

CITY OF KEENE  
NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

Monday, February 8, 2021      6:30 PM      Remote Meeting

**Planning Board Members Present**

Pamela Russell Slack, Chair  
David Orgaz, Vice-Chair  
Mayor George Hansel  
Councilor Michael Remy  
Emily Lavigne Bernier

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

Councilor Kate Bosley, Chairman  
Councilor Mitch Greenwald  
Councilor Philip Jones  
Councilor Gladys Johnson  
Councilor Catherine Workman

**Planning Board Members Not Present**

Andrew Weglinski  
Gail Somers  
Roberta Mastrogiovanni  
Tammy Adams, Alternate

**Staff Present**

Rhett Lamb, Community Development Director  
Tara Kessler, Senior Planner  
John Rogers, Building and Health Official  
Med Kopczynski, Director Economic  
Development and Special Projects  
Mari Brunner, Planner

**1. Statement of Authority to Hold Remote Meeting**

Chair Russell Slack began the meeting by reading the following statement with respect to holding remote meetings: *“In Emergency Order #12, issued by the Governor of the State of New Hampshire pursuant to Executive Order #2020-04, certain provisions of RSA 91-A regulating the operation of public body meetings have been waived during the declared COVID-19 State of Emergency.*

*Specifically:*

- *The requirement that a quorum of a public body be physically present except in an emergency requiring immediate action under RSA 91-A:2;*
- *The requirement that each part of a meeting of a public body be audible or otherwise discernible to the public at the location specified in the meeting notice as the location of the meeting under RSA 91-A:2, III(c).*
- *Provided, however that the public body must:*
  - *Provide access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means;*
  - *Provide public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting;*
  - *Provide a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access; and*
  - *Adjourn the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting.*
- *All votes are to be taken by roll call.*

32 • *All committee participants shall identify the location from where they are participating and*  
33 *who is present in the room with them.*”  
34

35 Chair Russell-Slack said the public may access the meeting online by visiting the Zoom website,  
36 www.zoom.us/join, and entering the Meeting ID 893 8296 4232 or call (888) 475-4499, Enter  
37 Meeting ID: 893 8296 4232. View live on Cheshire TV channel 1302. For issues with access  
38 during the meeting call: (603) 209-4697. The agenda and supporting materials are available at:  
39 ci.keene.nh.us/joint-planning-board-planning-licenses-and-development-committee.  
40 Members of the public shall not be permitted to speak nor shall comments be taken until the  
41 Chair asks for public comment.  
42

43 **2. Call to Order & Roll Call**

44 Chair Russell Slack called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and a roll call was taken.  
45

46 **3. Minutes of January 11, 2021 & January 19, 2021**

47 A member of the public had a correction for the January 19, 2021 meeting minutes – Page 24,  
48 Line 598, correct the spelling of her name from “Kathleen” to “Cathleen.”  
49

50 A motion was made by Councilor Jones to approve the January 11, 2021 meeting minutes and  
51 the January 19, 2021 meeting minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Councilor  
52 Mitch Greenwald and was unanimously approved by roll call vote.  
53

54 **4. Continued Public Workshop Ordinances O-2020-10 & O-2020-11** – Relating to the  
55 establishment of the City of Keene Land Development Code and changes to the City's downtown  
56 zoning districts. Petitioner, City of Keene Community Development Department, proposes to  
57 update and unite the City of Keene’s regulations related to land use and development, including  
58 the Zoning Regulations, into the City of Keene Land Development Code; to establish 6 new  
59 zoning districts in Keene’s downtown area (Downtown Core, Downtown Growth, Downtown  
60 Limited, Downtown Edge, Downtown Transition, Downtown Institutional Campus); to remove  
61 the Gilbo Avenue Design Overlay District and the Downtown Railroad Property Redevelopment  
62 Overlay District; and, to modify the SEED Overlay District. This proposed map change would  
63 affect 316 parcels, encompassing a total land area of approximately 220-acres, and would result  
64 in the removal of the Central Business and Central Business Limited Zoning Districts.  
65

