

**CITY OF KEENE  
NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES**

**Monday, July 25, 2016**

**6:30 PM**

**Council Chambers**

Members Present:

Gary Spykman, Chairman  
Nathaniel Stout, Vice-Chair  
Mayor Kendall Lane  
Andrew Bohannon  
Christine Weeks  
George Hansel  
Pamela Russell Slack

Members Not Present:

Douglas Barrett  
James Duffy  
Chris Cusack  
Tammy Adams

Staff:

Michele Chalice, Planner  
Tara Kessler, 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** – June 27, 2016

Ms. Weeks offered the following corrections:

Page 4 *if the motion for rehearing in front of the ZBA is denied then it will go before the Superior Court* – Ms. Weeks asked whether it should say Supreme Court not Superior Court as stated. Mayor Lane clarified Superior Court was in fact corrected as stated.

Page 7, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph ... *96 one-bedroom, 36-two bedroom, 168 total bedrooms....* Ms. Weeks felt it should say 132 bedroom not 168 bedrooms.

Chair Spykman stated it was in fact 132 units not 168 bedrooms..

Page 8, third paragraph ... *This complex however, would target a higher range, \$40,000 range...*

Ms. Weeks felt Mr. Marcotte stated their target range was \$70,000 for couple.

Councilor Hansel did not recall the number being that high.

Chair Spykman recalled the \$30,000 - \$40,000 range.

Page 11, the name *Joslyn Kimball Frank* should read as *Joslin Kimball Frank*.

Page 11, last sentence *He added they don't plan on getting rid of this building unless someone asks them to, but will attempt to work with the abutters.*

Ms. Weeks asked the Board if they recalled which building was being referred to here. The Mayor stated the building being referred to is the one they are filing the application for; the large building. Ms. Weeks felt the word “asks” did not seem appropriate as the abutters might not want the building. The Chair felt Mr. Marcotte might have been referring to the City. It was agreed the word “asks” would be changed to “required”.

A motion was made by George Hansel to accept the June 27, 2016 minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mayor Kendall Lane and was unanimously approved.

### **III. Public Hearing**

1. **SPR-07-16 – MoCo Arts – 38 Roxbury Street – Site Plan** – Applicant, MoCo Arts proposes to construct a new 2-story, 16,533 SF performing arts center at the site of the former YMCA. The site is .79 acres in size and located in the Central Business Zoning District and the Historic District (TMP# 017-07-016).

#### **A. Board Determination of Completeness.**

Planner Michele Chalice recommended the Board grant the exemptions and accept Application SPR-07-16 as complete. A motion was made by Mayor Kendall Lane that the Board accept this application as complete. The motion was seconded by George Hansel and was unanimously approved.

#### **B. Public Hearing**

Mr. Jim Phippard of MGJ Realty addressed the Board on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Phippard explained this property is the former YMCA property located on Roxbury Street,  $\frac{3}{4}$  acre in size next to a residential property owned by Cheshire Housing. On the east is a play field previously owned by the Keene Middle School. This field is slated to be turned into an apartment complex in the near future.

The applicant's property is currently occupied by a masonry building, 48,500 square feet in size. The applicant's proposal is to remove this building and replace it with a new two-story building, 16,533 square feet in size. Chair Spykman asked for the difference in footprint between the two buildings. Mr. Phippard stated the current building occupies more than  $\frac{2}{3}$ <sup>rd</sup>s of the property and the applicant's building would be 8,000 square feet.

There will be two curb cuts for this property and they would be one-way curb cuts; the easterly curb cut would be an entrance only and the curb cut to the west will be an exit only. At this westerly exit there is an easement owned by the City and by Cheshire Housing which allows for cars exiting the bottom level of the parking garage to exit onto Roxbury Street. This easement will be unchanged by this proposal. There will be 23 on-site parking spaces created for this site even though this property is located in the Central Business District; angles spaces on the east side, pull in parking at the rear of the building and a double lane driveway on the westerly portion of the property which will serve as a drop off and pick up area. Mr. Phippard explained cars will enter on the east, queue up around the building (there is sufficient room for queuing for 20 cars). This is an effort to prevent cars from backing up into the street. Mayor Lane asked where the access point to the building would be for a student who gets dropped off. Mr. Phippard stated there are two entry points; if they park in the rear there is a rear entry, there is also a sidewalk which surrounds the building and referred to where the main entrance is located. There is no access point near the drop off but there is also an access point at the easterly entrance.

