

**CITY OF KEENE
NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**JOINT PUBLIC WORKSHOP
PLANNING BOARD/
PLANNING, LICENSES, AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

Monday, April 13, 2015

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

Planning Board Members Present

Gary Spykman, Chair
Christine Weeks
Councilor James Duffy
Andrew Bohannon
Nathaniel Stout
George Hansel
Douglas Barrett

Planning Board Members Not Present

Mayor Kendall Lane

**Planning, Licenses and Development
Committee Members Present**

David Richards, Chairman
Councilor Emily Hague
Councilor Bettina Chadbourne
Councilor Carl Jacobs
Councilor David Meader

**Planning, Licenses and Development
Committee Members Not Present**

Staff Present

Rhett Lamb, Planning Director
Michele Chalice, Planner
Karen Purinton, Planner

1. Roll Call

PLD Chair Richards called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and a roll call was taken.

2. January 12, 2015 meeting minutes

A motion was made by James Duffy that the Joint Committee accept the January 12, 2015 meeting minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by David Meader and was unanimously approved.

3. Public Workshop

Ordinance – O-2014-12 – Relating to Zone Change for a Section of Wyman Road. Petitioners, Attorney Thomas Hanna on behalf of Prospect Place, street section located from the intersection of Route 12 and Wyman Road to the northeasterly boundary of Tax Map and Lot Number 919-09-24. This section of Wyman Road would be added to the list of streets in Section 102-1111 where Institutional Uses are permitted by Special Exception. Thirteen parcels in total would be affected by this proposal.

Planning Director, Rhett Lamb explained that this was the first step in a multi-step process to vote on a zoning change. This is a public workshop which can be continued to next month if the Committee felt it was necessary. When the Joint Committee is ready to take a vote, the Planning Board would vote to the degree to which the petition is consistent with the City's Master Plan and the PLD Committee would vote to recommend that the Mayor set a date for a public hearing. Those recommendations are sent to the City Council which will then hold a public hearing on the ordinance. After that public hearing, the ordinance is referred back to the PLD Committee for final recommendation and that recommendation is voted on by the City Council.

Attorney Thomas Hanna addressed the Committee. Attorney Hanna stated that he represents Prospect Place. He indicated that the first speaker would be Dr. Kimball Temple Chair of Prospect Place, followed by Jim Phippard of Brickstone Masons.

Dr. Kimball Temple of 114 Jordan Road was the next speaker. Dr. Temple indicated that he has lived in Keene since the 70's and has practiced medicine at the Hitchcock Clinic from which he retired in 2007. In 2008 he was asked to join the Board of Prospect Place which has been in existence since 1874 and represents the oldest residential elder care home in New Hampshire and they have been at the same property since that time. The mission of this organization is to offer dignified living for people who are aging. About 20 years ago, the Home started having issues with occupancy and has had to draw down on the endowment at about 7% to 8% a year.

Dr. Temple went on to say that most of their rooms are located on the second floor so by fire regulation, the residents have about six minutes to exit the building which limits them to the kind of people they can accept as residents. With the down turn in the economy, their wealth advisors have also advised them that they will be out of money in about ten years. As a result, a meeting of the incorporators was held in 2010 and during this meeting they discovered that they had three options open to them; close down, continue to operate with the few people who are occupying the property and the third option was adding independent units and have a more ready supply of residents to occupy the Home and address the issue that all living facilities have, namely that after someone is admitted if there is need for more care than the facility can offer being able to provide for that care.

As a result, they decided to get some help in developing a unit such as that. Dr. Temple talked about his experience with Rivermead which is a Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC). Their business model asks for an entry fee which ensures residents of assisted living, nursing and dementia care without an increase in fees. Dr. Temple added that he also knew the person who developed Rivermead, Ed Kelly. Mr. Kelly looked at Prospect Place's business model. However, at that time in 2010, the economy was bad but most importantly they could not find any land to accomplish this. Prospect Place enlisted the services of Brickstone Masons and they did find some properties, negotiations for one did not amount to much, they did make a bid on a property on East Surry Road which bid was rejected. In 2014, they came across property on Wyman Road (48 acres). This landowner was willing to talk about options on this property if Prospect Place could get the necessary state and local permits and obtain financing.

