

**CITY OF KEENE  
NEW HAMPSHIRE**

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

Monday, June 13, 2016

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

**Planning Board Members Present**

Gary Spykman, Chair  
Nathaniel Stout, Vice-Chair  
Christine Weeks  
Andrew Bohannon  
Douglas Barrett  
George Hansel  
Councilor James Duffy  
Mayor Kendall Lane

**Planning Board Members Not Present**

Pamela Russell Slack  
Chris Cusack  
Tammy Adams, Alternate

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

David Richards, Chairman  
Councilor Philip Jones  
Councilor Bettina Chadbourne  
Councilor George Hansel

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

Councilor Robert Sutherland

**Staff Present**

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

**1. Roll Call**

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

**2. May 2, 2016 meeting minutes**

Councilor Jones offered the following correction: Page 5, to change Mr. Slack to Ms. Slack.

A motion was made by Christine Weeks that the Joint Committee accept the May 2, 2016 meeting minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Phil Jones and was unanimously approved.

**3. Continued Public Workshop**

**Ordinance – O-2016-01 – Relating to Zoning Changes. Petitioner, City of Keene Planning Department, requests the creation of three zoning districts; a Business Growth and Reuse District, a Neighborhood Business District and a Residential Preservation District and the associated zoning map changes. The two hundred and fifty-six parcels of land affected by this request total an area of 266 acres. The project area is generally east of Main Street, south of Water Street, west of Eastern Avenue and north of Baker Street.**

Planner Michele Chalice addressed the Committee and stated she is before the Committee to address certain questions that were raised by the Committee. She began by going over a few reminder images. She referred to an area in yellow which has 170 parcels currently in the high density district which are being recommended to be shifted to the Residential Preservation

District. Ms. Chalice showed the Committee three images which are images identified by the public as the types of aesthetic element they were trying to achieve with the Residential Preservation District.

Ms. Chalice referred to the intent of the Residential Preservation District, which is to provide and recreate neighborhoods that prioritize family dwelling. She noted the neighborhood is not looking for high density or industrial (ten parcels are in this district) to exist in this Residential Preservation District. She referred to the allowable uses in the proposed Residential Preservation District which are only single-family dwellings, non-commercial raising of farm animals and nursery childcare.

Ms. Chalice referred to pictures of homes on Dunbar Street as they currently exist as well as homes on the north side of Water Street. She then went over the current standards for High Density which has a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet, medium density is 8,000 square feet and low density is 10,000 square feet.

Ms. Chalice then went over the staff report. Legally non-conforming and pre-existing conforming uses and buildings – Ms. Chalice stated there are protections in place for property owners who currently own non-conforming of buildings. Chair Spykman clarified if they are non-conforming now they will still be protected in the way they are now if the zone changes. Ms. Chalice agreed. Ms. Weeks clarified whether it would be different if ownership changes. Mr. Lamb stated ownership has no bearing on non-conformity. Ms. Chalice stated the only time there will be an issue is if an owner decides to make a change to the use of the property; at that time they would have to bring the property into conformity. Ms. Chalice stated she had spoken to a lending institution who had indicated a property which was non-conforming would not incur any additional costs and would not prevent a borrower from being able to obtain a mortgage. Mayor Lane stated staff needs to talk to an appraiser about this. He indicated under current federal standards, appraising a non-conforming property is fairly limited.

No more than four unrelated people in a residence – Ms. Chalice stated this is a question raised by Councilor Chadbourne. Ms. Chalice went over the definition for family *“family means one or more person occupying a dwelling unit living as a single housing unit, not provided to a group of five or more unrelated people per building”*

Councilor Hansel asked how many non-conforming properties this new District would create. Ms. Chalice stated the City has no way of knowing how many of the existing properties are legally non-conforming. She noted that however, with the minimum lot size if the City was to go forward with what they were proposing for the dimensional requirements, 88% of the 180 parcels were less than 8,000 square feet. Councilor Hansel clarified the City is trying to preserve the lot size of a small number of lots. Ms. Chalice stated to maintain the feel of an area the City is trying to preserve the subdivision of larger lots into two lots. She referred to page 15 of 38 of the Committee’s packet and noted all but 12 of the 181 parcels from being subdivided into two lots, which means 12 of the lots within this new Residential Preservation District would be greater than 15,000 square feet. Ms. Chalice stated what is important to keep in mind is when a lot is subdivided it has to leave two viable building lots. She referred to some of the long narrow lots on the rendering and stated even though these exceed 8,000 square feet it would be difficult for someone (lot on Dartmouth Street, for example) to subdivide this lot.

