

**CITY OF KEENE
NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

Monday, November 27, 2017

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

Members Present

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

Members Not Present:

Mayor Kendall Lane
Tammy Adams Alternate
David Webb Alternate

Staff:

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

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 – October 23, 2017

A motion was made by Councilor George Hansel to accept the October 23, 2017 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Pamela Russell Slack and was unanimously approved.

III. Continued Public Hearing

1. **SPR-11-17 – Water & Grove Streets – Site Plan** – Applicant Wendy Pelletier of Cardinal Surveying & Land Planning, on behalf owners, Jeanette Wright and Michael Lynch, proposes a commercial parking lot. The site is 4,635 SF in size and located in the High Density Zoning District (TMP# 028-03-011). The Applicant is requesting a Waiver from Development Standard #8 “Screening.”

A. **Public Hearing**

Applicant’s representative Wendy Pelletier of Cardinal Surveying and Land Planning addressed the Board first. Ms. Pelletier stated this has been an existing parking lot and the applicant is asking that it be continued to be used as a parking lot. Ms. Pelletier stated it is mis-labeled as commercial but noted the only people who would be parking here are tenants who live in the area. There are going to be 11 spaces and planters will be added to the lot. The lot is 100% paved and the applicant does not plan on changing that. There will be some striping added to delineate the spaces. A post and chain fence will be added. The Police Department asked that a solid fence not be added for security concerns and for graffiti issues. No other improvements are being proposed. With respect to lighting, the average reading in the middle of the site is 0.11 foot candles, 0 foot candles at one corner and 0.25 foot candles at the opposite corner. There are two existing curb cuts but one of the planters will block one of those curb cuts, which would make the curb cut on Grove Street just an exit only as per request of engineering staff. This concluded Ms. Pelletier’s presentation.

Chair Spykman questioned Ms. Pelletier’s characterization of this site as a non-commercial parking lot. He stated that he understood these spaces were going to be rented or leased, which would make it

a commercial enterprise. Ms. Pelletier stated the use of these spaces would be connected to the residences in the area and they will not be connected to any business downtown or elsewhere.

Chair Spykman stated the Board has also not received a clear answer as to why this site cannot be properly landscaped. The Chair noted the back corner which has zero foot candles does not meet the Board's lighting standard. Ms. Pelletier referred to a rendering of a solar light which would be mounted on the pole to provide lighting for this corner. These lights could also be on sensors. As far as planters, she noted it is not unusual to locate planters on concrete. The Chair did not feel this would meet the Board's standards. Ms. Pelletier stated these planters will be anchored into the pavement so they can't be moved around; this is so that paving does not need to be dug up. As far as these planters having issues with snow plowing, she felt this would be an issue, regardless of what is planted on this site. She felt the planters will be off the ground so there is a chance they won't be affected by the salt.

Staff comments were next. Planner Tara Kessler addressed the Board and stated staff had not received any changes to the plan until this afternoon, so staff has not had sufficient time to provide comments on these recently submitted materials. The concerns from the previous Planning Board meeting remain the same. With respect to the lighting, the applicant's photometric plan shows that the site does not meet the Planning Board lighting standard, which is an average of 0.5 foot candles for a site such as this. Ms. Kessler stated the applicant could ask for a waiver from this standard, but this waiver request would need to be noticed ten days in advance of the meeting, hence a waiver from the lighting standard cannot be granted if it was requested this evening.

With respect to the planters, there was concern from staff as to the planters not being connected to the ground. If the planters do not connect with the earth/soil underneath, it is staff's opinion that this does not qualify as landscaping per the Development Standards.

With respect to screening, the applicant has requested a waiver. The applicant is proposing a metal post and chain between this site and the abutters to the west and south. This post and chain may provide a partial barrier to prevent snow from piling on adjacent lots, but it would not screen the glare from vehicle headlights. Ms. Kessler stated the applicant has requested a waiver from this screening standard and referred to the waiver criteria as follows:

- a) *That granting the waiver will not be contrary to the spirit and intent of these Regulations;*
- b) *That granting the waiver will not increase the potential for creating adverse impacts to abutters, the community or the environment; and*
- c) *That granting the waiver has not been shown to diminish the property values of abutting properties.*
- d) *Consideration will also be given to whether strict conformity with the regulations or Development Standards would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant.*

Ms. Kessler noted the Board did receive a letter from an abutter expressing concern with headlights shining onto their property (abutter to the south). This concern was discussed by the Board at the last meeting and no changes have been made to the plan since that time.

