

**CITY OF KEENE
NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

Monday, February 27, 2017

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

Members Present

Gary Spykman, Chairman
Douglas Barrett, Vice-Chair
Nathaniel Stout
George Hansel
Pamela Russell Slack
Chris Cusack
Martha Landry

Members Not Present:

Mayor Kendall Lane
Andrew Bohannon
Tammy Adams, Alternate
David Webb, Alternate

Staff:

Rhett Lamb, ACM/Planning Director
Tara Kessler, Planner
Michele Chalice, Planner

I. Call to order – Roll Call

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

II. Minutes of previous meeting – January 23, 2017

A motion was made by George Hansel to accept the January 23, 2017 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Pamela Russell-Slack.

Mr. Stout offered the following correction:

Page 2, Mr. Stout withdrew his nomination to be changed to read as follows:

Mr. Stout requested that he withdraw his nomination and election as Vice-Chairman.

Mayor Lane offered the following correction:

Gary Spykman nominated Nathaniel Stout as Vice-Chairman. The nomination was seconded by Mayor Lane.

Nomination of Gary Spykman as Chair was seconded by Doug Barrett. Stout declined his nomination. Approved with Spykman withstanding

The amended minutes were unanimously approved.

III. Boundary Line Adjustment

1. S-01-17 – 19 & 20 Hillcrest Avenue – Boundary Line Adjustment – Applicant and owner Anne M. Young proposes to adjust the boundary between the property at 19 Hillcrest Avenue (TMP# 020-02-018) and the neighboring property at 20 Hillcrest Avenue (TMP# 020-02-019) owned by Jerry H. and Carolyn Spring. The proposal will move the eastern boundary of 19 Hillcrest Ave by 10-feet to the east, increasing the size of the parcel at 19 Hillcrest Avenue by approximately 785 square feet. Both parcels are located in the Medium Density Zoning District.

A. Board Determination of Completeness.

Planner Tara Kessler recommended to the Board that Application S-01-17-19&20 was complete. A motion was made by George Hansel that the Board accept this application as complete. The motion was seconded by Pamela Russell-Slack and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Chair Spykman stated a Boundary Line Adjustment is not a public hearing and the Board is not compelled to hear from the public, but they can should they choose to.

Ms. Ann Young of 19 Hillcrest Avenue addressed the Board and stated her neighbor Jerry Spring of 20 Hillcrest Avenue was also present today. Both their parents owned the property before they did. After Mr. Spring's father's death Ms. Young's sisters and she purchased 20 Hillcrest Avenue. Mr. Spring and his wife would like to repurchase this property. However, they would like to move the boundary line ten feet to the east because pins are set about four feet into her driveway. The Springs have agreed to this but the surveyor did not mark the property until a day after the closing which property she does not own anymore.

Mayor Lane asked whether there was ever a house on 20 Hillcrest Avenue. Ms. Young stated there is one on the opposite side of the street (empty lot) owned by Mr. Spring's uncle, which are all empty lots which cannot be built on.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Kessler stated this is a straightforward boundary line adjustment. The intent to move this boundary line ten feet to the east is so Ms. Young's driveway rests solely on her property; as well as create an eight foot buffer between the edge of pavement and property line to make it more conforming.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Mayor Kendall Lane that the Planning Board approve S-01-17 as shown on the plan identified as "Boundary Line Adjustment Plan Prepared for Anne M. Young and Jerry H & Carolyn Spring Hillcrest Street City of Keene County of Cheshire State of New Hampshire" prepared on 7/12/2016 by Backrod Land Use LLC. At a scale of 1"=20' with the following condition:

1. Both property owners' signatures appear on the plan prior to signature by Chair.

The motion was seconded by George Hansel and was unanimously approved.

