

City of Keene
New Hampshire

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, November 28, 2022

6:30 PM

**Council Chambers,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Pamela Russell Slack, Chair
David Orgaz, Vice Chair
Mayor George S. Hansel
Councilor Michael Remy
Kenneth Kost, Alternate

Staff Present:

Jesse Rounds, Community Development
Director
Mari Brunner, Senior Planner
Evan Clements, Planner

Members Not Present:

Emily Lavigne-Bernier
Roberta Mastrogiovanni
Armando Rangel
Harold Farrington
Randyn Markelon
Gail Somers, Alternate
Tammy Adams, Alternate

I) Call to Order – Roll Call

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

II) Final Vote on Conditional Approvals

Ms. Brunner stated there were no items for final vote on conditional approvals for tonight.

III) Public Hearing

SPR-964, Modification #7 – Site Plan – Hampton Inn Landscaping Modifications, 120 Key Rd - Applicant SVE Associates, on behalf of owner Jazzlyn Hospitality II LLC, proposes to modify the landscaping for the Hampton Inn site at 120 Key Road (TMP #110-019-000). The property is 2.4 acres and is located in the Commerce District.

A. Board Determination of Completeness

Planner Evan Clements stated the applicant requests an exemption from submitting a landscaping plan that shows the location, species, and size of all landscaping materials proposed to be installed on the site, as required per Section 25.12.5.5.a of the Land Development Code. The applicant has submitted invoices with incomplete information related to the species and planting size for the proposed landscaping. The Community Development Director has determined that this information is required in order for the Board to review the proposal for compliance with the site development standard for landscaping in Article 20 of the Land Development Code. Specifically, staff are unable to review the application to determine whether the proposed plant species comply with Development Standard 20.5.1.A (invasive species) or 20.5.1.B (hardy to regional climate conditions). Therefore, the Community Development Director has denied this exemption request.

Furthermore, per Section 25.12.6.C of the Land Development Code, if a requested exemption is not granted by the Community Development Director, or their designee, the applicant may appeal the decision to the Planning Board prior to the Board's determination of application completeness. The Board should invite the Applicant to explain the exemption request and decide whether or not to grant the requested exemption prior to voting on application completeness. If the Board does not grant the requested exemption, this application will need to be tabled until the necessary information has been submitted with the application. In addition to the request above, the applicant has requested exemptions from providing an existing conditions plan, a proposed conditions plan, a grading plan, a lighting plan, elevations, and technical reports. Staff have determined that these requested exemptions would have no bearing on the merits of the application. However, staff does not recommend that the Board accept the application as complete.

Chair Russell Slack stated the first item the Board needs to decide is whether it wants to grant the exemption for providing a landscape plan that shows species and size of all landscaping materials to be installed on site. The Chair called the Board's attention to what the applicant has submitted with the respect to the variety of species being submitted as well as species that were submitted in July 2021.

Ms. Brunner suggested giving the applicant an opportunity to address what they are proposing.

Mr. Rob Hitchcock of SVE Associates and Mr. Ashok Patel applicant addressed the Board. Mr. Hitchcock stated the reason for the exemption is to prevent expenses of nearly \$5,000 to create a spreadsheet which ultimately will be filed with the department. He stated his hope was that the Board would visit the site and determine if this was a good landscape plan. He felt it was a nicely landscaped plan with nearly 350 plantings but the applicant has planted close to 400 plantings. He added the species that were selected were based on what was available. The approved planting plan was put together in 2006 and some of those species are not readily available today.

Mr. Patel added what gets included on a plan by the landscape architect are at times not available in the nurseries. He added some of the plantings were relocated for aesthetic and vehicle approach purposes, but nothing was done to intentionally avoid selecting a specific species.

Mr. Kost stated there are many people in this City who go out and remove invasive species from public areas because this has become an issue. Mr. Kost stated this is his concern – not adding to an already existing problem.

Mr. Patel stated next year when the plants come up if they are identified as invasive they will have no problem removing such plants.

Mayor Hansel stated he is not concerned about moving of plants, and also the fact that the applicant provided more than the number required shows that they are not trying to get around having to provide plantings. However, what the Board and the citizens of Keene are concerned about are the invasive species and how those can be avoided.

Chair Russell Slack asked if this request was approved could it be with a requirement that it come back before the Board in the spring. Ms. Brunner in response stated the Board has a few options, the application can be denied and the applicant requested to come back in the spring with a revised plan. Alternatively, if the exemption is granted and the application is accepted as complete, staff strongly recommends it can be conditioned that the information be provided to staff at an earlier point or request a waiver.