Ms. Weeks stated she understands how drop off would be handled but asked how pickup would work; whether a young child would have to go outside looking for their parent. Mr. Phippard stated this would depend on the age of the child; the youngest kids will always be escorted to the building and from the building, older students could come out on their own. There will also be staff people who would assist with this. He further stated queuing of cars is currently happening on Railroad Street which has caused issues over the years. Hence, the reason so much effort was put into this site to avoid queuing on the street.

Mr. Phippard went on to say during the site visit, Board members noticed issues with line of sight when exiting onto Roxbury Street because of the fencing that is located there right now.

The applicant is proposing to open this up and create an at-grade courtyard area with permeable pavers which would improve the line of sight quite a bit. He went on to say the permeable pavers are part of the LID measures to address stormwater runoff on site. There is also going to be an infiltration system which circles three sides of the building where stormwater from the rooftops and the paved area would collect in that system. This drainage passes through hooded outlet pipes to get sedimentation out. Groundwater is not an issue for this site which is greater than seven feet at every location. The property has been designed for a 50-year design storm with no runoff leaving the site.

The new building will be constructed closer to the street than the existing building. There is also landscaping being created around that front area adjacent to the court yard. There will also be a fenced-in area in the front with a three-inch caliper tree where outside activities could be conducted. Mr. Phippard referred to areas where two other trees are going to be located.

The building itself will contain a black box theater which could seat up to 200 people, there will be three studios for daily programming as well as support areas such as green rooms, changing rooms and rest rooms.

Lighting – outside lighting will be wall mounted full cutoff LED fixtures. There will be three pole lights located at the rear of the property for rear parking and for the dumpster.

Dumpster – will be enclosed with similar material used for the building

Mr. Phippard then turned the presentation over to local architect Katie Cassidy Sutherland. Ms. Cassidy Sutherland began by noting that the building is located in a pedestrian friendly manner; hence, the larger expanse which has no windows has been located to the back of the lot. In front of that is a translucent lobby with a glass store front system to keep with other store fronts in the area. There are also some glass store front windows at the front of the building. The southwest corner which faces Central Square has a more pedestrian friendly look. The other side of the building which faces Roxbury Street has more residential buildings and the scale of the applicant's building compliments that. The windows are larger as they face Central Square and smaller as they face the residential area.

Ms. Cassidy Sutherland added that they have gone before the Historic District Commission and have obtained a Certificate of Appropriateness. She referred to the massing study they did of the building compared to other buildings on Roxbury Street. The materials used are consistent with what is used downtown but also has a more contemporary feel to it. Ms. Cassidy Sutherland referred to the rendering of the Black Box Theater which is a 38-foot tall building which is as tall as the current YMCA building. The studios at the front are about 34 feet high. The side that faces the lower part of Roxbury Street is not being considered a primary façade because there is an understanding a new development is going to be located on the grass field next door. There is brick on the façade as well as the translucent glass.

Towards the back of the site is where the faculty offices and green rooms are going to be located. There is aluminum wall paneling being proposed for this side of the site which is not visible to pedestrians. She also noted to the west facing side which again will not be visible from the public way. This concluded Ms. Cassidy Sutherland's presentation.

Mr. Stout noted that soils in this portion of the neighborhood have caused difficulty to anchor a building and asked how that issue is being addressed for this building. Mr. Phippard stated the

geo technical work is still underway; soils borings have been done but the existing building is causing difficulty to try and complete borings under that building. Hence, a complete geo technical report will not be available for a few more months. He stated it is anticipated the new building will be constructed on piles similar to how new buildings have been constructed downtown.

Mayor Lane asked where the Keene Brook runs in relation to this building. Mr. Phippard stated his understanding is this portion of Keene Brook was changed to a 48-inch storm drain which passes below the parking garage and comes out into the alley, under the driveway to Roxbury Street and then to Beaver Brook. The Mayor stated before piles are driven into the ground it would be necessary to make sure where exactly this brook is located. He added the brook is encased in a large brick archway configuration which occupies a very large area.

Ms. Weeks asked for the timeline for this project. Mr. Phippard invited Mr. Reagan Messer to address this question. Reagan Messer Executive Director of MoCo Arts of 214 Court Street stated they would like to begin demolition of the current YMCA Building by August, continue with the geo technical studies, and if everything goes as planned construction will start by March - April with an anticipated completion date of December 2017.