IV. Public Hearings

1. SPR-964, Modification #2 – 120 Key Road – Hampton Inn & Suites – Site Plan – Applicant SVE Associates on behalf of Jazzlyn Hospitality, LLC proposes to construct a 92-unit hotel with the same building footprint and site layout as was approved by the Keene Planning Board on February 27, 2006. The site is 2.25 acres in size and located in the Commerce Zoning District (TMP# 164-01-003). The applicant is requesting a waiver from Development Standard #1: Drainage.

The Mayor stated that he is an abutter to this property and recused himself from this public hearing.

A. Board Determination of Completeness.

Planner Michele Chalice recommended to the Board that Application SPR-964, Modification #2 was complete. A motion was made by George Hansel that the Board accept this application as complete. The motion was seconded by Pamela Russell-Slack and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Mr. Robert Hitchcock of SVE Associates stated this is the same project from ten years ago. The foundation is in, the stair tower is in and this all stays as long as it is deemed structurally satisfactory. If not they will all be replaced. He stated this is a 9,800 square foot lot, 16,000 square foot building, 99 rooms no restaurant, there will be a pool but there will be no restaurant.

He referred to where the five 20-foot light poles are going to be located in the parking lot, consisting of LED fixtures. There will also be a canopy with four under canopy soft lighting. Water and sewer will be connected to Key Road.

There was a traffic study was done and it was determined there would be negligible impact during peak hours. After the traffic report was done, it was realized the City was moving forward with a roundabout at the Key Road/Pearl Street intersection. The City Engineer has agreed traffic will not be an issue.

This property sits at 473.1 which elevation helps get drainage off site. Mr. Hitchcock referred to the three catch basins on site, they are connected with a perforated pipe and bedded in stone. At the rear of the site there are three dry wells. Because fill is being added to the flood plain, compensation has to be provided and a layer of stone is being added underneath the parking lot; eight or nine inches of gravel, stabilization fabric and two feet of stone below that. The void space in the stone would compensate for the loss of flood storage on site. Subsequent to Board approval a flood plain permit would be required to be obtained.

This area is flat and historically other sites such as Autex has flooded, but this site has remained dry. There are three different parapets that run around the building, the main one is about five feet tall, and therefore the units on top of the building will not be visible.

Bike rack and bench have been provided as per request of planning staff.

Landscaping – shows a high density of plantings and trees.

Mr. Hitchcock circulated an elevation view of the building and indicated the cornices the Board is being shown is slightly different and this is what the applicant will be going with. This would be a four-story building, received zoning variance from the Zoning Board to get to the four stories. Mr. Stout asked for explanation as to what happened before the Zoning Board with reference to the number of floors. Mr. Hitchcock stated the applicant applied for special exception which allowed for 3.5 floors and 50 feet. What no-one seems to not know is what half a floor is. After being granted the special exception, the applicant was granted a variance to go from 3.5 floors to four floors and 50 feet. Mr. Stout noted an attic or a cellar is not considered as half a floor which he felt needs some clarification by the City.

Chair Spykman asked for explanation of the waiver. Mr. Hitchcock stated they don't need the waiver anymore as Public Works staff asked for a full engineering report to come up with the same answer which is when you decrease impermeable surface you decrease runoff.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Chalice stated it was important to note that both the Planning Department and Public Works are not approving the proposed compensatory storage design; this is a design that does not look familiar to staff; staff will be reviewing the floodplain permit which has not been submitted yet. Councilor Hansel asked about the Flood Plain Permitting process. Ms. Chalice stated this is a City of Keene Flood Plain Permitting process and is handled by the Zoning

Department in concert by the Planning Department and the Public Works Department. Ms. Chalice added this is a very complex area of hydrologic conditions and a detailed review will be undertaken once the application is filed. Mr. Hitchcock added this is the same application which was approved ten years ago. Mr. Lamb agreed Mr. Hitchcock is correct, it was shown on the site plan and the site plan was approved but no flood plain development permit was ever reviewed or approved for that development. Mr. Hitchcock stated if it was not approved, he wasn't sure how a building permit was obtained at that time and added he would provide this for staff review. Chair Spykman asked whether this would be a condition. Ms. Chalice agreed and added the department did receive a drainage summary so any reference to that in the conditions will be removed. Mr. Hitchcock stated the applicant was agreeable to the conditions being proposed.