Councilor Remy stated he appreciates staff giving thought to the issue with invasive species and agrees with the recommendation provided by staff just now.

Mr. Hitchcock stated he would like to suggest the Board accept the application as complete and in the spring when the plants leaf out, have a registered architect perform an inspection of all the plantings to determine if there are invasive species and if the plantings are appropriate for the zone and provide a certified letter to the Board. If something has to be removed, it can be done.

The Mayor stated the applicant does not need to come back before the Board but could provide this information to the Community Development Director to be approved administratively. The Chair felt the applicant should come back before the Board. Councilor Remy stated his concern would be that the composition of the Board might have changed by that time. The Chair felt a majority of Board members would still be part of the Board at that time. Ms. Brunner stated if the application is accepted as complete, she would recommend it be condition precedent for final approval and that way the Board will be voting to approve final approval and will provide them with 180 days to comply and at the end of six months they can always request an extension if necessary.

The Mayor asked for clarification on what the Board will be voting. Mr. Clements explained granting the exemption is the Board saying it has enough information to properly review this application based on the Standards.

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel to grant the exemption request and accept this Application SPR-964, Modification #7 as complete.

Councilor Remy asked if there was a difference between denying completeness versus not getting the application itself approved tonight. Mr. Clements stated the hotel is open for business and they

could be in violation of their site plan. If staff had the species list it would be a straightforward application, not having that is what is causing the issue. Ms. Brunner added if the Board opened the application and issued a condition precedent, to issue final approval at a later date, there would not be the need to notice a second public hearing. If completeness is denied and the applicant has to come back at a later time – the item would have to be re-noticed.

The motion made the Mayor was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy and carried on a 4-1 vote, with the Chair voting in opposition.

B. Public Hearing

The Chair asked for public comments. With no comments from the public the Chair closed the public hearing.

Staff comments were next. Mr. Clements stated according to the applicant, the location of the installed landscaping deviated from the approved landscaping plan in order to accommodate underground utilities and stormwater structures such as detention basins. The original approved landscaping plan did not take into account these site features. Field changes were made to ensure that the landscaping did not conflict with these and other site features.

The improved landscape plan included 72 trees and 284 shrubs, the installed plans includes 98 trees and 315 shrubs. During a conversation with the applicant, it was revealed that a surveyor and not a landscape professional was utilized to create the as-built Landscape Plan. During the installation of the plantings, the landscapers removed the identification tags on the plants. Due to the removal of the identifying tags, the planting species could not be identified by the surveying staff conducting the work. In addition, because the plants were provided from various sources, the applicant does not have a list of the species that were planted. This lead the applicant to use a general description of the plantings and not the specific species in the planting schedule. Section 20.5.1.A of the LDC states “*No plant material shall be installed on a site that is listed by the NH Department of Agriculture, Markets and Food as an invasive species.*” It is not possible to determine whether this standard has been met.

He further stated Section 20.5.1.B of the LDC states “*Plant materials shall be hardy to regional climate conditions per the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Plant Hardiness Zone Map.*” It is not possible to determine whether this standard has been met, due to the lack of information. Without information about the hardiness zone for each of the plant species that were planted, a waiver request from this standard would be required.

Section 20.5.4.C of the Land Development Code states “*All landscaping approved as part of a site plan shall be considered as elements of the site in the same manner as parking, building materials and other site details.*” Staff believes that information about the species of plantings is an important part of the record of this project and without these details, future enforcement actions related to landscaping may be challenging.

With respect to Screening, Mr. Clements stated the project at the time of approval was required to provide a minimum of one shade tree and ten shrubs per 35 linear feet of frontage along the

public right-of-way. The project is required to install a minimum of three trees and 30 shrubs for perimeter landscaping and 11 trees for interior landscaping. The as-built landscaping plan shows 11 trees along the right-of-way, at least 60 shrubs and at least 70 interior trees. The spacing of these plantings is less than 35 feet and provides adequate screening for the parking lot. All utility hookups visible from the public right-of-way, including a large transformer located on the northeast corner of the property, have been properly screened by landscaping. It appears that this standard has been met. Mr. Clements reiterated, per zoning the landscape requirements for this application has been met. It is the site development standards that are in question.