The next issue was whether there was a market for CCRC in this community; a survey was formulated and sent out to people in Cheshire County, Brattleboro and to people in southern Massachusetts. 1,000 surveys were sent out and 300 people expressed interest in attending a focus group. In July 2014, five focus groups were conducted in Keene, Walpole and Brattleboro and of those 300 people who attended 71 were ready to put down a deposit and another large group expressed a lot of interest. Since that time, work has moved forward and the feeling is that one of these facilities in Keene would be very worthwhile. The hope is to have about 154 independent units and 52 healthcare assisted units. There will also be a large community and auditorium space. Dr. Temple felt this offers another option for the elderly in this community.

Jim Phippard of Brickstone Landuse Consultants was the next speaker. Mr. Phippard stated that he got involved with this project in January 2011. Using the criteria provided by the applicant; zoning, acreage, road access, topography, wetlands, city utilities, configuration, steep slopes, soil conditions he looked for an appropriate site for the applicant. They looked at over 200 properties and narrowed it down to three sites; Chapman Road, East Surry Road, and Old Walpole Road. Each of those properties met most of the criteria but noted that there is no site that would have all the criteria the applicant is

looking for. Mr. Phippard added that all of the sites would have required a rezoning to allow an institutional use.

Mr. Phippard then referred to the plan that was included in the Board's packet for the property on Wyman Road. The area shaded in gray is the rural zone and corporate park is on either side of Wyman Road. He indicated that there are four parcels that are not in corporate park that could be affected if institutional use is added. Mr. Phippard went on to say that in 1994 when the City was getting ready to introduce the corporate park zone, Wyman Road was still a rural road that intersected into Route 12 and corporate park was created knowing that something needed to be done to improve this access via Wyman Road. City Council purchased the land area that was necessary to relocate Wyman Road where it meets Route 12 and this was a brand new roadway that was constructed in 1995 to act as the entrance into corporate park. At that time the 30 foot right of way that existed was widened to 80 feet.

Mr. Phippard stated that when he visited this area he noticed after you get past Black Brook Road it is a forested setting with one single family home and the Miracles of Motion property. Both sides of Black Brook will never be developed because of the natural peat that exists here. There is a lot of wildlife that also exist here which will remain. He noted that regardless of what type of use that goes in here the road surface needs to be improved. He noted that he did not feel there would be a need to widen the right of way (33 feet) that exists right now. He indicated that for traffic calming reasons, roadways that are much more heavily travelled than Wyman Road are proposing narrower travel lanes.

Mr. Phippard went on to say that Prospect Place hired a traffic engineer to evaluate the traffic volume should a CCRC be permitted on this property. Mr. Phippard stated that it is surprising how low a traffic volume these types of uses generate and they also generate them during off peak hours. During a morning peak hour the estimate is 51 vehicles per hour based on the size of the facility being contemplated. For living facility with over 200 units (which is based on studies from other CCRC's), this will bring the level traffic on Wyman Road in the morning peak hour to about 260 trips per hour and felt this was a reasonable number, it's high, but not unreasonable. Mr. Phippard noted that there are ten-foot travel lanes on Maple Avenue for about 1,000 feet of the travel way. During PM peak hours about 89 trips will be generated by the facility, bringing the total to about 300 trips. PM peak hours for CCRC will be between 12 pm – 4 pm and the PM peak hour on the roadway will be between 5 pm – 6 pm. This concluded Mr. Phippard's presentation.