Chair Spykman asked whether staff was satisfied with the landscape plan. Ms. Chalice stated there is an abundance of landscaping being proposed and staff is satisfied. Councilor Hansel clarified this plan has more permeable square footage. Ms. Chalice stated her understanding is this plan decreases the amount of runoff from the site and asked for clarification from Mr. Hitchcock. Mr. Hitchcock stated this site has more permeable than the site the applicant started with but has the same permeable square footage as the site which was approved ten years ago.

Dr. Cusack asked Ms. Chalice to address the issue of traffic as it relates to this site. Ms. Chalice stated the Key Road/Winchester Street intersection is a difficult one especially during the weekends or at the end of the day and the traffic study confirms this. However, because of the nature of this facility, this circumstance is not going to be exasperated. She added the intersection of Key Road and Winchester Street is going to be improved very soon with the location of the roundabout, and the Engineer has added there will be some traffic added from the facility until improvements are made in 2019.

Councilor Hansel asked for the number of rooms. Mr. Hitchcock stated it would be two less than the previous plan

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

Councilor Hansel stated he is thrilled to see this project finally moving forward which would be a big improvement to this area and felt the petitioners have done a good job with it.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by George Hansel that the Planning Board approve SPR-964 Modification #2, entitled "Hampton Inn & Suites, 120 Key Road, Keene, NH". Prepared for Jazzlyn Hospitality II, LLC dated January 20, 2017, last revised February 13, 2017, drawn by SVE Associates, at various scales; with the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature by Planning Board Chair:
 - a. Revisions to the Site Plan of an additional note be created in the "Sequence of Work" list to assure that the construction and/or placement of the Stabilized Construction Entrance is completed prior to all other site disruption/work.
 - b. Revisions to Landscaping Plan to include:
 - i. A Shade Tree Planting Detail that specifies for each shade tree: "placement of 300 CF of native, permeable soil in an area no less than six feet wide and three feet deep",

- ii. A Shrub Planting Detail.
 - iii. Planting islands widths be revised and noted as a “minimum 8’ planting area width”.
 - c. Revisions to the Architectural Plans to note that the entrance canopy must have at least 13’ of clearance.”
 - d. Receipt of an approved Floodplain Development Permit.
2. Prior to signature, submittal security for:
 - a. Landscaping materials,
 - b. Erosion control measures/materials and
 - c. A digital, “as-built” plan (compatible with the City’s ArcView and/or Civil 3D programs) in a form and amount acceptable to the Planning Director and City Engineer.
3. Owner’s signature on plan.

The motion was seconded by Pamela Russell-Slack and was unanimously approved.

Mayor Lane rejoined the Board.

IV. New Business

1. CIP Discussion – Steve Thornton, Finance Director 2. New Business

Finance Director Steve Thornton and Planning Director Rhett Lamb were the next two presenters.

Mr. Thornton stated each year City staff prepare a six-year capital improvement plan with guidance obtained from the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP), fiscal policy, input from the community and actions of the City Council.

As part of the CIP process, the proposed program is reviewed by the City Council and the Planning Board. He indicated, tonight he is before the Planning Board seeking recommendation from the Planning Board for adoption of the CIP to the City Council.

The focus of the CIP is to plan for the City’s future. The guiding principle of this planning effort is to advance the vision of the CMP including;

- ❖ A quality built environment,
- ❖ Unique natural environment,
- ❖ A vibrant economy,
- ❖ Strong citizenship and proactive leadership,
- ❖ A creative and learning culture, and
- ❖ A healthy community.

The CIP includes projects with an estimated cost in excess of \$20,000, and useful life of at least five years. The capital planning process provides a framework to consider projects, over the time frame of the CIP, in the context of the community’s vision, values, and goals, along with impact on property taxes, utility and other user rates.