Mr. Barrett clarified when you say no more than four unrelated persons whether it is not the same as saying five or more unrelated persons is a family. Chair Spykman stated he read it in the

same manner “... *five or more shall not be deemed to consist of a family...*” so up to four is ok. Ms. Chalice agreed and said it is confusing when it is stated in two different ways.

Mr. Duffy referred to the lots on Dartmouth Street and Belmont Avenue – clarified there are already structures in this area. Ms. Chalice there is, but new ones cannot be built here because this area is also in the floodplain.

Councilor Jones clarified the goal is to create incentives to create workforce housing and permit lots to be smaller. Ms. Chalice stated the City is actually proposing to go the opposite direction; currently there are lots located in the high Density District where lots only have to be 6,000 square feet in size, these will now have to 8,000 square feet minimum lot size. The Councilor asked whether this would affect setbacks. Ms. Chalice stated the only change would be to the rear setback where there would be a five foot change.

Ms. Chalice then talked about “*The Potential Removal of Parcels of Dunbar and Water Streets*” These are mostly rental properties and are not likely these would change in the future, and they might have a greater value if a buffer was created between the proposed Residential Preservation District and the commercial zone alongside. On Water Street, currently three are shown as single family of which one is an LLC.

Chair Spykman asked whether Ms. Chalice was talking about just the five properties on Dunbar Street or those on the north side of Water Street as well. Ms. Chalice stated staff was referring to both streets. These properties are currently in the high Density District.

**Proposed Dimensional Requirements** – Ms. Chalice stated for the proposed district the recommendation is to stay at two-stories. Because this area is located at the bottom of the Beaver Brook Watershed, it would be advantageous to consider having more greenspace in these areas. This means there needs to be a larger lot sizes to allow for the types of buildings people would like. To permit people to do what they like with their properties with the minimum amount of regulation, along with the need to have more open space, staff is proposing to split the difference and suggesting 8,000 square feet for the minimum lot size and the minimum lot size per dwelling unit to 5,400 square feet. Mayor Lane asked in the Residential Preservation District if there is going to be only one dwelling unit permitted, shouldn't the minimum lot size be 8,000 square feet and the lot size per dwelling unit also be 8,000 square feet. He felt the 5,400 implies that two dwelling units could not be permitted on this lot. Ms. Chalice asked for the Planning Director's input. Mr. Lamb stated there is a write-up for this District to permit two-family homes, the table follows that logic.

Chair Spykman asked how staff arrived at the 5,400 square foot number. Ms. Chalice stated she doesn't know the origin.

Ms. Weeks noted in this proposed District the maximum occupied by the structure is 35% and the minimum greenspace is 55% which adds up to 90% - she asked whether the impermeable referred to here is driveways, patios, sidewalks etc. Ms. Chalice agreed. Mr. Lamb explained this table should be read a little differently and indicated to get to 100% the last two columns need to be added up. He added the Maximum % of Lot Impermeable includes the house, driveway, garage etc. The column to the left of that is only the structure. Ms. Weeks stated her question still is whether 10% would be sufficient for driveway, patio, garage etc. Mr. Lamb stated this would depend on the size of the lot. Ms. Weeks felt for this proposed area requiring 55% greenspace might be a challenge. Chair Spykman stated the goal here is to encourage more greenspace and if

someone has already used up 45% between a house and a driveway but also now wants to construct a patio, the answer would be to construct a permeable patio.

Mayor Lane stated another way to look at this would be is that you are taking the minimum density lot size and applying low density standards to it. The Mayor questioned how the City plans on enforcing this on an existing lot. Ms. Chalice stated the City does not go lot to lot taking measurements. The Mayor noted the City does issue building permits for houses but not for driveways. Ms. Chalice stated the City does issue driveway permits for new driveways or for additional driveways. Mr. Lamb added there is coordination but agreed not every driveway expansion goes through the permit process; if it is an existing driveway and goes through a significant change it is subject to review under the driveway permit.