66 **a. Review of and vote on proposed amendments to O2020-10 and O-2020-11, including**  
67 **amendments to the proposed Land Development Code and the proposed Zoning**  
68 **Map**  
69

70 Senior Planner Tara Kessler began by reminding the committee where they are in this process.  
71 She noted that it is possible this would be the final meeting of the public workshop phase on  
72 these ordinances. Following the public workshop phase, there will be public hearings scheduled  
73 by the Planning Board and the Historic District Commission and a public hearing before the City  
74 Council and, ultimately, a final vote by the Council.  
75

76 Ms. Kessler stated for tonight’s meeting she will be reviewing the amendments proposed to the  
77 ordinances and the Land Development Code shared in a memorandum dated February 1, which  
78 was included in the agenda packet for this meeting.  
79  
80  
81

82 Ms. Kessler began a review of each amendment. She noted that staff propose to remove from O-  
83 2020-10 all reference to new or amended language to Chapter 46 of the City Code of  
84 Ordinances, related to the establishment of a Congregate Living and Social Services license, and  
85 to introduce this language to City Council as a separate ordinance. Staff needs more time to  
86 complete the language related to licensing for congregate living and social services uses. As  
87 Chapter 46 is outside of the proposed Land Development Code, changes to this chapter will be  
88 sent to the Planning, Licenses and Development (PLD) Committee for their review and  
89 recommendation to City Council. Ms. Kessler noted that because the proposed Land  
90 Development Code references the congregate living and social services license, it will be  
91 important for the Council to vote on O-2020-10 (which establishes the proposed Land  
92 Development Code) and the ordinance detailing changes to Chapter 46 at the same time. Ms.  
93 Kessler noted that if the Committee is in favor of this amendment, City staff will introduce the  
94 topic of changes to Chapter 46 to the PLD Committee at their meeting on March 24, 2021.  
95

96 Councilor Jones asked about the vote that would be taken today. Ms. Kessler stated if the  
97 committee was ready for a vote today the Committee would vote on the proposed amendments to  
98 the ordinances, and before it is sent out of the public workshop phase the Planning Board would  
99 vote that this ordinance as amended is consistent with the Master Plan, and the PLD Committee  
100 would vote to request the Mayor set a public hearing on the amended ordinance.  
101

102 Ms. Kessler continued in her review of the proposed amendments.  
103

104 She noted that staff propose to include all terms and definitions for rules of measurement  
105 outlined in Article 1 and principal permitted uses outlined in Article 8 into the Definitions  
106 Chapter for ease of reference.  
107

108 Ms. Kessler stated that the following amendment is one that has been discussed at previous  
109 meetings and there has been expressed support for by Committee members. This amendment is  
110 to allow for Small Group Home (this would allow for eight unrelated people to live together in a  
111 group home setting) by Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in all zoning districts that permit single-  
112 family dwellings, and to be clearer that this use is also allowed where Large Group Homes are  
113 allowed. With this amendment, the following districts would permit Small Group Homes:  
114 Rural, Residential Preservation, Low Density, Low Density 1, Medium Density, High Density,  
115 High Density-1, Neighborhood Business, and Downtown Transition.  
116

117 Ms. Kessler noted that staff are proposing for Large Group Home to be added to the High  
118 Density 1 zoning district, which currently permits both single family residences and multifamily  
119 residences. She noted that there are only a handful of parcels in this zoning district.  
120

121 Ms. Kessler stated that there were concerns raised at a previous meeting about whether the  
122 number of residents permitted in a Domestic Violence Shelter would include children. Staff took  
123 the feedback and have proposed excluding minor children of shelter clients from the proposed  
124 occupancy maximum of 12. The amended language would read as follows: "Domestic violence  
125 shelters located within or directly adjacent to residential zoning districts shall not have more than  
126 12 occupants at any time, *excluding the minor children of shelter clients.*"  
127

128 Councilor Bosley clarified that there will be limitations placed on occupancy based on Fire  
129 Regulations, which would include minor children. Ms. Kessler confirmed that fire, life and code  
130 safety codes would place limitations on occupancy.  
131

132 Ms. Kessler noted that this amendment is to address an error in Table 8-1 Permitted Principal  
133 Uses by Zoning District. The proposal is to change “P” to “P1” wherever it appears for  
134 “Domestic Violence Shelters,” as there are limitations for how this use may be operated.