Mr. Thornton stated when they develop the CIP they try to balance investment in the infrastructure and facilities of the City so the goals of the CMP could be advanced but keeping in mind the financial costs to the residents of Keene. The first year of the CIP is always included in the first year of the operating budget which begins on July 1.

Mr. Thornton then went on to explain of reorganization of CIP document. The first goal was to present project requests using a program based format, and the second goal was to highlight the financial impact of the proposed CIP.

Pages 1-6: City Manager's transmittal memo

Pages 7 – 28: Executive Summary, Program Highlights and Financial Discussion.

Pages 30 -70: Financial Detail by Fund, Wells Street TIF District financial presentation, and Capital Reserve Detail.

Pages 71-200: Presentation of proposed projects by program type and project proposals and descriptions and description and its relationship to the CMP, if applicable.

Page 201-217: Appendices – future projects.

Mr. Thornton then went over program highlights. There were six areas identified. The total proposed projects over 6 years is \$67,643,062, and an additional \$18,295,000 for capital reserve. During the same period \$17.26 5million of capital reserve funds will be spent to finance projects. The breakdown of proposed program funding is as follows:

1. Public Health and Safety are programs, activities, and projects which are intended to protect the health and safety of individuals and the community. The goal of these activities is the protection of the public from dangers affecting health and safety from crime, disaster, fire, and disease. Included in this section are the Police and Fire Departments from the General Fund, and the Sewer, Water and Solid Waste Funds.
 - Project requests total \$22,166,700 or 32.77% of the program
 - Water and Sewer projects are at a cost of \$17,547,803 or 79.16%. Of this \$13 million is for improvements to the water and sewer distribution, collection system, and \$4 million for replacement of various components of the production and treatment facilities.
 - The balance consists of improvements at the transfer station (1.4m) and replacement of fire department apparatus and ambulances, as well as radios, and an upgrade to communications equipment at the dispatch center at the Police Department.
2. Transportation (Quality Built Environment and Vibrant Economy) – programs, activities, and projects which are intended to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and things within the City and to connect the local community with Monadnock Region, the state, and the world. The primary goal of these activities is to make sure roads, bridges, sidewalks, bike paths, and other transportation infrastructure are in good condition and meet the needs of the community. Included in this section are project requests developed by DPW, Highway and Engineering Divisions.
 - Project requests total \$17,337,141 or 25.63% of the program
 - \$8.1 million for the Road Rehabilitation (repaving) program and \$6 million for the state road projects on Winchester Street

- \$1.7 million in bridge construction projects – Roxbury and George Street Bridges over Beaver Brook
 - \$346,500 to replace high pressure sodium streetlights to LED
3. Economic Development and Vitality (Vibrant Economy) – programs, activities, and projects which are intended to promote the retention and expansion of existing businesses and to encourage and attract new business development in Keene. The primary goal of these activities is enhance overall quality of life and the sustainability of the community. Projects included in this section were developed by the Airport, DPW and the Parking Fund.
- Projects total \$15,402,146 or 22.77% of the program
 - Airport improvement projects total \$11.025 million and largely consist of FAA funded projects for runway improvements and equipment. One project to upgrade bathrooms and improve accessibility as well as provide a pilots lounge.
 - Victoria Street Extension to connect Marlboro Street and Victoria Street
 - Downtown revitalization
 - Improvements to the Gilbo east Parking lot – paving, curbing, lighting
4. Flood and Storm Water Management (Quality Built Environment, Healthy Community, Vibrant Economy) – programs, activities, and projects which are intended to prevent and remediate conditions leading to localized flooding due to more frequently occurring major precipitation events through preventative maintenance, drainage system improvements, and comprehensive storm water infrastructure planning. Projects in this section were developed by DPW Engineering Division and the Planning Department.
- Projects total \$4.822 million or 7.13% of total
 - Projects range from high level studies such as the Climate Adaptation Vulnerability Assessment and Beaver Brook Hydrologic Analysis to contracted cleaning and repair of drainage lines and catchment basins in the City.
 - Major programs include Flood Management Projects, which provides drainage system improvements in localized areas to address ongoing local flooding problems (\$2.339 million) and the rehabilitation of Goose Pond Dam, for which the City has received a notice of deficiency (\$879,000)
5. Community Development (Quality Built Environment, Healthy Community, Vibrant Economy, Unique Natural Environment) - programs, activities, and projects which are intended to add to or significantly expand the capacity of community infrastructure or facilities. The primary goal of these activities is to improve the quality of life in the community and to meet the needs of a changing community. Included projects were developed by the Parks and Recreation and Fire Departments.
- Projects total is \$2,155,890 or 3.19% of total
 - Major project is the improvement to Carpenter Field at a cost of 1.5 million
6. General Operations Facilities and Infrastructure - programs, activities, and projects which are intended to maintain and provide facilities, infrastructure, and equipment necessary for the provision of basic governmental services. The primary goal of these activities is to maintain City operational assets in good working order in an environmentally friendly and economically efficient manner. Included projects were developed by the Equipment Fund Division of the DPW, the Assessor's Office, the Facilities Division of Parks and Recreation, and the Information Technology Department.
- Projects total is \$5.759 million or 8.51% of total program