With respect to the recommended motion, a condition precedent has been suggested with respect to submittal of a revised landscape plan with the following information added:

- i. A planting schedule that reflects the invoices submitted to the Community Development Department and includes the scientific names of all plantings on the schedule.
- ii. A data table that indicates the required and installed quantity of landscaping to ensure compliance with zoning and site development regulations.

As stated by the applicant have a certified landscape architect review all plantings in the spring to verify that none of these species are invasive and are appropriate for this zone; documents with their stamp.

Councilor Remy clarified condition 1 i. would be a list as opposed to a landscape plan. Ms. Brunner added staff's recommendation is to have a list shown on the landscaping plan but necessarily one that identifies each individual shrub on the plan; to make sure the list is printed on the same sheet that showed the location.

A. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board approve SPR-964, Modification #7 as shown on the plan identified as "Landscape As-Built Plan Hotel Site Jazzlyn Hospitality II LLC 120 Key Road Keene, NH" prepared by SVE Associates at a scale of 1"=20' dated August 16, 2022 and last revised October 3, 2022 with the following conditions:

A. Prior to final approval and signature by the Planning Board Chair, the following conditions precedent shall be met:

1. Submittal of a revised Landscaping Plan with the following information added: a data table that indicates the required and installed quantity of landscaping to ensure compliance with zoning and site development regulations.
2. Submittal of five full sized paper copies and one digital copy of the final plan.
3. Submittal of a current inventory completed by a registered landscape architect of the plantings on the site, including the species, in a form acceptable to the Community Development Director and showing no invasive species and that regionally appropriate plantings were installed on the site.

The motion was seconded by Councilor Remy.

Mr. Kost noted that a landscape architect is registered by the State license similar to a licensed engineer and are not certified landscape architects. He also clarified that the only item that needs to be signed by the registered landscape architect is the plan list and not re-sealing any drawings. The Mayor stated it could also be a letter indicating they visited the site and reviewed the plantings and that they are a registered architect.

The motion was unanimously approved.

IV) Continued Public Hearing

S-04-22 – Conservation Residential Development Subdivision & SPR-04-22 – Site Plan – 0 Drummer Road – Applicant and owner Christopher Farris proposes to subdivide the 13.1-ac parcel located at 0 Drummer Rd (TMP #515-015-000-000-000) into 6 lots and construct 5 multi-family buildings. Four of the lots are proposed to be developed into 5-unit multifamily residences, one lot is proposed to be developed as a 6-unit multifamily residence, and the remaining lot would be conserved as open space. The developable lots are proposed to have access from Timberlane Drive via a shared private driveway and vary in size from 0.3 to 1.2 acres. The open space lot is 9.5 acres. Waivers are requested from Section 25.10.8.B.2 of the Land Development Code regarding the requirement to prepare a survey that shows all metes and bounds of the revised parcels, Section 20.14.3.D regarding the requirement that all off-street parking be located to the side or rear of buildings, and Section 19.3.5.A.3.a regarding the requirement that all structures be accessed from interior streets. The site is in the Low Density District.

A. Public Hearing

The Chair noted this application was accepted as complete at the June 27 Planning Board meeting.

John Noonan of Fieldstone Land Consultants was the first to address the Board. Mr. Noonan stated this item was continued at the last meeting due to some discrepancies between the land development code and the zoning table. Those have since been updated to show that multi family is permitted with a CRD subdivision. He indicated the submitted plans dated June 13, 2022 have not been changed. Some of the outstanding items to be discussed were the architectural elevations to be compatible with the neighborhood. The applicant has changed the building architecture and has submitted same. Mr. Noonan went over the samples that were submitted to the Board.

Staff comments were next. Ms. Brunner addressed the Board and stated the public hearing was first heard on July 25 and at that time the Board accepted the application as completed and granted the waiver request regarding metes and bounds. At that meeting the Board voted to continue the meeting obtain more information on architecture and visual appearance, traffic, and drainage concerns raised by abutters. The applicant has since submitted letters addressing storm water runoff and traffic and those letters have been included in the Board packet as well as revised architectural renderings.

Ms. Brunner stated the application since July has been continued twice; the first time was to the September meeting and then to tonight to allow time to connect the CRD Regulations to the Zoning Ordinance which has been completed by City Council.

There have been departmental comments received on this application.