135  
136 Ms. Kessler noted that staff propose to amend the definition of Domestic Violence Shelter.  
137 Currently the definition read as *“The facility may also offer a variety services to help natural*  
138 *persons and their children including counseling and legal guidance.”* In speaking with a member  
139 of the public there was a concern about use of the term natural persons, which might allow for  
140 people who are not residents of the shelter to receive services on site. Staff’s suggestion is to  
141 delete the replace the term “natural persons” with “shelter clients.”

142  
143 Ms. Kessler noted that at previous meetings there was agreement from the Committee that Solar  
144 Energy Systems should be allowed in the Industrial Zoning District by right without requiring a  
145 conditional use permit. Staff have incorporated edits to the proposed Code to account for this  
146 change.

147  
148 Ms. Kessler noted another change to Table 8-1. Staff had inadvertently included Fraternity and  
149 Sorority as a permitted use in the High Density Zoning District. This use would only be  
150 permitted in Downtown Institutional.

151  
152 Ms. Kessler noted that based on feedback from the Joint Committee at a previous meeting, staff  
153 are proposing to remove the requirement that applications for a Congregate Living and Social  
154 Services Conditional Use Permit include an Operations and Management Plan as part of their  
155 application submission. This will be a requirement of a license for Congregate Living and Social  
156 Services but no longer a requirement for a CUP.

157  
158 Ms. Kessler noted that questions were raised at the December meeting about language in the Site  
159 Development Standards Screening Standards related to the side and rear of a building. To  
160 provide enhanced clarification staff are proposing to amend Section 20.6.2.A.1 to read *“Waste*  
161 *collection, waste compaction, recycling collection shall not be located along the building*  
162 *frontage or along a building facade with a primary entrance and shall be screened from view*  
163 *from adjacent property or public rights-of-way (not including alleys).”* Similarly, staff propose  
164 to edit the screening standards for drive-through businesses as follows: *“Drive-through windows*  
165 *and lanes shall not be located along the building frontage or along a building facade with a*  
166 *primary entrance.”*

167  
168 Ms. Kessler noted Article 25 at the present time includes application/permit review and approval  
169 procedures. Section 25.4 is specific to amendments to the land development code. Today the  
170 Planning Board and Historic District Commission have statutory authority over their own  
171 regulations. Articles 19 and 20 are the purview of the Planning Board and Article 21 is the  
172 purview of the Historic District Commission as well some sections of Article 25 as it relates to  
173 application processes. In the current proposed version of the Land Development Code, it was  
174 suggested that any time the Planning Board made changes to their regulations (Articles 19, 21)  
175 an entire Joint Committee process will be required plus a Planning Board public hearing which  
176 staff felt was rather onerous. As a result, staff is proposing that for the Planning Board with  
177 respect to Articles 19, 20, and Sections 25.10 through 25.14 of Article 25, and the Historic  
178 District Commission with respect to Article 21 and Section 25.15 of Article 25 – if there are  
179 changes proposed the respective board would a public hearing and those amendments would go  
180 before the PLD Committee for a recommendation to the City Council.

181

182 Ms. Kessler noted the reason the Council will be voting on these specific Articles is because by  
183 placing all these regulations in one document in the City Code, ultimately the City Council has to  
184 adopt and make changes to City Code.

185  
186 Ms. Kessler stated that another change to address a mistake, is to amend Section 25.5.6.B, which  
187 relates to the review criteria for variances as follows: Replace the phrase “*of this chapter*” in  
188 “*The proposed variance is not contrary to the spirit of this chapter*” with “*of the Zoning*  
189 *Regulations.*”

190  
191 Ms. Kessler stated that staff are proposing an amendment to Section 25.9.5 related to the  
192 procedure for the zoning administrator to issue a written interpretation. She stated that the  
193 language being proposed is that “*The Zoning Administrator shall publish their written*  
194 *interpretation on the City website within 5 calendar days from the date of issuance.*” This would  
195 allow for greater transparency of administrative decisions.