- Of this, \$4.3 million is for the replacement of vehicles and equipment through the Fleet fund, \$550,000 for repairs and replacement of equipment in City facilities, and \$443,000 is for the replacement of City IT network equipment

Mr. Thornton then went over the many different ways these projects are funded: Grants 25.56%, Capital reserves 25.52%, Bonding 33.59%, Current Revenues 11.35%, Donations, sale of property, etc. 4.17%

The proposed CIP is in the process of review by the Finance, Organization, and Personnel Committee. A Public Hearing of the CIP will be held on March 2nd. On March 9th, the FOP Committee will meet at 6:30 to deliberate and provide recommended changes to the proposed CIP. Finally, on March 16, the City Council will consider the CIP for adoption.

This concluded Mr. Thornton's presentation.

Mr. Stout asked about the City's policy on granite curbing. Mr. Thornton stated the policy is with new sidewalk its asphalt sidewalk with granite curbing. Mr. Lamb noted the life cycle is much longer for concrete versus asphalt.

Ms. Landry stated she appreciated the way staff perspective was provided for these different projects and bringing it back to the six focus areas of the CMP. She asked whether the distribution of resources across these focus areas have changed greatly and how does the City know they are making progress. Mr. Thornton stated more focus is being placed and water and sewer projects. In 2006 the City received an Administrative Order from EPA and because of this Order Public Works put in place a priority cleaning program. They have also been looking at the Wastewater Treatment Plant which is about 30 years old which had certain deficiencies which need to be addressed. The same has been done with the water program and the City's road system.

Ms. Landry before the creation of the CIP it has been suggested that the Board look at some areas of the CMP it would like to see go forward and asked whether the Board does this. Chair Spykman stated it has been discussed how to be more proactive in this process and some progress has been made. Mr. Lamb stated now would be the time to start thinking about how to engage the Council for the next cycle. Ms. Landry felt a list to indicate which projects tie into the six focus areas would be a helpful document for the Board.

Mayor Lane stated the CMP is aspirational and the reality is we don't often get there. He further stated the granite curbing does have a much better appearance but also has an economic value – use of granite curbing in some of the neighborhoods encourages people in these neighborhoods to upgrade and improve their own properties.

Councilor Hansel felt the CIP is an important document and stated he likes that it is a staff driven process and felt the Board's time to have input is during the master plan process. He felt the CIP is not the place to include special interest group projects.

Mr. Stout asked whether the funding for CIP projects is on a decline because of the lack of state funding. Mr. Thornton stated the infrastructure work and the facilities work don't tend to change much except with a small growth. However, last year there was the library project which provided for some extra costs. He talked about the street light program which is going to save the City money in the long run. Mr. Thornton added he did not think the City was restricting the departments

from work they had to do. Mr. Stout felt this document shows smarter spending on the part of the City.