Ms. Weeks asked whether there are any environmental concerns due to taking the building down. Mr. Messer stated they have received a hazardous materials report and from his understanding this is pretty normal for a building that age and this will be addressed before the demolition begins. He indicated the hazardous material discovered is mostly asbestos.

Chair Spykman asked about the on-site traffic and asked for explanation of other traffic impacts for this site. Mr. Phippard stated the applicant has hired Stephen Pernaw, Traffic Engineer who has looked at the previous use and used that as a baseline. Based on this calculation, the morning peak hour the trips are estimated to be 100 vehicle trips and for the YMCA the morning peak hour trip generation was 140 trips. During the PM peak hour the trip generation was 133 vehicle trips which coincided with the YMCA use.

The Traffic Engineer then looked at the existing MoCo Arts traffic generation. He noted the manner in which this generation was obtained is by the Traffic Engineering renting a room at the Marriot Hotel and setting up video camera and videotaping every entry and exit and then turned that into the peak numbers. He also doubled those numbers to allow for growth at the new facility and came up with estimates for trip generation. Mr. Phippard referred to page 20 of the Staff Report where these numbers are summarized on Table 1. The AM peak hour trips are very low as most of MoCo's programs are after school. For the new building 129 PM peak hour trips are being estimated.

The applicant also asked the traffic engineer to look at the summer program numbers. MoCo Arts runs a CAKE summer camp program and a Cupcake summer camp program. The number of participants for these programs is much larger. Those trip numbers appear on Table 2; 102 for AM peak hour, the former YMCA was 100 trips; the PM peak hour for MoCo Arts is 111 vehicle trips and 133 trips for the former YMCA. These numbers assume these programs will stay the same at the new facility and added these camp programs also utilize other properties in the City (UCC Church and Salvation Army) and they plan to continue utilizing these properties as well.

Mr. Phippard referred to the fenced in court yard and the raised retaining wall on the east side of this new property. When the YMCA was open there was no on-site parking. Most patrons of the YMCA crossed the street to access the Wells Street parking lot but ignored the crosswalk located on Roxbury Street. However, the exit which is now going to be located at the east will channel patrons towards this crosswalk, which he felt is a great improvement as far as safety was concerned.

Ms. Weeks asked about the shared curb cut which was brought up by the developer of the old Middle School building at the last Planning Board Meeting. Mr. Phippard stated they were approached about this issue the day they were turning in their application. Mr. Phippard stated Mr. Marcotte had sent him a plan where the curb cut to the west was shifted slightly to the property line and widened to act as a shared curb cut. Mr. Phippard noted that applicant's plan also has parking spaces right off this property line. He indicated MoCo's concern is the queuing of cars as explained previously. This will not only block MoCo's parking spaces but also Mr. Marcotte's client's spaces as well. Initially, this might work because that applicant will own and manage this property but their long term plan is to turn that building into condominiums and selling those apartments to multiple individuals. At that point when there is an issue, you are now dealing with 132 property owners whose spaces are being used, blocked etc. The applicant feels with the queuing issue this shared curb cut might not be the best option for them.

Mr. Phippard then referred to the conditions proposed by staff:

1.a. Staff is recommending traffic signage for the east side parking spaces (for the angled spaces). Mr. Phippard stated the reason for this is to warn people when traffic is queuing they could be blocked. The applicant doesn't feel this necessary because the people who are going to be using these spaces are either employees or parents who would overtime realize if this is an issue not to park here or change their times for using these spaces. The applicant feels this is an operational problem and if it continues to become an issue it will be controlled by MoCo.

1.b. This item is regarding traffic signage for the westerly exit as a recommendation from the Police Department. Mr. Phippard stated the cars exiting the lower level of the adjacent parking garage would enter the shared driveway turn right to exit onto Roxbury Street. Mr. Phippard felt that corner of the parking garage has good visibility as there is an opening in the wall for about 50 feet. The new building is also being constructed further back from the parking garage. Mr. Phippard stated he originally did agree to a stop sign but has now come to realize there is no place to locate one without creating a visual obstruction or prevent the sign being hit by a vehicle.