196  
197 Ms. Kessler noted that the Site Development Screening Standards do not clearly address how or  
198 if small-scale solar energy systems require screening. Ms. Kessler noted that staff will be  
199 presenting changes related to screening of small-scale and roof-mounted solar energy systems at  
200 the Planning Board public hearing it will hold on Article 21 of the proposed Land Development  
201 Code.

202  
203 Ms. Kessler noted that the standards related to window replacement in the Historic District  
204 Regulations in Article 21 need to be amended to be clearer about what is required for  
205 replacement of non-historic windows. Staff will present proposed edits to the Downtown  
206 Historic District Regulations that seek to provide greater clarification on standards related to  
207 window replacement at the public hearing the Historic District Commission will hold on Article  
208 21 of the proposed Land Development Code.

209  
210 Ms. Kessler noted that the changes she would be reviewing next relate to changes to the  
211 proposed zoning map, and O-2020-11. She stated that at a previous meeting the Committee was  
212 in favor of placing the parcel at 21 Davis Street, which is currently located in the Central  
213 Business Limited District and had been proposed to go into Downtown Transition, into the  
214 Downtown Core District. She noted that the amended proposed zoning map reflects this change.

215  
216 Ms. Kessler noted that there had been conversation at previous meetings about gaps in the  
217 transition district along Water Street. Staff’s suggestion is for the parcel at 92 Water Street,  
218 which is the site of the City Side Apartments and is located at the corner of Community Way and  
219 Water Street, to be located in the Downtown Transition District. Currently, it is proposed to go  
220 from the Central Business Limited District to the Downtown Growth District.

221  
222 Hearing no questions or comments on the above amendments. Ms. Kessler went on to say there  
223 have been concerns raised by members of the public regarding the consideration for diminution  
224 of property values as a criteria for special exception and for CUP. She indicated staff is not  
225 proposing to make this change and felt this is something the committee might wish to discuss  
226 further.

227  
228 She further stated there was also a comment made by a member of the public regarding the  
229 purpose of zoning and that the primary purpose of zoning is for protecting property values. This  
230 individual cited NH RSA 674:17 in their testimony. Ms. Kessler referred to NH RSA 674:17  
231 which states that the zoning ordinance shall be designed to:

- 232 (a) *To lessen congestion in the streets; RSA 674:17*  
233 (b) *To secure safety from fires, panic and other dangers.*  
234 (c) *To promote health and the general welfare;*  
235 (d) *To provide adequate light and air;*  
236 (e) *To prevent the overcrowding of land;*  
237 (f) *To avoid undue concentration of population;*  
238 (g) *To facilitate the adequate provision of transportation, solid waste facilities, water,*  
239 *sewerage, schools,*  
240 *parks, child day care;*  
241 (h) *To assure proper use of natural resources and other public requirements;*  
242 (i) *To encourage the preservation of agricultural lands and buildings and the agricultural*  
243 *operations described in RSA*  
244 *21:34-a supporting the agricultural lands and buildings; and*  
245 (j) *To encourage the installation and use of solar, wind, or other renewable energy*  
246 *sources.*

247  
248 It also states:

249 *Every zoning ordinance shall be made with reasonable consideration to, among other things, the*  
250 *character of the area involved and its peculiar suitability for particular uses, as well as with a*  
251 *view to conserving the value of buildings and encouraging the most appropriate use of land*  
252 *throughout the municipality.*

253  
254 Ms. Kessler explained the purpose of zoning is many things and part of it is consideration of  
255 property values, but whether it is specifically to protect property value is not clearly stated.  
256 However, by structuring zoning to address the list of considerations above, property values are in  
257 fact being addressed and potentially preserved. Ms. Kessler asked for input from other staff  
258 members present tonight.

259  
260 Mr. Kopczyński addressed the committee and stated when staff was given this charge for the  
261 zoning change, there were a number of different objectives such as modernization, streamlining  
262 etc. Staff did talk about consideration for property values but the reason it was not included is  
263 because there are no specific standards for assessing how a proposed use might influence future  
264 property values of surrounding properties. Unlike for instance when it comes to traffic, there is  
265 the ITE Manual. However, he noted it always up to the Committee to decide how it wishes to  
266 move forward with this issue.