**Minimum Percentage of Green Open Space** – Ms. Chalice stated this is pretty straightforward. The City is looking at a desired aesthetic for this residential area. The example of maximum area occupied by structure; looking at a small lot and making sure it would be reasonable for certain amount of expansion without the need to come back before the City for a variance. Mr. Lamb noted it appears there is some discomfort around this subject and felt staff should look at a block and advise the Committee what the coverage is today. Mayor Lane stated the chart which has been drafted for Dunbar Street and Water Street was very helpful and would like to see something of that nature.

**The Potential Inclusion of Two-Family Dwellings** – Ms. Chalice stated the Affidavits are done differently in different communities. She indicated she is waiting to hear from a community how this Affidavit is used. The City has 57 existing two-family dwellings right now and if this is permitted as an allowable use, the City will be permitting the creation of additional two-family dwellings.

Ms. Chalice stated the Town of Peterborough is requiring this Affidavit as a pre-cursor to obtaining an occupancy permit for new two-family dwellings. In Keene, it is currently used for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) with property records. Ms. Weeks asked whether there was a limit to the number of non-family members permitted in each unit. Ms. Chalice stated as long as the owner lives on the property, they are permitted to have three non-related persons in their unit and in the second unit there could be four non-related persons. Chair Richards stated they would still need a lodging house license.

Mr. Duffy stated ADU's also permit in-law apartments where people use it for the purpose of taking care of aging parents, which could help families stay intact. The Mayor questioned what happens in a situation when there are no more parents living in that unit. He did not feel this would a viable long-term solution. Mr. Lamb stated he is only aware of a handful of lodging house licenses provided in the City. The City is not likely to see people apply for a lodging house licenses for five or more people unless it is for a specific property such as a fraternity.

Ms. Chalice stated for next time she would like to discuss the Business Growth District and the four parcels that are not recommended to go into another district.

Ms. Weeks asked about the ten parcels in the industrial district. Chair Spykman stated these parcels were originally owned by the Kingsbury property and when they were not going to be utilized for expansion they were sold as residential lots and have been built on.

Mr. Barrett stated in a situation where the property is owner-occupied but the owner does eventually move out, he would not particularly be concerned about this until future occupants become disruptive to the neighborhood. He indicated he would like to find out from the Town of Peterborough if the Affidavit was ever used for a complaint enforcement mechanism. Ms. Chalice stated regardless of whether the Affidavit is filed with the property record or whether it is filed as a Certificate of Occupancy, they would both be standing records. Ms. Chalice stated what staff is wondering is whether the owner occupancy could be some sort of annual verification. Mr. Barrett stated if this should become an onerous process what he is wondering is if something is on the books, and if a problem should arise the City could follow-up.

Mr. Lamb stated with an ADU the Affidavit follows the property even if the property should change hands. If there was a complaint the City could take action and the Conditional Use Permit for the ADU could be withdrawn. Mr. Lamb stated in his opinion this was a better program than the license. Mr. Barrett stated he rather put the enforcement energy into issues that are egregious.

Chair Richards asked for staff recommendation for going forward with this item. Ms. Chalice stated the public workshop should probably be continued and it does not seem like the Committee is not ready to move forward with the dimensional standards, hence condition B. a. would not be appropriate at this time. She felt B.b. should be left as proposed.

Chair Spykman agreed and added he felt the Committee was heading in a good direction with this discussion. He however, felt the Committee has not had a discussion about whether or not multi-family dwellings should be included or not in this district.

Mr. Duffy did not feel multi-family dwellings should be allowed in this district but if it is going to be permitted then it also should be permitted in elsewhere in Keene as well. Mr. Duffy went on to say to help revitalize this area, it is important to preserve the residential character (what is left of it) which could create a lot of social and economic benefit for the community. He talked about the public/private partnerships that are happening using new market tax credit and the different ways to address multi-use units.

Ms. Weeks asked whether there was a difference between multi-units and duplexes. The Committee agreed there was. Ms. Weeks noted the Committee had discussed how important it was to offer property owners the option of having a rental unit as part of their home. She asked whether there was the option of permitted duplexes in this District. Mr. Lamb stated staff is recommending single family and two-family homes for this District; the term multi-family is three units and up. Mayor Lane felt duplexes should be allowed which allows many families to afford a house and it also helps older homes to be rehabilitated.