Ms. Kessler stated staff recommends continuing this public hearing to the December meeting so the applicant could try to meet the Board's standards if the applicant was willing to request an extension of the Board's 65-day decision deadline, which expires between now and the next meeting. Mr. Lamb explained the term "by mutual agreement," which is the method the Board has used in the past whereby the applicant requests an extension of this decision deadline either in written form or provides a clear indication at the meeting that the applicant is requesting this extension (as long as the record indicates same).

The Chair asked for public comment. The Chairman referred to a letters included in the Board's packet, one from Tim Symonds of Tim Holdings LLC and the other from Greenwald Realty. With no further comment from the public, the Chairman closed the public hearing.

Councilor Hansel stated nothing has changed on this plan since the last time the applicant was before the Board, and because he was not inclined to approve it the last time, he encourages the applicant permit the Board to continue this item so that the outstanding items the Board had concerns about could be appropriately addressed. Mr. Stout agreed with Councilor Hansel.

The Chair reopened the public hearing to hear from the applicant's representative. Ms. Pelletier requested an extension of the Planning Board's 65-day decision deadline to December 18, 2017. The Chair closed the public hearing again.

B. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Councilor George Hansel that the Planning Board grant the request from Wendy Pelletier of Cardinal Land Surveying to extend the Planning Board's 65-day decision deadline for SPR 11-17 to December 18, 2017 and to continue the public hearing for SPR 11-17 to the December 18, 2017 Planning Board meeting.

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

2. **SPR-13-17 – Emerald Street Substation – Site Plan** – Applicant VHB on behalf owner Public Service of NH dba Eversource proposes to rebuild the existing substation at the west end of Emerald Street. A Surface Water Protection Conditional Use Permit Application is included in this submission (SWP-CUP-2017-01). The site is 2.52 acres in size and located in the Commerce & SEED Zoning Districts (TMP# 047-03-009). The Applicant is requesting a waiver from Planning Board Development Standard #19, "Architecture and Visual Appearance."

A. Public Hearing

Mr. David Fenstermacher from VHB addressed the Board first. He indicated the last time the outstanding items the applicant Eversource had to address related to meeting the Board's stormwater standard, soil containment and erosion control measures. He indicated one of the first items the applicant focused on was the net zero stormwater runoff number and the best way to reduce this number was to reduce the size of the footprint. He referred to the square portion of the site on the north – this has been brought back 40 feet on either side and the impervious surface has been reduced by about 800 square feet. There was a secondary access which was going to be in gravel, this has now been changed to reinforced grass which you can drive on but has the feel of grass. These changes now meet the net zero stormwater runoff numbers.

The other issue the applicant focused on was the seasonal high water table, these numbers were also submitted. As far as the percolation rate, when the size of the footprint was reduced, the need for the dry well was no longer necessary but the applicant would like to retain this dry well for an added siltation catch benefit.

Mr. Fenstermacher talked about the lot across the street. Eversource has a consultant on board who is going to provide a Soil Management Plan. This concluded Mr. Fenstermacher's presentation.

Vice-Chair Barrett stated his understanding was that the reinforced grass was not necessary to meet the net zero stormwater runoff numbers and was more for visual appeal and asked what this would look

like. Mr. Fenstermacher stated they are honeycomb-like structures that allow for grass to grow – they are made out of concrete.

The Chair asked for staff comments next. Ms. Chalice addressed the Board and stated what the applicant had stated are all positive aspects. The site size has been reduced which has brought the site to net zero stormwater runoff which was an initial concern. There is now data to confirm that the water table has sufficient depth for stormwater infiltration. And uses for the site across the street have been clarified (page 18 has a detailed list). The reason for concern on the adjacent uses is because of the proximity of the area of construction material movement to the creek's embankment. The silt fence being proposed only goes to the property corner and does not protect the stream embankment from silt/sand runoff to the bridge abutment shown on the photo. The Soil Containment Plan staff requested could show protections so that no silt runs off into the creek during storm events. This Soil Containment Plan will need to be approved by the City Engineer. This concluded staff comments.