Mr. Phippard stated he suggested a compromise during the site visit and that is to paint a Stop Sign in white on the pavement and noted there is already a right turn sign painted on the pavement. He indicated the City Engineer also agreed a stop sign would create a visual obstruction. He further stated normally a stop sign is mounted eight feet above the ground but in this instance the bottom of the sign would be 5½ feet above ground because of the ceiling of the parking deck. Mr. Phippard went on to say most people who use this parking garage are city employees and know how the traffic flow works at this location. Mr. Phippard stated the applicant is willing to work with the Planning Director and City Engineer to come up with a solution.

Councilor Hansel stated he was agreeable to painting a stop sign on the pavement and added he didn't need any more obstruction hanging lower than six feet to hit his head on.

1.a. Ms. Russell Slack referred to 1.a. where it talks about *reservation of these parking spots for "Staff Only"*. Mr. Phippard stated his understanding is the applicant did not want to designate these spaces for staff.

Ms. Weeks referred to the queue and asked at what point a vehicle could bypass the queue. Mr. Phippard referred to an area half way around where there is room to bypass the queue. At Roxbury Street you can take a right or left and according to the estimate done at the existing facility about 80% would travel left.

Mr. Bohannon stated he is not concerned about people getting trapped in these spaces and added he has experience with this type of queuing and parents know each other and are courteous enough to back up their cars to let cars move.

Mr. Phippard went on to refer to condition 2 which refers to an urban heat island at the rear of the site. Mr. Phippard stated he disagrees with this representation. Mr. Phippard stated the reason he disagrees with this representation is because the area being referred to is located on the north side of the building which is going to be nearly 34 feet tall and pointed out to the other taller buildings that surround this site. He stated this site gets very little sunlight and hence did not feel it should be categorized as an urban heat island. Mr. Phippard added there is also concern as to where more trees can be located and referred to the area where there are going to be screen plantings. Mr. Phippard stated he would not be able to fit 300 cubic feet of soil in this location to plant a tree without going five feet deep for most species of trees. Some trees do have a very long tap root, such as nut trees but didn't feel this was a good option. He referred to the area in the rear where there is an underground propane tank, utility lines coming into the building, electrical lines that go overhead and the sprinkler line which does not permit the planting of any more trees. He referred to the three trees that are being proposed and noted none of these are required under zoning in the Central Business District. He asked that proposed conditions 2.a. and b. not be required.

Mr. Phippard stated staff had asked for revision on the reduced lighting and this has been submitted. Staff has also referred to a dark corner on the site. Mr. Phippard stated this seems to be the issue with the Development Standards which he hoped would be fixed when the land use code changes are made. Mr. Phippard explained lighting levels are required to be brought to zero at the property line. In some cases, like what the applicant is proposing to do there is a stairwell they would like to relocate to the rear corner to provide access to the second level of the parking garage. Light levels at this corner are at zero and staff would like the applicant to increase it, which the applicant can do only if the Board waives its standards.

Mr. Phippard went on to say 3.a. is requiring a motion sensor at *City/Central Square Housing garage exit at the MoCo drop-off/pick-up*. Mr. Phippard stated his preference is not to use motion sensors unless it is at a controlled circumstance like a garage entrance or front steps of a house because of how sensitive these sensors can be. This concluded Mr. Phippard's presentation.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Chalice began by complimenting this project. Ms. Chalice stated the Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic District was filed on May 18<sup>th</sup> and in the Staff Report there is no discussion about Standard 19, Aesthetics as this has been addressed. She noted this is a project which has several LID measures which is something staff has encouraged for all its site plan applications. This is a site which has no required parking but the applicant is providing 23 spaces. This is a site which also does not have landscape requirement but there is a

masterfully designed landscape plan to accommodate the children who are going to use the facility and this landscape plan will also help direct pedestrians in a safe manner to where they need to go. Ms. Chalice stated the City is fortunate to have this type of site design in its downtown. She felt this site design creates an active street scape which is what the City is envisioning for all its new development.

With reference to signage, Ms. Chalice stated her recollection is the City's Engineer's recommendation was to not follow the request of the Police Department – right turn only and a Stop Sign. Ms. Chalice stated she will check the email from the Engineer and anything that is proposed will need to be approved by the City Engineer and the Planning Director.

In terms of lighting, there is a request for increased lighting for pedestrian safety and noted to the brick building façade which would prevent light spilling onto adjoining properties. Ms. Chalice also called the Board's attention to the issue with the construction timing and future maintenance of the relocated stairway access; a meeting date has been scheduled and did not see any issues with coming up with some sort of an agreement which all parties can be comfortable with.