Chair Spykman stated he was also in favor of single and two-family and for the two-family one of the units should be occupied by the owner. However, the mechanism should be least onerous and felt filing an annual permit was unnecessary. Chair Spykman then referred to the minimum lot size of 5,400 square feet per dwelling unit and felt this implies to two separate dwelling units. The square footage is per dwelling unit and for a 10,000 square foot lot; the second unit would need the extra square footage so that in the medium density district or this preservation district there is adequate space for a garage etc.

Councilor Jones stated the goal is to make this a walkable community and felt it doesn't have to be in this District but there should be a multi-family somewhere in the close vicinity to downtown.

Mr. Barrett noted of the 180 parcels we are discussing today, only about 50 exceed the 10,800 square feet which is required to have the second unit and nine of those lie in the floodplain, which limits development. Hence, felt only small number of lots qualify to locate a duplex and as a result is in favor of approving the inclusion of duplexes in this proposed new District.

Mr. Lamb in closing stated what he is hearing is a comfort level with two-family homes in this District and that is the understanding staff is going to use to move this process forward. It is also staff's understanding that Dunbar Street and Water Street were going to be removed from this District.

A motion was made by Gary Spykman to continue this public workshop to the July 11 Joint meeting. The motion was seconded by Mayor Kendall Lane and was unanimously approved.

#### **4. Discussion – East Side Redevelopment**

Ms. Kessler stated this is a continued discussion of the east side redevelopment which started at the last meeting. She indicated her focus today is to define and set some context for the east side of Keene and outline some projects currently included in the FY17-21 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and outline next steps staff is planning on taking on this effort.

Ms. Kessler explained East Keene consists of Ward 1 and Ward 2, which is 37% of the land area of Keene. It is rural in nature and borders Roxbury to the east and Sullivan to the north. Because of the vast area staff is proposing the narrowing what is being defined as East Keene for this initiative (smaller subset of Wards 1 and 2); Beaver Street to the north, Eastern Avenue to the East, Brown and Tiffin Streets to the south and Main Street to the west, this is 6% of Keene's total land area. She noted there is a diverse age group of people who live in this area – according to the 2010 census data 19% of persons ages 18 – 24, 20% of persons ages 25 – 44 and 18% of people over the age of 65. In addition to the significant portion of the population living in this area, this area also consists of a significant portion of Keene's housing. 22% of housing is located in this area with 30% of all renter occupied units and 14% of owner occupied units and 30% of vacant units.

Ms. Kessler then went on to explain the development areas. Roxbury Street resembles Main Street; urban and as you move east you transition more into the single-family and two-family units. Water Street to the west has a mix of industrial, residential and other commercial uses and as you move further east it is more residential. Marlboro Street looks different compared to the other collector streets – on the west you start with a collection of residential and commercial uses and as you move east it becomes much more open between uses.

Ms. Kessler then went over the projects currently in the FY17-22 CIP.

Starting with road rehabilitation – the City consists of 127 miles of roadway and this study area has about 14 miles of roads. In the FY17-22 CIP, \$969,857 is designated for road rehabilitation which accounts to 12.5% of road rehabilitation in the City-wide budget.

FY17 – Water Street

FY18 – Dunbar Street, Willow Street, Willow Court, Baker Street, Harrison Street

FY19 – Carpenter Street, Valley Street, Kingsbury Street, Fowler Street

FY20 – Proctor Street, Adams Street, Adams Court, Gates Street, Avalon Street

FY21 – Martin Street

Bridge improvements – In the study area there are six red listed bridges along Beaver Brook. Only one is in the FY18 budget for replacement, which is the Roxbury Street Bridge. Ms. Kessler explained red listed bridges are bridges that have variety of issues and are on a program to be replaced or fixed; these bridges still remain open.

Water and Sewer projects - intrusion and infiltration study scheduled to happen in FY16 for a cost of \$48,750 to fix pipes, pipes joints etc. in the sewer system. In this current CIP there is also repairs scheduled for the 3 MG and 1.5 MG Water storage tank on Roxbury Street which is the primary water supply source for the study area. There is also water main cleaning scheduled in FY18 for Kingsbury Street and in FY20 for Roxbury Street.