Mr. Stout noted that the traffic study also referred to the Route 12 intersection and asked whether or not that meets a threshold for a traffic light. Mr. Phippard stated that this intersection was looked at in 2005 and explained that this is currently a four-way intersection with no signal control. This intersection in 2005 met two out of the four warrants for a traffic light but NHDOT decided that because of the location it did not justify a traffic signal. Their concern was that because of the location and because cars will be travelling at a high rate of speed along a downgrade and coming around the corner cars might not have adequate time to stop. He noted that this discussion is going to happen again and added that C&S did not build the expansion they had planned for. They did add to their work force but not to the extent they were contemplating in 2005. If the proposed facility goes in, this discussion will come up again with NHDOT.

Councilor Hague asked when the soil testing was done whether any evaluation was done on soil that was designated as prime agricultural soil by the Natural Resources Conservation. Mr. Phippard answered in the affirmative and stated that there are areas that are designated as prime agricultural as well as areas that are considered to be prime wetlands on the US Fish and Wildlife mapping.

Councilor Jacobs asked Mr. Phippard to clarify what he had said about the road redesign. Mr. Phippard stated that if this use goes in he would recommend that the road gets rebuilt for areas that

don't have a proper base. He noted that the 2017 CIP lists Wyman Road for repair but wasn't sure of the extent but it is not likely to be rebuilt. He added that he would however, discourage anymore widening of the road.

Councilor Chadbourne asked if the existing road was to be repaired what the weight limit would be. Mr. Lamb felt that this type of questioning should happen when a specific project is being proposed. What the Joint Committee is being asked to do today is a request for rezoning.

Mr. Phippard added that with the creation of the corporate park the City did install a gravity sewer system in this area through Black Brook North as well as a water tank on the hill. Hence, city water and sewer already exists and there is adequate capacity for a facility such as this.

Attorney Hanna was the next speaker. Attorney Hanna stated that the key aspect of this program is that when individuals move into this facility they have the assurance that when they need extensive care they would not have to pay anything extra. He noted that there is no example of this type of facility in the master plan and it is not defined in the zoning ordinance. However, the Zoning Administrator has issued an administrative ruling that a CCRC is an institutional use. Therefore, a CCRC is an allowed use in the rural zoning districts and on one of the enumerated streets only if a special exception from the Zoning Board could be obtained.

Attorney Hanna asked that the Board consider a number of factors; the site is surrounded on the west, part of the east and to the south by corporate park. It is 8/10ths of a mile from the bypass and half of that distance has already been improved for corporate park. This road can be rebuilt within its current right of way and this issue will be studied by both the Planning Board and Zoning Board. This facility is a short distance from the hospital, YMCA, and the Fire Station on Hastings Avenue and it has easy access to downtown. He went on to say that it is ideal in his view because it is next to Miracles in Motion, which is not just a horse arena but is also an institutional use. He felt having Miracles in Motion as a neighbor would be a real advantage to his client. He referred to page 20 of the staff report which indicates that there will be a use for this type of facility in our community.

Attorney Hanna added that any of the other sites the applicant had in mind would have come before the Board for the same consideration. There were also sites that were looked at downtown that were not viable for this use. He referred to the following language from the Staff Report: *While the Master Plan does call for institutional uses to be located near downtown or existing Village centers, an institutional use like a continuing care retirement community is not specifically contemplated by the Plan – suitable land for this use in proximity to downtown is extremely limited.*

He added that they do agree that the Master Plan does not exclude institutional use in the rural district and asked the Board to consider this in their review.

Attorney Hanna then went on to refer to certain portions of the Master Plan as follows:

Page 38 – Increased densities downtown and sustaining downtown. Affording Keene residents the opportunity to live in a facility as what is being suggested will help downtown Keene. If a new facility is not built the ones that are remaining will inevitably close and people will eventually move to other communities.

Page 42 – Downtown vibrancy. *“...attractive to a young demographic, as well as executives...* Attorney Hanna felt that placing a CCRC downtown might displace the young demographic.

