asked for some form of signage to be added for pedestrians and bicycles that travel through this intersection to be aware of turning trucks. Mr. Lussier noted the bike path already has a stop sign on either side of that driveway. He felt people would quickly understand that this site is being used for construction; however, if the Board would like a sign, then one can be installed.

A motion was made by Chair Farrington that the Planning Board provide a non-binding recommendation to the City of Keene to increase public awareness that there will be trucks entering and exiting this site. The motion was seconded by Michael Hoefer and was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

H. Other Business

None

I. Staff Updates

1. Overview of Administrative and Minor Site Plan Approvals Issued from January–June 2026

Ms. Brunner addressed this item. She indicated a list of Administrative Planning approvals reviewed between January-June of this year were included in the Board's packet on pages 50 and 51. There were no Minor Site Plans approved during this time period and only four administrative approvals were issued. She noted that administrative approvals letters are posted on the Community Development webpage on the City website after they are issued and are deleted on a quarterly basis.

J. New Business

Mr. Hoefer felt the Cottage Court CUP process is being used in a way not originally intended by the City. For example, the conversions of smaller units versus the larger development that is

happening near the hospital. Chair Farrington agreed, but added that the overarching goal is to increase density and infill in all districts of the City.

K. Upcoming Dates of Interest

- Planning Board Steering Committee: Tuesday, August 11, 12:00 PM
- Planning Board Site Visit: Wednesday, August 19, 8:00 AM - To Be Confirmed
- Planning Board Meeting: Monday, August 24, 6:30 PM

The Chair asked that the Board respond regarding their availability to attend site visits when they are contacted by City Staff.

L. More Time Items

Ms. Brunner noted the Joint Planning Board & Planning, Licenses, & Development (PLD) Committee meeting has been cancelled for August 10th due to lack of quorum from the PLD Committee.

M. Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Farrington adjourned the meeting at 8:24 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Megan A. Fortson, AICP – Planner & Deputy Zoning Administrator