Flooding and Stormwater projects – The Beaver Brook Hydrologic Study is scheduled in FY18 for \$150,000 and the Climate Adaptation Vulnerability Assessment for \$50,000 scheduled in FY18 as well as flood management projects for Roxbury Street and Church Street.

Other projects – Carpenter Street Field improvements scheduled for FY20. This is a project the City is partnering with the Conway School of Design. Also, the Victoria Street Extension to Marlboro Street and the Marlboro Street corridor improvements for which \$25,000 (design) scheduled in FY18 and another \$170,000 (improvements) scheduled in FY19 – for transportation improvements.

Other Related projects which have happened in the near future - development of the municipal complex at 350 Marlboro Street (Public Works facility, Police Department, Keene Ice). City owned fiber from the municipal complex to City Hall. This fiber has been leased to at least outside agency. Marlboro Street rezoning, the East Side forum and the complete streets demonstration. Mr. Duffy asked about the video which was done during the complete streets demonstration and asked whether the Committee could see this video. Staff stated perhaps a link could be sent to the Committee.

Ms. Kessler then talked about the Nelson-Nygaard study recommendations. The primary purpose of this study was to look at access management through the corridor, to reduce the number of curb cuts, to find alternative routes for truck traffic, create a greenspace near the Kingsbury property along Beaver Brook, increase access to the rail trail from the neighborhoods south of the rail trail. The report also broke Marlboro Street into three areas; Main Street to Grove Street – suggestions for this section was to narrow travel lanes and to locate for protected bike lanes on either side.

The second portion of the corridor the study focused on was from Grove Street to Baker Street. Here the emphasis is on safe bicycle travel and connectivity to the Rail Trail when possible.

The third portion is from Baker Street to Optical Avenue and here there is focus on improved street scape through landscaping and also focusing on connectivity to the Rail Trail.

Ms. Kessler then went over the proposed next steps as follows: Establish a work plan, involve and engage the community, identify and pursue funding opportunities, establish public and private partnerships.

There are two potential funding sources.

The first is the Transportation Alternative Program – federal funding through DOT. The application for this is due by September 2016, it is an 80% federal funding and a 20% local

match. This is for a \$400,000 minimum project. This application would take some thought and planning to apply. The letter of intent is due by July 1<sup>st</sup>.

The second is the US Department of Transportation TIGER Grant. It is 100% federal funding for a \$1,000,000 minimum award (rural communities with local and private match). Since starting in 2009 there have been 6% of applications awarded. For example for the Concord Complete Street project which was a 10.2 million project cost, the town received 4.7 million in TIGER Grant. There was a significant amount of community involvement that went into this project.

Ms. Kessler stated the City will be applying for the Transportation Alternative Program grant and submitting the letter of intent by July 1<sup>st</sup>.

Councilor Jones asked the Mayor about the Transportation Improvements Capital reserve which was supposed to be used as matching funds and asked what was in this fund. Mayor Lane stated some of these funds were allocated to the Emerald Street sidewalk project in this year's budget but stated he was not sure of the balance. There is about \$100,000 that goes into this fund annually.

Mr. Duffy stated the Council is responsible for allocating funding but asked whether it was appropriate for the Committee to provide concrete recommendations for this project. Chair Richards agreed the Committee could.

## **5. Discussion – CMP Implementation**

Ms. Kessler stated this is a continuation of a discussion which happened earlier in the spring - prioritization of the master plan. An exercise was undertaken to narrow the list down to the top six focus areas. They are as follows:

- Supporting economic development and redevelopment
- Identifying and facilitating more options for workforce housing
- Enhancing and improving broadband infrastructure and access
- Pursuing funding for a community-wide weatherization program
- Identifying ways to retain younger individuals in the community
- Focusing on Keene as an intermodal transportation hub

At the last meeting staff had indicated they would have area experts testify on the subject matters and develop strategies. Ms. Kessler stated she would like to provide some information which would help narrow this list and solicit input from the Committee.