Page 48 – Housing Design and Quality. High quality housing stock that is safe, durable and designed for human and less for auto is desirable. Attorney Hanna felt this portion is consistent with their proposal and the use of Wyman Road in the manner in which they propose.

Page 52 – Historic Resources. Attorney Hanna noted that Prospect Place is historically significant and contributes to the architecture of Court Street.

Page 63 – Mixed Uses in Neighborhoods. The Master Plan encourages mixed uses in neighborhoods. The proposed CCRC is in close proximity to Summit Road, the Maple Avenue Activity Center and the Court Street Activity Center. He felt that this facility will become its own “village”.

Page 67 – Energy Efficiency. New high standard construction is what is being proposed with energy efficiency in mind.

Page 69 – New Jobs. The facility will bring in about 75 full time positions. The construction cost will be close to 45 million dollars and will take about 18 months of construction and will also offer a number of jobs locally.

Page 79 – Park & Walk Community. The proposed CCRC is close to a few village centers; a certain percentage might have cars but some will also use in-house transportation.

Page 101 – Active Well-Being. Integrating different age groups and letting residents to age in place. The proposed CCRC is consistent with this goal and there will be multiple opportunities to interact with young people.

Page 113 – Minimize Adverse Physical Impacts on the City. City water and sewer already exist due to the corporate park development. Fire Department services are close, there will be no impact on the school population and the adequacy of the road will be addressed by the Zoning Board and then by the Planning Board.

In conclusion, Attorney Hanna emphasized that the City of Keene has the regulatory system to deal with this situation in our community. He then referred to the third special exception criterion, *There will be no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians* and noted that the Zoning Board takes this criterion very seriously. He referred to a special exception application that was filed for 34 West Street a few years ago where the applicant felt that the traffic circulation falls under the purview of site plan review and as a result this application was denied by the Zoning Board for not providing the appropriate traffic information. A rehearing was called for and appropriate traffic information was provided to the Zoning Board. He felt that systems are well in place to handle the road issue.

Councilor Duffy asked why the sites downtown were not considered to be suitable. The Councilor then referred to language on page 69 of the Master Plan *New jobs must be a primary objective for Keene and the region. High quality jobs that pay a living wage...* the Councilor asked whether the 75 jobs Attorney Hanna referred to would pay a living wage and contribute towards the tax base. He also noted that institutional use also refers to profit and non-profit facilities and asked how this would contribute to the economic development as contemplated in the Master Plan. Attorney Hanna indicated that this would be a non-profit organization and as mentioned would have no impact on the schools and will seek tax-exempt status and will undoubtedly discuss payment in lieu of taxes with the City because of the City resources they would be using.

Mr. Phippard addressed the Committee and answered the questions Councilor Duffy had posed. Mr. Phippard stated that they had looked at the former Middle School property. He noted that the land area

at this property is not large enough for what they are looking for. Hence, they considered a six or seven story property but according to the structural engineer, floors cannot be added to the existing building which then required all existing buildings to be removed. This would also require some sort of parking structure which would drive up the cost. Mr. Phippard noted that six and seven story buildings are not what the population of the residents were looking for.

The other site that they looked at was the old Public Works property which has a long history of contamination and they did talk to an environmental scientist about clean-up, which lead the applicant in a different direction. This site is also partially within the 100-year floodplain and the sub soils that exist here could lead to additional construction costs. The property on Wyman Road doesn't have these conditions.

Chair Richards assured those present that this session will not be the last time they can ask questions and it is quite likely that this matter will be back next month.

Councilor Hague noted that Mr. Phippard had talked about connectivity to activity centers and looking at the list of streets that qualify for institutional use – eight of the ten are connected to the downtown but this site does not have sidewalk connectivity and asked for comment. Attorney Hanna stated that this particular type of facility will only fit into rural settings according to the site selection analysis and agreed that it will be difficult to walk to these centers but what the applicant intends to do is to encourage getting to these village centers by car or public transportation. Attorney Hanna added that he would obtain the wage information for Councilor Duffy for the next meeting.