Ms. Landry in response to Councilor Hansel stated she was not implying pet projects should be included in the CIP and referred to language which calls for the review of the CMP on an annual basis before the annual operating budget to allow for assessment of progress of the lofty goals set forth in the CMP. She stated she appreciates the monumental work staff puts into this document which she indicated she has done even though technically it is the Planning Board's responsibility not staff's responsibility.

Mayor Lane agreed it was critical for the Planning Board to be involved in this process. He noted to the upcoming public hearing on March 2nd which the Board could attend and added the Board is always invited to actively get involved in this process. He stated the City is fortunate to have staff who are taking up this responsibility and encouraged the Board to get involved.

Dr. Cusack asked how the CIP changes from year to year; he referred to the skate park which was projected to go forward last year in FY18 for \$350,000 but in this year's CIP it is estimated for \$500,000 in FY19. He asked what would prevent this project from increasing yet another time. Mr. Thornton stated a group of citizens are working on fundraising for this project. Last year they put together a design and they are still working on finalizing the design. However, projects don't usually have this type of inflation. Chair Spykman noted many of the projects in the CIP have their own funding sources and referred to the Airport projects as an example.

Mr. Stout asked for a document which outlines projects when they go back a year or two, which would show a trend over a period of time. He also suggested a discussion within the Board as to how it can get involved in this process sooner. Mr. Thornton noted the time for the Board to get involved would be sometime in the spring. Mr. Lamb reminded the Board of the CMP implementation exercise the Board participated in and suggested a process like that the Board could get involved in. Mr. Stout asked whether it would be possible to extend the life of the Master Plan by implementing more from the CIP. Mr. Lamb stated a Master Plan should be updated every ten years, some portions even sooner- 2020 seems to be that timeframe. However, extending the current CMP is probably not something that would be advisable.

A motion was made by Mayor Kendall Lane that the Planning Board recommends approval of the Capital Improvement Program for 2018-2023. The motion was seconded by George Hansel and was unanimously approved.

V. New Business:

Mayor Lane asked whether the Board has received a site plan for the project at the Colony Mill. He noted there is a change of use which should prompt a site plan. Mr. Lamb stated the Board's regulations permitted this project to be approved administratively. Mr. Lamb stated all of Board's 19 standards were evaluated and the only one where a change could be attributed to was with traffic (commercial to residential). It indicated a reduction in traffic. The department reviewed the Zoning Board's granting of variances to determine if there was public interest but there were no public interest at that hearing. Under the circumstance it was determined this project would be approved administratively. Chair Spykman stated staff had contacted him on this item and he was in agreement with staff to make this decision administratively.

Mayor Lane stated he is concerned because this is a significant project for the City and would have major impact on the City. He felt it should have gone Board review and expressed his

disappointment and felt the scale of the project makes a difference. The Chairman stated he made that call.

Mr. Lamb stated the Board's regulations calls for the Planning Director to make this call and staff confers with the Chair to make sure those regulations are being upheld appropriately. He stated he would like to have a conversation about this issue as this has always been a concern for him as far as this regulation are concerned. The Mayor stated he has no issue with 99% of the decisions that are made. However, when there is a project that would have a significant impact, it needs to be presented to the public for its review and comment.

Mr. Stout asked what the salient point here would be require Board review with this item. The Chairman suggested staff to make a presentation as to what the rules are as they stand now and how they are implemented.

V. Upcoming Dates of Interest

Planning Board Meeting -Monday, March 27, 6:30 PM

Planning Board Steering Committee Tuesday, March, 14, 12:00 PM

Joint PB/PLD Committee Monday, March 13, 6:30 PM

Planning Board Site Visits Wednesday, March 22, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed

On a unanimous vote, the meeting adjourned at 8:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Krishni Pahl
Minute Taker

Reviewed by: Rhett Lamb, Planning Director/ACM
Edits: L. Langella