Chair Spykman stated he had asked about the structure across the street, as to whether some exterior work could be done to this building and last month the applicant had indicated this could be addressed. Ms. Chalice stated staff had not received any information about this building. Ms. Ashley Ruprecht addressed the Chair's question – She stated the applicant has agreed to replace the plywood window openings with brick that would match the Control House.

The Chairman asked for public comment. Mr. Toby Tousley of 499 Washington Street noted this project was located in a Commerce Zoning District which would render a utility sub-station a non-conforming use and because this is an enlargement to a non-conforming use, he asked whether this item has been before the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a variance request. He noted Section 102-210 says that such enlargement must go before the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a variance request before it comes before the Planning Board. Mr. Lamb stated his understanding would be that the applicant met with the Zoning Administrator who made a determination that it was not an expansion and that therefore, the project did not have to go before the Zoning Board. Chair Spykman stated from the Planning Board's point of view, this issue is not an item under their purview. Mr. Tousley stated this matter cannot continue if proper procedure has not been followed. Mr. Lamb reiterated if the Zoning Administrator did not determine this was an expansion of a non-conforming use, there is no restriction to the Planning Board hearing. On the other hand, if a re-examination of this determination is made by the Zoning staff that there has been an enlargement, then the Board cannot act until the matter goes before and is granted a variance from the relevant zoning regulation. He added that because staff had not heard from the Zoning Administrator, the Board could act on this item.

Mr. Tousley went on to say the Board skipped over the issue of screening last month and stated he had requested screening on the eastern side of this site facing his side of the property. He added this area used to be industrial but this has all changed now and there are residences in this area now. He did not feel it was an unreasonable request to ask for screening and expressed his frustration with the applicant not wanting to address this issue with him. He added it had been told to him that slats cannot be added but noted Section 8A precludes slats only for dumpster screening. He felt the police not being able to see through these slats should not be applicable here. Mr. Tousley stated he wanted some type of screening on his side of the site.

Dr. Cusack noted the Board did not ignore the screening issue last month, it was just that the Police Department did not want it. However, felt some sort of screening would be necessary.

Mr. Bohannon asked whether the applicant could talk about the screening. Kurt Nelson and Ashley Ruprecht addressed the Board. Mr. Nelson stated they have had conversations with the abutter and

would like to address the issue with screening, however, are constrained with what they can do. As far as a vegetative screening – this is not possible. There is no soil or an area where anything can be planted. It is also against substation standards to have trees right against the fence which could be something people or children could use to climb over. There are plantings however, being proposed for the north side.

Mr. Bohannon asked whether something like a windscreen has been thought of for the fence. Mr. Nelson stated this is not something they have given any thought to, but referred to the concern the Police Department had raised with respect to being able to see into the site which is a concern they share as well. However, they were willing to come up with some practical solution.

Vice-Chair Barrett stated there was concern raised last month about a fence causing damage to the fence's foundation due to increased wind load. Mr. Nelson agreed this could be a concern with high winds.

Chair Spykman clarified the applicant would be agreeable to screening as long as it met the approval of safety officials and was not a structural issue. Ms. Ruprecht agreed and added she had spoken to a lieutenant from the Police Department who had indicated any type of obstruction on the eastern side would be an issue for them.

Mr. Lamb felt this might be somewhat of a risky condition; there is no fence designer, or a security expert present who could advise the Board. Trying to draft a motion based on this idea could be difficult. He added if the Board was concerned about this, the applicant could be asked to come back with a solution which would have been reviewed by experts. With respect to the security issue, Mr. Lamb stated he does not want to minimize the important of safety but the Board has a role to play in this and screening cannot be eliminated in all circumstances because of some generalized security issue that is undefined.

Mr. Nelson felt a fenced screening is only going to provide a certain amount of screening; there is infrastructure that is impossible to screen. He noted however that they were willing to work with the abutter on a compromise.