The first item "*Supporting economic development and redevelopment*" and many others inter-relate with that. Since the last time the City has developed an Economic Development Committee which has been meeting on the first and third Tuesdays of the month. This is a nine member Committee and their goal is to develop an economic development strategy before the end of the calendar year. Chair is Mitch Greenwald, staff liaison is Rebecca Landry. They are consulting with subject experts as well as planning on bringing in someone from the State who has expertise in economic development. Mr. Lamb asked whether Ms. Kessler would propose to fold bullet 3 regarding broadband access into economic development strategy as part of what that Committee is doing. Ms. Kessler stated she would like to defer to that to the Committee.



Mr. Duffy did not feel it is appropriate for the Joint Committee to focus on economic development and he was glad there was a Committee working on it. He felt the Joint Committee could focus on identifying and facilitating more options for workforce housing which contributes to economic development. He added he was concerned there was nothing which had to do with the environment or ecology among these priorities. Mr. Duffy went on to say once broadband and workforce housing is addressed the item which talks about retaining younger people would resolve itself.

Councilor Hansel agreed with Mr. Duffy in that as a member of the Economic Development Committee they did look at workforce housing and there was consensus on the Committee that they would focus on other areas as well.

Chair Spykman in response to Mr. Duffy's comment that there is nothing in the list of items regarding the environment – Mr. Duffy added except for weatherization. The Chair stated this was an important item as there are many homes in this community which are “drafty and leaky” and people are pouring money into these homes to heat them. Weatherization would go a long way to save the use of heating oil and felt this was an important environmental aspect. Mr. Duffy agreed it was but felt there was much more which we could address.

Mayor Lane stated he would like to look at Keene as an intermodal transportation hub which would have a major environmental impact on this community. He added there might be federal funds available but not until Keene has a plan.

Councilor Jones noted the Committee went through an entire night picking out these items and did not want to go backwards with this. He indicated items 1 and 3 perhaps should be left for another Committee to focus on but felt the others were important as well. He went on to say he agrees with the Mayor in that transportation fits in with everything and was an important aspect.

Mr. Barrett stated he agreed with Councilor Jones in that these are items the Committee voted on and felt the Committee should move ahead. He added if there are other City Committee addressing specific items then the Joint Committee should take on other items from the list of strategies.

Chair Spykman stated he would like an explanation as to what intermodal transportation hub meant. Mayor Lane explained that this would be an area that deals with bus transportation, parking, bicycles, bike paths, park and ride facilities, electric charging stations which would be available; a plan to bring all these items together.

Ms. Weeks asked Councilor Hansel whether the Economic Development Committee was also considering broadband. Councilor Hansel stated it has been discussed quite a bit and suggested keeping the list as is but perhaps focus on other items on the list. Ms. Weeks suggested smaller groups within the Joint Committee to address one or more items. She stated she would be interested in working on weatherization. Mr. Lamb stated the Committee could focus on certain items and staff plans on bringing subject experts to address these issues.

Mr. Duffy asked for more information on MAST. As far as weatherization was concerned, he referred to the SEED District and the Returning Homes Program and stated he would like an update on these items. Mr. Lamb stated nothing has changed since the last time as staff does not have direction to move forward on this.

Councilor Chadbourne agreed the Joint Committee should not duplicate efforts but felt it would be necessary to stay informed and ask the Economic Development Committee to provide a report on a regular basis.

Councilor Hansel stated based on today's discussion he would rate the strategies as follows:

- Identifying and facilitating more options for workforce housing
- Focusing on Keene as an intermodal transportation hub
- Pursuing funding for a community-wide weatherization program
- Identifying ways to retain younger individuals in the community
- Supporting economic development and redevelopment
- Enhancing and improving broadband infrastructure and access

A motion was made by Mayor Kendall Lane to go along with the proposal made by Councilor Hansel to rearrange the strategies as listed above. The motion was seconded by Gary Spykman and was unanimously approved.

Ms. Weeks asked staff to look into the trees located at the Hannaford Plaza. She felt about four or five trees looked dead and ask that these be replanted especially with the resurfacing work which is being pursued at this location. Mr. Lamb stated this is a Planning Board item and he would look into it.

**6. Next Meeting – Monday, July 11, 2016**

**7. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 pm.  
Respectfully submitted,

Krishni Pahl,  
Minute Taker

Reviewed by Rhett Lamb, Planning Director  
Edits, L. Langella