Staff comments were next. Mr. Lamb addressed the Committee and stated that he too has a difficult time separating the project from the rezoning request. He noted that the Committee has to be ready to accept whatever project is proposed if this zoning change is approved and a special exception is issued. Mr. Lamb stated that it is not that the City does not need this type of use but the question is where you locate such a use. There are nine parcels that would be affected by this proposal where an institutional use is not allowed under the zoning ordinance. The four on the northern end of Wyman Road are affected because they are in the rural zoning district.

Mr. Lamb referred to Page 8 of the Staff Report – *Institutional uses are allowed by right in the Central Business, Central Business Limited, and Commerce Zones, and are allowed in other zones by special exception...* and the list of uses are as follows:

Health care facility, hospital, accessory (temporary) housing for families of patients admitted to a hospital, clinic, nursing home, sanitarium, convalescent home, home for the aged, private school, child care facility, place of worship, senior center, and museum.

Mr. Lamb also added that there are no density limitations on institutional uses, which means that the buildings can be of any size.

The list of streets listed on page 9 of the staff report are served by water and sewer. A few of them intersect rural zoning; On Court Street there is one parcel that is subject to a conservation easement and one is owned by the City as a cemetery. On Arch Street (Old Chesterfield Road) the road is about 30 feet wide, passes about 10 rural parcels on its way to Langdon Place. In some cases institutional uses were allowed on one side of the street and not on the other side.

The question that has come up is whether a street needs to be adequate to support an institutional use. Some of the listed streets are significant streets and some are narrower streets serving residential and rural land uses. The petitioner feels the special exception process and the site plan process will decide

if the use is allowed and if widening of the street is necessary it can be managed through the permitting process.

Mr. Lamb then referred to the characteristics of a rural zone –

The intent of the Rural (R) District is to provide for scattered, very low density development, predominantly of a residential or agricultural nature, which can be accommodated on the land without major disruptions of the natural terrain, vegetation, watercourses, or surface drainage. Such lands are generally those outside of the valley floor and beyond where city water, sewer, and other utilities can be readily supplied. In this case there is a portion of land that was corporate park at one time and then changed back to rural. The land is in proximity to water and sewer, although extensions of water and sewer would be necessary to serve this land.

Mr. Lamb then touched on traffic and street analysis. There is a classification of streets in the CMP called major streets, collector streets and local streets. There is a difference between the function of a street and the design of a street. He called the Committee's attention to the bottom of page 12 of the staff report which is what the city code calls for in terms of width for a new street. He indicated that Wyman Road is listed as a collector street because of its proximity to Route 12 and the fact that it was widened to improve corporate park activity. He went on to say that during a site plan review and the special exception process the applicant will be asked where traffic will come from; because of Route 12 most of the traffic regardless of what institutional use is located here it is likely to come from Route 12 but this does not mean there will not be traffic coming from the other end (Old Walpole Road) and this needs to be factored into this discussion.

With reference to the traffic study, Mr. Lamb stated that contact has been made recently with District 4 of NHDOT regarding re-evaluation of Wyman Road/Corporate Park/Route 12 intersection and there was a recently letter that came in after the staff report was put together and added that he will get this to the Committee in time for its next meeting.

With reference to the scenic road designation, Mr. Lamb stated that Wyman Road is not listed as a scenic road. If a private developer was to widen a road which would alter the scenic character, the rules of scenic road don't apply. The scenic road ordinance only applies to the City of Keene and any public utilities altering the scenic nature of the street.

Mr. Lamb explained that the reason there is a sub-heading "Area History" included in the staff report is because when Wyman Road was developed to corporate park it was as a function of a lengthy planning process. He added that when a zoning change happens in the city it is often done through a public/private partnership.

Zoning Chronology was next. He stated that it was important to note that in 1994 the area shown in blue on the map was zoned for corporate park use. Mr. Lamb also referred to flood plain and added that 5 acres is in the 100-year floodplain along Black Brook.