Mr. Tousley stated he was not asking for a very tall fence, just a fence with slats to provide for some screening. He stated he also does not understand how a fence built into concrete could blow over. Mr. Tousley stated this screening is also for noise.

Mr. Stout asked Mr. Tousley why this concern was not addressed last month. Mr. Tousley stated a week before the last meeting, the applicant sent him plans which he assumed were the plans being submitted to the Board showing the slats and assumed this was what was going to be approved and because of other obligations he could not be present last month. However, at the meeting, the issue of the police objecting was raised and the slats were eliminated.

Ms. Ruprecht stated the slats were shown on the plans that were sent to the applicant and at that time did not feel an abutter's support was necessary for a project's approval. Once there was objection from the Police Department, this item was eliminated from the plan at the last meeting.

Councilor Hansel asked Ms. Ruprecht if the Board asked for the slats to be added back in whether the applicant would be in agreement. Ms. Ruprecht stated if the Police Department and the city agree, it was agreeable to the applicant. Mr. Stout asked whether any consideration was given to a modified version of the slats. Ms. Ruprecht stated this now becomes how much screening a modified version is

going to provide. Mr. Stout felt this is a conclusion the applicant would need to provide. Ms. Ruprecht stated they have not looked at any other versions because the police were adamant any type of screening on the eastern side would negatively impact security.

Ms. Russell Slack stated she was not sure where the Police Department was coming from and there is no-one present to address this issue. She asked whether the applicant has used slats at other sites because this was something that was proposed by the applicant. Ms. Ruprecht stated they have a similar project in Manchester and the engineer for this site had indicated in most urban areas where there is potential for crime, screening is not something that is encouraged. She added it is not that they don't provide screening, but they need city approval for same. Mr. Nelson stated break-ins into substations is a common occurrence as well as infrastructure security. Ms. Russell Slack asked how long this grid has been at this location. Ms. Ruprecht stated it has been at this location for 60 years. Ms. Russell Slack asked whether it has ever been broken into. The answer was a no.

Mr. Tousley stated he would be happy with any type of screening and noted all other locations into this site had been screened except from his property. The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Councilor Hansel stated he agrees with the abutter; originally there was discussion about privacy slats not a masonry wall and added if Eversource had proposed a masonry wall to locate gear on it, this discussion would not be happening. He added only a small section of this site is going to have privacy slats and felt the abutter and applicant could come to some type of agreement to locate something on the eastern portion. He stated he does not understand how this would inhibit the police from being able to see into this site.

Mr. Stout stated he agrees with Councilor Hansel and what would have been helpful for tonight would have been some screening alternatives. Vice-Chair Barrett noted the abutter is not asking for the entire portion to be screened but just a small portion. He added he also agrees with Eversource that a fence is not going to completely provide a screening from these large structures.

Councilor Hansel stated he is not comfortable approving this application tonight.

Ms. Landry asked whether all interested parties could meet before the next meeting. Mr. Lamb stated this would be the intention and added if this application is continued, the Board would also need to extend the decision deadline. He added the request would be for Eversource to come up with a design that the Board could approve. If there is no viable solution, staff will advise the Board as such.

Vice-Chair Barrett felt the best option would be for this item to come back with a best solution and the Board can decide at that time, even though this will push the applicant back another month. He added he always appreciates the guidance provided by planning staff and does not take their advice lightly. Mr. Lamb stated by potentially making screening a condition of approval and providing staff the authority to make a decision on this matter would not provide the public the opportunity to comment on it and felt the best option would be for this matter to be brought back to the Board next month.

Mr. Bohannon stated if this matter comes back next month and it is still an argument back and forth between the applicant and the abutter he will be inclined to remove the request; he felt the issue just needs to be resolved.

The Chair re-opened the application and invited the applicant to come back up and address the Board. Mr. Nelson stated the applicant would like to ask for an extension of the 65-day decision deadline and a continuation of the project application to the December Planning Board meeting.

B. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Councilor George Hansel that the Planning Board grant the request from Public Service of New Hampshire dba Eversource to extend the Planning Board's 65-day decision deadline for SPR 13-17 to December 18, 2017 and to continue the public hearing for SPR 13-17 to the December 18, 2017 Planning Board meeting.