The Engineering comments indicate as follows:

- *The applicant is proposing to construct public infrastructure which will be turned over to the City for operation and maintenance in perpetuity. Approval of the application should be conditioned upon acceptance of these public utilities by the Keene City Council.*
- *Since the applicant is proposing shared driveways, cross-easements should be recorded which define the rights and responsibilities of each property owner with respect to access, maintenance, costs, etc.*
- *All of the structures will be given Timberlane Drive addresses. Developer should contact DPW for address assignment once foundations are installed.*
- *To date, the Department has not received the DES connection permit.*
- *The proposed design will require drainage easements between the parcels. The cross easements should stipulate the rights and responsibilities of each parcel. In particular, the Department is concerned that Lot 3 will receive runoff from all 5 parcels and discharge said runoff directly to a delineated wetland. Failure to maintain the proposed swales, forebay, and detention basin may result in discharge of sediment laden stormwater to the wetlands area.*

With respect to the CRD and Subdivision Regulations:

Dimensional Standards – All dimensional standards have been met. The total number of units that are permitted is 27 and the applicant is proposing 26. 50% of land is required to be placed in open space and the applicant is proposing to place 72.3% in open space. Hence, this standard has been met.

Permitted Uses – All of the permitted uses are included in the CRD Regulations and this standard appears to be met.

Environmental Criteria – The first criteria indicates that “*all development shall be located outside the primary conservation areas and shall minimize impact to any secondary conservation areas.*”

Ms. Brunner noted all primary conservation areas for this site have been identified and are located in the open space lot. In addition the applicant has also identified any secondary conservation areas (precautionary slopes) and they are minimizing development in those slopes. Ms. Brunner further stated the standard calls for all structures to be accessed via interior streets rather than street bordering the perimeter of the tract. In addition, this section states “*in the event that a waiver of this standard is granted, shared driveways shall be incorporated where feasible.*” The Applicant requests a waiver from this standard and proposes to construct shared driveways in lieu of an internal road. The written waiver request is included as an attachment to this staff report. In making a determination whether or not to grant this waiver, the Board should find by a majority vote that the criteria outlined in Section 25.10.14 of the LDC have been met.

Open Space Standards - These standards state that the area of land designated as open space shall not be used to site individual lots, construction of buildings, facilities for accessory uses, roads and other areas for vehicular traffic. This section further states that the open space reserve should not be fragmented, should be located adjacent to other open space or protected lands when possible, and should be reasonably accessible from each proposed lot. The applicant notes that no development is proposed on the open space reserve. In addition, the open space parcel is one contiguous area that abuts existing conservation land, and can be accessed directly from Lots 3 and 4. Residents from Lots 1, 2, and 5 would access the open space lot from Timberlane Drive.

Open Space Ownership & Maintenance - This section requires that all land designated as open space shall not be further subdivided, and shall remain as open space in perpetuity. In addition, all designated open space must be permanently protected by covenants or easements, shall be deeded to and maintained by a Homeowners Association, a non-profit organization, or some other entity as approved by the Planning Board or its designee, and shall be held, managed and maintained by the developer until such time as they are transferred to the designated entity. The applicant is proposing the open space is managed by a Home Owners Association. Staff is requesting written documentation of any legal instruments required for the management of the designated Open Space land be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney prior to signature by the Planning Board Chair.

Councilor Remy asked what the difference was between an internal street and a shared driveway. Ms. Brunner stated an internal street (private or public) has to be built according to City street standards. With a driveway they are limited to less than 300 feet.

Ms. Brunner next addressed the Site Development Standards:

Drainage & Stormwater Management

The Applicant submitted a Storm Water Management Report indicating the proposed development will not increase runoff leaving the site. In order to mitigate and treat runoff associated with the new development, the Applicant proposes to construct a stormwater management system consisting of ditches lined with rip-rap and stone check dams and four driveway culverts that will direct stormwater to a sediment forebay or conveyance swale and into a detention basin. Overflow will be conveyed via a swale to a level spreader. For large events, there is an emergency spillway that outlets into the wetland buffer to prevent runoff from being directed onto Timberlane Drive. This drainage system and have been review by engineering staff. As a condition of approval staff is requesting submittal of written documentation for the access and utility easement and written documentation of a cross-easement for the stormwater management and drainage system, which shall be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Director and City Engineer.

Sediment & Erosion Control: Applicant is proposing to install perimeter controls including silt fencing and a stabilized construction entrance. There is more details provided on Sheet DT-1 of the plan set. Staff is recommending that a security for erosion control be included as a condition of approval.

Snow Storage & Removal: The applicant is proposing that snow storage along the edges of the paved area.