Chair Spykman asked Ms. Chalice to comment on staff's recommendation for more trees. Ms. Chalice stated the applicant is already providing trees where trees are not required and added there will be children from the facility using all the greenspace that is available and she would maintain the request to locate a tree at the rear which would be beneficial but due to the circumstance, would not force the issue. Mayor Lane asked whether additional trees would require giving up some of the parking spaces. Ms. Chalice agreed it would.

Ms. Weeks referred to page 28 and asked whether it would be prudent to designate one lane as left turn only and one as right turn only. Mr. Phippard stated this is the intention but the rendering wasn't very clear.

Councilor Hansel asked if the Board was to eliminate the stop sign whether the ultimate decision would still be up to the City Engineer. Ms. Chalice stated she would not recommend taking this out. Chair Spykman stated the manner in which this condition is worded, does not necessarily mean it has to be a stop sign; it calls for signage and Mr. Phippard has proposed a white sign on the pavement. Mayor Lane stated he has no problem painting a sign on the pavement but questioned who would be responsible for the maintenance. Ms. Chalice stated this would be part of the agreement and noted the conditions being deleted are 1.a. but retaining b. and c.

Mayor Lane asked about condition 3; he stated he agrees about issues with light sensors and wouldn't want to see lighting next to a residential building but felt it was necessary to increase the lighting at the stairway. He asked how the Board handles this item. Chair Spykman suggested rewording this condition to eliminate the necessity for a light sensor but a requirement for lighting at this location. Ms. Chalice agreed to deleting 3.a. and retaining 3.b. Councilor Hansel asked whether 3.b. has adequate language to locate a light at the stairway. Ms. Chalice stated *to be approved by City Engineer and Planning Director* could be added here. Mr. Phippard asked whether it could then be agreed that the applicant could increase the light level at this stairway. Ms. Weeks asked for clarity whether it should be stated *a waiver has been granted*. Ms. Chalice stated the Board does not have the ability to site a waiver because a waiver has not been advertised.

Chair Spykman asked for public comment next.

Mr. Michael Blair, MoCo Arts Board President read the following for the record:

*My name is Mike Blair and I live at 175 West Surry Road in Keene and I'm proud to be the current Board President of Moco Arts. MoCo needs a larger space. We've struggled for years to meet the spaced needs of our MoCo family during times of strong growth coupled with expanded programs. Our programming is primarily education-based, serving kids from 18 months-18 yrs old and we provide a wonderfully supportive atmosphere for kids interested in theater and dance. Our goal is to stay in the immediate downtown area and the old YMCA building sits on a lot that provides MoCo with a terrific opportunity to build even closer to Main St and Central Square and allows for safe pick up and drop off which is less than idea at our current Railroad St. location.*

*As I'm sure you're all aware, a few months ago the HDC approved our application to demolish the old YMCA and build our new facility in its place. We ask for your support in allowing us to revitalize this location and make it a vibrant area once again as we transform what is now an unsightly situation into an efficient, new building that fits the character of the downtown area and provides MoCo with the facility they need for the foreseeable future.*

*I offer my full support for this project, knowing full well that it will help to keep Keene vibrant and well connected to the Arts. Thank you for your consideration.*

Mr. Phippard offered a correction. The correct name for this entity should be *MoCo Arts Education Center*. He further stated he also wanted to clarify that this facility does more than performing arts; they would be able to add more programs at this new facility, such as backstage, lighting, and sound activities.

Chair Spykman read into the record a letter from William N. Prigge:

*It is my understanding that there will be a Planning Board hearing pertaining to the site plan review for MoCo Arts on July 25, 2016. I believe this project is very worthy of support on at least two-levels. First would be the cleanup of the mess created by the semi-demolition of the former Keene YMCA building, and have the salutary effect of creating an edifice enhancing the quality of the neighborhood.*

*On a more important level would be the quality and contribution of the institution to the city at large, To my knowledge, MoCo Arts presently has top-quality programs, however, the current location apparently has limitations on the interior, and certainly has limitation on the exterior as far as traffic and safety of young children is concerned. The proposal to have off-street parking and waiting areas would certainly be a great improvement.*

*I am sure there are other "positives" that could be expressed, and I am sure they will be by friends and supporters, but as neighbors, we heartily support this project.*

Ms. Ann Henderson of 16 Granite Street, Board member of MoCo Arts was the next speaker. Ms. Henderson stated that MoCo Arts started 25 years ago in an abandoned machine shop as a way to introduce the arts into this community. MoCo is now ready to move into the next phase and felt this project represents the positive development of arts in Keene.