Mr. Lamb with reference to steep slopes stated that there are areas that could fall under the prohibitive slopes (greater than 25%) and areas that would fall under precautionary slopes (15% - 25%) located on this property.

Mr. Lamb then talked about how the Master Plan relates to this application. He explained that the overall theme of the Master Plan is enhancing sustainability in the City of Keene. The three elements of sustainability are economic sustainability, natural resources sustainability, and social equity sustainability. He indicated that the key is to find a balance and if you were to translate this to a

landuse map it indicates that you should concentrate development in locations where utilities are present to support them, and where density already exists in order to encourage walkability and ensure village quality. He noted that the landuse map included in the Committee's packet identifies primary growth areas and core village or activity centers.

Mr. Lamb went on to say that that interpreting the landuse map would indicate that portions of Wyman Road included in this petition crosses two future land use designation categories:

Manufacturing/Industrial (Corporate Park side of the line) and the other is CRD/Rural/Low Density Residential/Agriculture/TDR Sending Area – these are outlying areas that generally have moderate to severe environmental limitations, including steep slopes, rock and ledge close to the ground surface, large intact forest and agricultural ecosystems.

Mr. Lamb added that TDR stands for Transfer of Development Rights, a concept which implies selling development rights on the outskirts of the City and applying those development rights to more urban settings.

Mr. Lamb then went over the staff report findings:

Master Plan Consistency – Mr. Lamb stated that the Joint Committee has a narrower definition of institutional use compared to the zoning ordinance. If the Master Plan was strictly followed, what would be contemplated is to find a property in one of the activity centers or in the secondary growth areas. The challenging aspect is that the design the applicant has, calls for a large land area and the landuse plan does not contemplate the design brought forth here with the CCRC. The Master Plan calls for a more denser/urban style living.

He further stated that the CRD/Rural/Low Density/TDR Sending Area are generally reflective of existing land uses. Mr. Lamb stated that the Master Plan does call for institutional uses to be located near downtown but may not be in the form of a CCRC but our community demographics clearly call for this kind of activity. The fastest growing age group not only in Keene but throughout New England is the 55 years and older group.

Mr. Stout asked what Mr. Lamb meant when he said that the zoning ordinance has a broader definition for institutional use and asked whether it was the Master Plan that had a narrower definition. Mr. Lamb answered in the affirmative and went on to refer to Page 18 of the Staff Report where it lists the institutional uses as outlined in the Comprehensive Master Plan - city offices, health care facilities, school properties, county facilities, and other non-profit land uses. Location and functionality of institutional uses should be located close to downtown or where it fits the needs and scale or in a village/neighborhood activity center. Mr. Lamb stated that this is a more limited definition versus the zoning ordinance which has a longer list focusing more on health care facilities.

Ms. Weeks asked whether Mr. Lamb knows what the zoning was for the property prior to Langdon Place being located here. Mr. Lamb stated that he would look into this.

Councilor Duffy stated that Mr. Lamb had indicated that the Master Plan states that there is a need to support the aging population and asked whether there is also reference in the Master Plan about also supporting work force housing as well. Mr. Lamb answered in the affirmative. Councilor Duffy asked for more information on CCRC for the next meeting.

Mr. Barrett stated that on page 15 it talks about how in 1994 zoning was switched to corporate park but then two years later it was switched back to rural and asked for more for clarification. Mr. Lamb stated

that he was not employed with the City at that time but the record indicates that the developer, MEDC made the argument to change from corporate park to rural because of the possibility of developing these properties was limited by steep slopes and wetlands.

Councilor Jacobs asked whether CRD is a concept that could be used in this instance. Mr. Lamb stated that the question depends on the density of the development. For instance, institutional use under zoning could be anything from a day care facility to a hospital. Some institutional uses might be appropriate at the edge of the City but other uses that are much denser would probably not be acceptable. He said the applicant feels the special exception process will decide that distinction.