Landscaping: The Applicant is proposing to install four red maple trees, four Bigfruit Hawthorn (a large shrub/small tree), and a mix of 23 shrubs including 10 rhododendrons, eight winterberry, two nannyberry viburnum, and three dwarf alberta spruce. A total of 26 surface parking spaces are proposed; the way it is laid out, each unit would have two spaces (one in the garage and one surface parking).

Screening: This standard states that “*Screening in the form of landscaping or other treatment (e.g. berms, walls, fences) shall be used to ... form a buffer between single-family and multifamily dwellings, which are different in height, form or material than the adjacent single-family dwellings*” . This site is well screened by the open space land. However, staff is recommending that a 30-foot no-cut buffer be placed over the vegetated area along Timberlane Drive –the applicant is in agreement to this requirement and this is include as a condition of approval.

With respect to HVAC equipment, there is a note on the Utiltiy Plan (Sheet UT-1, Note 20) which states “All HVAC equipment shall meet the screening standards of the L.D.C.: Roof mounted equipment shall be setback 10’ from edge. Ground-mounted equipment to be located so as not to be visible from the public way – screen if visible.” With this language added staff feel this standard has been met.

Lighting: The lighting fixtures being proposed meets the Board’s standard.

Sewer & Water: The Applicant proposes to connect to City sewer and water, and proposes to install two hydrants at the end of the shared driveways for safety, testing, and maintenance purposes. All of the buildings will have sprinklers for fire protection. Due to the fact that the water connection is proposed to be on the high-pressure side of the Timberlane Drive pressure zone, each service connection will require a pressure-reducing valve (PRV). In addition, the Applicant also submitted a sewer flow analysis, as requested by the City which demonstrates that there is sufficient capacity in the sewer system for the proposed project. Per Section 22.1.4.G of the LDC, “*Any infrastructure that serves 2 or more residential parcels shall be public. Services shall be the only lines serving individual residential parcels.*” In addition, Section 22.1.4.H states that “*All public infrastructure shall be located in city streets or public rights-of-way or easements. The City shall be responsible for maintaining all public infrastructure.*” The Applicant is aware that the water and sewer utilities will need to be accepted by the Keene City Council, and proposes an access and utility easement (shown in the cross-hatched area on the plan). Staff recommend that approval of the application should be conditioned upon acceptance of the water and sewer infrastructure as public utilities by the Keene City Council. In addition, submittal of written documentation for the utility and access easement be included as a condition of approval.

Traffic & Access Management: The Applicant submitted a traffic assessment which concluded that the proposed development would have a negligible impact on the adjacent roadway system. With respect to access management, the Applicant proposes to utilize a shared driveway in lieu

of an internal road. As noted previously, there is a waiver is a waiver requested from the requirement that all structures shall be accessed from interior streets. Because it is going to be shared driveway, staff is requesting site location and cross easements for the share driveway as a condition of approval.

Filling & Excavation: A significant portion of the development area contains precautionary slopes of 15%-25%. Majority of disturbed earth material appears to be intended to remain on site. Since fewer than 50 trucks are expected to remove or deliver material to the site, it appears that this standard has been met. The applicant included a table on the subdivision plan that demonstrates that less than 20,000 square feet of precautionary slope area will be disturbed on each individual lot.

Surface Waters & Wetlands: There is existing wetland systems which have been delineated on the site and identified as primary conservation areas. A waiver has been submitted to seek relief from performing a complete wetland delineation on the new conservation lot and the Board did grant this waiver. The required 30 foot wetland buffer for these wetlands is shown on the plan. No development is proposed within the wetland buffer area. However, the edge of the buffer comes within one foot of the wetland buffer and hence staff recommends that the wetland buffer be flagged and inspected prior to the installation of sedimentation and erosion control features.

There is another waiver being requested for parking to be allowed in front of the building and this is because of the way the parcel is laid out. The frontage is along Timberlane Drive and lot 3 parking will face Timberlane Drive and the applicant is requesting a waiver to locate parking in front of that building.

This concluded staff comments.

The Chair asked for public comment next.

Mr. Mark Van Saun of 62 Meeting House Road addressed the Board and asked about over flow parking and asked whether there is a plan to address this issue. It was stated previously that parking can happen on Timberlane Drive. He noted overnight parking is not permitted during winter months and asked how the City was planning on addressing this issue. Ms. Brunner stated this is a decision that would need to be made by Public Works and City Council as to whether on street parking can be permitted overnight and added this conversation has not happened yet. She added there are two extra spaces in the lot for overflow parking. Mr. Van Saun did not feel that was adequate and noted this was a concern for many of the abutters.