267  
268 Mr. Lamb added there are property appraisers who are certified for the purpose of establishing  
269 property values. Mr. Lamb stated what is being asked is to predict whether or not a future change  
270 will result in decrease of value. He indicated what an appraiser would offer could give some  
271 valuation, but staff do not want to set up a system where there could be testimony from  
272 appraisers giving differing opinions on the same topic. Mr. Lamb felt as a result, there did not  
273 need to be a criteria specific to value of property.

274  
275 Councilor Johnsen felt eight people seemed like a large number for the purpose of a group home.  
276 Councilor Bosley stated she isn't sure whether this was the exact reason the number eight was  
277 chosen; but thought it was because for any duplex situation there could be four unrelated people  
278 living on each side of that duplex, which could constitute for eight. She noted this number could  
279 appear in most of these neighborhoods. Ms. Kessler added group home is an allowed use under  
280 the current zoning code with an unlimited number of people and except for residential  
281 preservation, all other zoning districts that permit single family homes also permit the location of

282 group homes. What is being proposed significantly reduces the density of group homes and also  
283 creates a review process by the Planning Board.

284  
285 Councilor Jones referred to the statute regarding zoning Ms. Kessler had referred to earlier and  
286 recalled this statute had been amended when Jeanne Shaheen was the Governor to include  
287 promoting smart growth principles – and asked for clarification as to whether this section was  
288 deleted or whether it was in a different section. Ms. Kessler stated this language is under RSA  
289 674:21 which refers to Innovative Landuse.

290  
291 b. Public Comment  
292 With that the Chair asked for public comment. Attorney Gary Kinyon addressed the committee  
293 on behalf of the Surry Village Charter School with reference to its facility located on Court  
294 Street. Attorney Kinyon noted back in November the Woodward Home had an application before  
295 the Zoning Board of Adjustment for the location of a Group Home. This property is located in  
296 the Medium Density District. Attorney Kinyon noted under the current zoning a Group Home in  
297 the Medium Density District is only allowed with a special exception and one of the conditions  
298 under this special exception is that it will not diminish surrounding property values. At that  
299 hearing there was fair amount of opposition, from him on behalf of the Surry Village Charter  
300 School, and a critical element considered by the Zoning Board to deny the Special Exception is  
301 that the proposed use will not diminish property values in surrounding neighborhoods. Attorney  
302 Kinyon stated he felt then and feels now that this is a critical element to a special exception  
303 requirement for a group home to be located in a Medium Density District and felt this was an  
304 important item for the Joint Committee’s amendment consideration.

305  
306 Attorney Kinyon went on to say, the Medium Density District in general, specifically in this area  
307 of the city, is primarily a residential zone and the purpose of the residential zone is to preserve  
308 residential uses. The group home proposed for this area was not a residential use and required a  
309 special exception to be located in this area. Under the proposed zoning, the permitted uses in the  
310 Medium Density District include a group home (small) and a domestic violence shelter. A  
311 domestic violence shelter will be permitted in the Medium Density District with certain  
312 conditions met. A group home (small) will be permitted with a CUP not a special exception and  
313 felt this diminishes the standards that need to be met for group home (small) especially to show  
314 that this use will not diminish property values in surrounding neighborhoods. Attorney Kinyon  
315 stated it is staff’s perspective that a standard of diminishing value is relatively subjective and  
316 brings into play experts. The attorney noted the standard for diminishing value has been a  
317 standard for application for variances under zoning and for special exception applications in  
318 Keene. He felt it is a necessary inclusion for special exception applications.

319  
320 Attorney Kinyon went on to say when a group home is introduced into a neighborhood like the  
321 Medium Density District, the city needs to give the abutters who may not want the proposed use  
322 in their neighborhood and the ability to show the board granting the approval that the proposed  
323 use will hurt their property value. Even though this is not the purpose of zoning, preserving  
324 property value is an important aspect for the Council to consider in adopting these zoning  
325 ordinance amendments. Attorney Kinyon felt this is an important item that should not only be  
326 preserved for special exception standards but also should be adopted into the CUP standards.