Chair Spykman stated that Mr. Hanna in his presentation referred to Miracles in Motion as an institutional use and asked Mr. Lamb to clarify that concept. Mr. Lamb stated that the riding arena was created originally for private use but wasn't sure how the activity that exists at the present time came into being and added that he can provide that information at a future meeting. Chair Spykman clarified that Miracles in Motion did not request a variance to turn this facility to an institutional use and hence there is no precedent of institutional use in that setting. Mr. Lamb agreed and added that it would not have been a variance but a special exception. Chair Spykman stated that it is difficult to separate the project from the zoning change as the applicant's entire presentation was about why this setting is appropriate. He asked by approving this request whether the Joint Committee will be setting precedent. Chair Spykman felt that if the committee approved this request it would be viewed as going for a form of contract zoning, zoning specifically for a project. He added that he wants to be cautious and would like staff's advice.

Mr. Lamb stated that there is no precedent setting here. He explained that every decision by the Committee is a fact-based decision. He indicated that for instance with Basehill Road when it was added to this list; when a zoning change was made it was with a condition that the road would be improved. He suggested that staff would advise that the committee not go in that direction because then it would fall into a contract zoning category. A zoning change would then rely on the secondary steps of a special exception followed by a site plan review which would not put the Joint Committee in a contract zoning category.

Chair Spykman asked Mr. Lamb to give a timeline on the zoning change that has happened with this property. Mr. Lamb explained that with corporate park it was an intentional series of steps the City took, knowing that the rezoning of the parcel was only part of making sure that the roads were adequate in support of the development that would take place. In 1993 an economic planning process occurred which then in 1994 led to a landuse plan that was adopted and parcels were identified for development. Simultaneously, the City was pursuing funding through the bond process and the establishment of the tax increment financing district happened. Then an agreement was signed with a major developer to build a building and generate taxes as the funding source to pay off the City's bonds.

Public comments were next.

Mr. Robert Sutherland of 66 School Street addressed the Committee and began by thanking the Petitioner and their agents. He indicated that the issue here is that this is the Mayor's property and a decision is going to be made by individuals who serve on the Council with the Mayor and felt these are issues that need to be dealt with. He also noted that the Master Plan was also signed by the Mayor as well as Councilor Hague.

Mr. Sutherland referred to the following language from page 116 of the Master Plan:

Given the limited supply of large areas of readily developable land and the community's desire to concentrate land within existing developed areas, land-use issues are mainly concerned with redeveloping and enhancing the existing available land and infrastructure. He indicated that the proposal is admirable but felt this land is not ideal because of the existing wetlands and hillside but is ideal because of the rural nature. What is also not ideal is that in Keene there is a desire to preserve the rural areas.

Keene also has a problem with economic impact and this development is going to restrict more economic addition to the tax rolls and here is another tax exempt property and felt there are many of these types of properties lately.

Mr. Sutherland pointed out that there are other lands outside of Keene that would be ideal for a project such as this, in Swanzey or in Westmoreland.

Ms. Nancy Lory of 63 Wyman Road stated that her's is one of the properties that will be affected by this rezoning. She indicated that she and her husband have lived in their property for 37 years. Ms. Lory stated that she hoped that the hearing will be open next month so that they have a chance to prepare their statement.

Ms. Weeks stated that she sees this as a real need in the community and knows of many who would have liked to stay in Keene but are now residing at Rivermead. She thanked the petitioner for all their efforts.

Councilor Jacobs for the benefit of the public wanting to prepare for next month – indicated that this meeting will be available on the City's website as well, and the set of minutes will also be available.

A motion was made by Gary Spykman that the Joint Committee continue this item to next month. The motion was seconded by Councilor Bettina Chadbourne and was unanimously approved.

It was noted that next month's meeting is on a Tuesday not a Monday.

4. Next Meeting **Tuesday**, May 12, 2015

5. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 9 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker
Reviewed by Rhett Lamb, Planning Director