Mr. Paul Koutros of 59 Meeting House Road noted staff had indicated several contingencies regarding erosion control etc. and asked whether these items need to be in place prior to construction. Ms. Brunner noted erosion control measures need to be in place before land is disturbed. Mr. Koutros asked about water runoff and collection basins – whether those have to be in place prior to construction. Ms. Brunner directed this question to the applicant. Mr. Noonan indicated the retention basin would be constructed before anything else is constructed. With respect to overflow parking, he noted Timberlane Drive was never a solution but noted they are

private driveways for each unit, the main driveway will be 24 feet wide with a three foot shoulder on each side and felt visitors should have space for parking.

Mr. Koutros felt 26 additional units will have impact to traffic and hoped this is being taken into consideration, especially during peak hours. Ms. Brunner noted the traffic report has been reviewed by engineering staff.

Mr. Joseph Darby of 19 Drummer Road addressed the Board next and stated for prior meetings abutter notice was provided by US mail and asked why that was not the case for this meeting. Ms. Brunner stated this is a continued public hearing and today's date was indicated at the last public hearing. Continued public hearings don't require notice. Mr. Darby stated he agrees to the concern raised by Mr. Koutros regarding traffic especially pedestrian traffic of school children.

With no further public comment, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Chair Russell Slack stated there is a report available regarding traffic which she indicated is very detailed and a study has been completed.

B. Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board approve S-04-22 for a 6-lot Conservation Residential Subdivision, grant a waiver from Section 19.3.5.A.3.a of the Planning Board Subdivision Regulations regarding the requirement that all structures be accessed from interior streets, approve SPR-04-22 for the construction of five multi-family buildings, and grant a waiver from Section 20.14.3.D of the Planning Board Development Standards regarding the requirement that all off-street parking be located to the side or rear of buildings, all as presented on the plan set identified as "Conservation Residential Development Subdivision, Tax Map 515, Lot 15, Timberlane Woods" prepared by Fieldstone Land Consultants, LLC, dated March 18, 2022 and last revised on June 13, 2022, and as presented on the building elevations received by the Community Development Department on July 15, 2022, with the following conditions:

A. Prior to final approval and signature by Planning Board Chair, the following conditions precedent shall be met:

1. Submittal of revised plans and building elevations to demonstrate compliance with the height requirements for the Low Density District in Section 3.3.4 of the Land Development Code. These materials shall be subject to review by the Zoning Administrator and the Community Development Director to confirm compliance with the City's zoning ordinance and all other applicable regulations in the Land Development Code.
2. Submittal of written documentation for the access and utility easement, which shall be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Director and City Engineer.
3. Submittal of written documentation of a cross-easement for the stormwater management and drainage system, which shall be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Director and City Engineer.

4. Submittal of written documentation of any legal instruments required for the management of the designated Open Space land, which shall be subject to review and approval by the City Attorney.
 5. Submittal of written documentation for the acceptance of all proposed public utilities by the Keene City Council.
 6. Submittal of a revised plan set which displays a “No Cut Buffer” over the 30-foot perimeter buffer along Timberlane Drive.
 7. Submittal of a security for landscaping, erosion control, and as-built plans in a form and amount acceptable to the Community Development Director and City Engineer.
- B. Subsequent to final approval, the following conditions shall be met:
1. Prior to the installation of sedimentation and erosion control measures, City staff shall inspect the wetland buffer in the development area to ensure it is flagged.
 2. In order to ensure the stormwater management system is installed and operates as designed, a professional engineer, hired at the expense of the applicant, shall inspect the on-site stormwater management system and certify that the system was installed in accordance with the approved design. The results of this inspection shall be provided to the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

The motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy and was unanimously approved.

V. Staff Updates

Ms. Brunner noted the Board has been provided with revised Land Development Code sheets with the newly adopted changes and they should update their respective LDC binders with the new sheets.

VI. New Business

VII. Upcoming Dates of Interest

- Planning Board Steering Committee – December 6, 11:00 AM
- Joint Committee of the Planning Board and PLD – December 12, 6:30 PM
- Planning Board Site Visit – December 14, 8:00 AM – To Be Confirmed
- Planning Board Meeting – December 19, 6:30 PM

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Krishni Pahl, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Evan J. Clements, Planner