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

IV. Public Hearings

1. S-10-17 – 37-39 Prospect Street – Subdivision – Applicant Fieldstone Land Consultants on behalf of owner Michael and Fern Geraghty proposes a 2-lot subdivision. The site is 0.523 acres in size and located in the Medium Density Zoning District (TMP# 008-03-022).

Mr. Barrett asked to be recused from this public hearing as he was an abutter to this property.

A. Board Determination of Completeness.

Planner Michele Chalice recommended to the Board that the Application S-10-17 was complete. A motion was made by Andrew Bohannon that the Board accept this application as complete. The motion was seconded by Nathaniel and was unanimously approved.

B. Public Hearing

Mr. Michael Clough of Fieldstone Landsurveying addressed the Board. Mr. Clough referred to the existing lot on a plan outlined in blue consisting of .518 acres, (22,000 square feet). The proposal is for a 2-lot subdivision. After the subdivision the lot will be reduced to .308 acres (13,400 square feet) and the new lot .211 acres (9,173 square) in size.

Mr. Clough stated this property is located in Medium Density where the lot size is 8,000 square feet, minimum frontage is 50 feet; building setbacks are 15 feet in the front, 10 feet to the side and 15 feet to the rear. After the subdivision, the new lot will take its frontage along Spruce Street (129.29 linear feet) and the existing frontage will remain for the existing lot (133.18 linear feet) on Prospect St. Mr. Clough referred to an existing sewer line that traverses the lot right now and ties into the municipal sewer line on Spruce Street. The applicant is proposing a 20-foot wide sewer easement shown on the plan in green, which would also allow for a new driveway for the single family dwelling. This concluded Mr. Clough's presentation.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Chalice stated the applicant had initially submitted this proposal with a single-family home sited on it as well as a driveway. If there are no complications, the Board has often been able to approve such requests, but this is not the case with this application; there is a large shade tree at the property line which would have to be removed. As a result, this application is now just a subdivision.

The property is served by city water and sewer, has an overall slope of 5%. It is a viable building site for a single family home and a driveway. Access to this site would be off Spruce Street not Prospect Street. This concluded Ms. Chalice's comments.

Councilor Hansel asked whether the easement was going to be in written format and how it was going to be enforced. Mr. Clough stated the easement language will be written into the new deed. Mr. Lamb asked what this language would say. Mr. Clough stated the language would restrict any structures within the easement. The Chairman asked whether a driveway would be permitted. Mr. Clough stated driveways usually run over sewer lines but if there was work that needed to be done this would be a

condition that would be written into the deed as well; that such expense will be borne by the easement holder.

The Councilor asked whether the applicant would be willing to draft an easement and submit this as part of the subdivision plan, so that it could be enforced should there ever be an issue. Mr. Clough stated they would have no issue with that.

Mike Geraghty of 55 Kendall Road stated the proposed driveway would not cross the easement; there would be no pavement or structures on this easement. The Councilor stated his issue is being able to enforce the easement should the property change hands. Mr. Geraghty stated this language would be included in the deed.

The Chairman asked for public comment next.

Ms. Ann Knight of 26 Prospect Street addressed the Board. She is an abutter diagonal to this property. Ms. Knight stated she opposes this subdivision because Prospect Street is already an extremely dense street. She noted from Court Street to Prospect Street where it intersects with Forest Street, there are 14 residences of these eight are already multi-family dwellings: a 10 room boarding house, 361 Court Street which is owned by Prospect Place and is zoned for 16 beds, 5 two-dwelling and another three-family unit.

Ms. Knight also pointed out, in preparation for the site plan the applicant has already taken down trees which makes it look even more dense.

Ms. Jen Knight of 26 Prospect Street added between Spruce Street and Forest Street there are already six multi-family dwellings and this is also a very narrow street and the only way to get to Court Street is via Spruce Street or Forest Street. She stated both these streets are always backed up with vehicles and this is compounded during the winter months with the snow banks. She pointed out that taking down of all the trees has taken away the only green space this area had.

Ms. Knight went on to say 25 Prospect Street is currently under contract and these new owners have expressed concern about the loss of privacy and are contemplating moving. She also noted construction traffic has been blocking the entrance to 25 Prospect Street and this has been going on for a few months.