As far as the background of this project, Ms. Henderson stated the applicant has done their homework; MoCo has a great fundraising team who is working very hard, they have a local architect, a local building manager, they have done due diligence with respect to the environmental issues and have been very conscience about this project because they take it very



seriously. Ms. Henderson stated MoCo is anxious to work with the City and bring life back to the old YMCA site and felt this was a good project and hoped the City would join in this partnership.

Mr. John Hoffman of 279 Boulder Road, Sullivan, Chairman of the Capital Campaign Committee read the following for the record:

*I want to go on record recording my strongest support for MoCo's project.*

*My wife, Jean, and I have been deeply involved with Moco for many years, and Jean served for a time as Chair of the Board of Trustees. We have been major financial contributors throughout our association with this extraordinary organization, and as Chair of the Capital Campaign Committee I am of course a proponent of the current building project.*

*I also have a broader perspective from engagement in many Keene and Monadnock area programs, and have a dedicated interest in the civic economic vitality of the downtown Keene environment.*

*Accordingly, the plan to replace the dilapidated hulk of the former YMCA with a thriving downtown educational and performing arts center provides great benefits for the community, as well as enabling MoCo to better – and more safely perform its mission.*

*So I ask that my views be included in the materials before the Planning Board as it considers MoCo's presentation.*

With no further comments, the Chairman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bohannon commended this project and referred to the mural MoCo has painted at its current facility and added that there is another mural that awaits MoCo at the bottom deck of the parking garage.

Ms. Weeks agreed with Mr. Bohannon and stated this is an exciting project and felt it would add a lot to Roxbury Street. She complimented MoCo's Board.

Ms. Russell Slack stated she was very excited about this project. She stated her three children benefited from this organization and hopes her grandchild will also attend MoCo. She stated the architecture fits well into this neighborhood.

Mayor Lane stated this is a major start to the renovations on the east side of the downtown portion of Keene. The Mayor felt this project will have a major impact on the redevelopment on the east side of Keene and will bring vitality and strengthen that portion of the City. He felt this project will have a "spill over" effect on Roxbury Street and the east side corridor.

Councilor Hansel agreed with what others had said and complimented the manner in which the application was done. The Councilor stated he also appreciated the architect attending the site visit which helped explain the project.

Chair Spykman complimented the architect for this well designed building and felt it would be a great enhancement to the downtown. He stated he also likes the fact they chose a local architect and also chose to stay downtown.

C. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Mayor Kendall Lane that the Planning Board grant approve SPR-01-16, as shown on the plan set entitled “Proposed New Facility for MOCO ARTS Education Center 38-42 Roxbury Street, Keene, NH”, Tax Map 017-07-016, prepared for MGJ Realty, dated June 17, and revised July 6, 2016 drawn by Brick Stone Land Use Consultants at various scales with the following conditions prior to signature by Planning Board Chair:

1. Prior to signature, submittal of a revised Site Plan for the following, to be approved by the City Engineer and Planning Director:
  - a. Traffic Signage for the west side intersection where exiting parking garage users merge into exiting MoCo center users.
  - b. An agreement specifying the details, construction timing and future maintenance responsibilities of a relocated stairway access to the second floor municipal parking garage.
2. Prior to signature, submittal of a revised Lighting Plan for the following to be approved by the City Engineer and Planning Director showing increase in the lighting levels for the two (front and rear), west-side, walkway areas, which may exceed the required perimeter lighting levels.
3. Owner’s signature on plan.
4. Submittal of security for landscaping, erosion control measures and an “as-built” plan in a form and amount acceptable to the Planning Director and City Engineer.

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

**IV. Planning Director Reports**

**V. Upcoming Dates of Interest – August 2016**

Planning Board Meeting – Monday, August 22, 6:30 PM

Planning Board Steering Committee – Tuesday, August 9, 5:30 PM

Joint PB/PLD Committee – Monday, August 8, 6:30 PM

Planning Board Site Visits – Wednesday, August 17, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed

On a unanimous vote, the meeting adjourned at 7:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Krishni Pahl  
Minute Taker

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