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

Councilor Hansel stated he would like to see the draft easement submitted with the final application prior to signature of the Chairman, so that the city has a record for future use.

Mr. Stout asked why the Board is approving this application in advance of a driveway permit. Mr. Lamb stated this lot is big enough only for a single family home and single family home driveways are approved by the City Engineer.

Mr. Bohannon asked whether the ten vehicle trips were per household. Mr. Lamb stated this was for a single family unit. Mr. Lamb stated for two working people this would be a high number.

Councilor Hansel recognized the concerns expressed by the abutters, however, those concerns are outside the Board's purview but felt there could be some enforcement issue with construction traffic the abutters could perhaps address with the City.

The Chairman reopened the public hearing to hear from an abutter. Ms. Jennifer Knight stated because of the narrow and dead end nature of Spruce Street the construction vehicles have no room to turnaround so these vehicles are currently parked on Prospect Street which would impede traffic on Prospect Street for a very long time.

The Chairman closed the public hearing again.

B. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Councilor George Hansel that the Planning Board approve S-10-17, as shown on the plan set identified as "Tax Map 8, Lot 3-22, 37-39 Prospect Street, Keene, NH, Prepared for land of Michael F. & Fern E. Geraghty, 1" = 20', dated November 16, 2017 with the following conditions:

1. Submittal of language for an easement requiring sufficient provisions to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
2. Owner's signature on plan prior to approval.

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

Vice-Chair Barrett rejoined the session.

V. New Business

1. Discussion – Site Plan Regulations and Review for Agricultural Developments

Ms. Chalice stated that at the October Planning Board meeting, staff was asked to look at the Board Standards as they relate to agricultural development. Ms. Chalice stated the NH Coalition for Sustaining Agriculture is a small group that was able to find a grant to explore all things agriculture in New Hampshire. She called the Board's attention to page 36 of the packet, an Agriculture Tool Kit which looks at land uses, local regulations and encouraging farming in the state. Ms. Chalice also noted the NH Right to Farm Flow Chart as the last packet page. The plan is to finalize this "Tool Kit" with the current grant and the second goal is to create better tools to assist farmers in navigating and interpreting applicable regulations.

Chair Spykman asked when this would be ready for use. Ms. Chalice stated this document is still in draft format; the Tool Kit is anticipated to be ready by the end of the year. A second grant is being sought for farmers to create alternative guidance that is more user friendly. There is no schedule for the second portion of this project.

Ms. Landry asked whether this process anticipates any legislative changes. Ms. Chalice answered in the negative and added as she went through this process she noticed there are quite a few protections in place to protect farmers from over-regulation.

Ms. Chalice stated the next step would be to bring this item back to the Board when it is final and eventually fold this into the Land Use Code Update. The Chairman asked whether a public process would be helpful for this item. Ms. Chalice stated those opportunities would be available when the Land Use Code Update is brought forward and added the Agriculture Commission will also be discussing this item at their next meeting. She stated she can bring an update from that meeting to the Planning Board as well. The Chairman stated he wanted to make sure this item does not get lost in the larger Land Use Code Update process. Mr. Lamb clarified the Board was comfortable adding this item to the Land Use Code Update and not pursuing a separate process to amend the regulations. The Chairman agreed.

VI. Director Reports

1. DRAFT 2018 Planning Board calendar adoption

Mr. Lamb stated should the Board approved this calendar tonight, staff would be able to put in place all the deadlines that would need to go along with the new schedule of meetings prior to the January meeting. If there is a Monday holiday, the meeting would take place on a Tuesday.

A motion was made by Councilor George Hansel to approve the 2018 meeting schedule as presented. The motion was seconded by Andrew Bohannon and was unanimously approved.

2. Move December 25th meeting to December 18th

VII. Upcoming Dates of Interest – December 2017

Planning Board Meeting – December 18, 6:30 PM

Planning Board Steering Committee – December 12, 12:00 PM

Joint PB/PLD Committee – Monday, December 11, 6:30 PM

Planning Board Site Visits – December 20, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

Reviewed by: Rhett Lamb, Planning Director
Edits, L. Langella, T. Kessler, M. Chalice