327  
328 Chair Russell Slack asked for staff’s response to these comments. Mr. Lamb responded by  
329 saying staff does not disagree that property values are important, but what staff is saying is that  
330 they can find a middle ground with oversight with conditions for CUP without explicit

331 discussion of property values. He stated he has a lot of respect for Attorney Kinyon’s opinion  
332 and felt it is something the committee should continue to discuss.

333  
334 Mr. Tom Savastano of 75 Winter Street, Keene stated he too agrees with Attorney Kinyon and  
335 stated property values are such an inherent concern for people who live in the city and have  
336 invested in this city. He felt this is a fundamental issue and needs to be included in this code.  
337 Mr. Savastano stated he joined and meeting late and questioned Ordinance 2020-11-A, Section  
338 46-561 which had a lot of red lines through it and asked whether this was changing the  
339 fundamental nature of what has been worked on. Ms. Kessler stated what is being proposed is  
340 that all references to chapter 46 be included in a separate ordinance, which would be introduced  
341 to the Planning, Development and Licenses Committee which will give staff more time to amend  
342 proposed language in Chapter 46 related to licenses for Congregate Living and Social Services.

343  
344 With no further comment, Chair Russell Slack closed the public hearing.

345  
346 Councilor Johnsen stated after listening to the prior two speakers this seems like a hard  
347 conversation. She indicated she is glad Mr. Lamb stepped in, as it sounds like an “us versus  
348 them” conversation and when decisions regarding licenses are made, the committee needs to be  
349 very aware of that.

350  
351 Mayor Hansel stated staff has worked very hard on this item. They have taken opposing  
352 viewpoints and made it work. He stated in an instance like this, not everyone is going to be  
353 happy with the outcome, but stated he is happy overall with the product and is ready to move it  
354 forward. Chair Russell Slack agreed with the Mayor and felt the staff has done the best they can  
355 with this and would like to move this item forward tonight. Councilor Bosley stated she too was  
356 ready to move this item forward tonight.

357  
358 A motion was made by Councilor Kate Bosely that the Joint Committee amend O-2020-10 and  
359 O-2020-11 in accordance with the amendments proposed in the Memorandum dated February 1,  
360 2021 included in the meeting packet for the February 8, 2021 Joint Committee meeting,  
361 including, but not limited to, the removal of Congregate Living and Social Services licensing  
362 provisions from O-2020-10, which is to be presented in a separate ordinance for submission to  
363 the City Council, and in accordance with the following amendments presented by City staff at  
364 the February 8, 2021 meeting:

- 365       a. Changes to the definition of Domestic Violence Shelter in Section 8.3.4.A of the  
366       proposed Land Development Code.  
367       b. Changes to Section 25.4 related to the amendment process for Articles 19 through  
368       21 and sections of 25.10 through 25.15 of the proposed Land Development Code  
369       related to the Planning Board and Historic District Commission regulations and  
370       application procedures.

371  
372 The motion was seconded by Councilor Mitch Greenwald and approved unanimously by roll call  
373 vote.

374  
375 A motion was made by Mayor George Hansel that the Planning Board finds O-2020-10-A and  
376 O-2020-11-A consistent with the City of Keene Comprehensive Master Plan.

377 The motion was seconded by Councilor Michael Remy and approved unanimously by roll call  
378 vote.

379



380 A motion was made by Councilor Mitch Greenwald that the Planning Licenses and Development  
381 Committee request the Mayor set a public hearing on O-2020-10-A and O-2020-11-A.  
382 The motion was seconded by Councilor Phil Jones and approved unanimously by roll call vote.  
383

384 Ms. Kessler noted these motions conclude the public workshop phase for these ordinances and  
385 they would move on to the public hearing phase. The Planning Board Public would be holding a  
386 public hearing on Article 19 (Subdivision Regulations), Article 20 (Site Development  
387 Standards), and sections of Article 25 related to the Planning Board site plan and subdivision  
388 application review process, on Monday, February 22, 2021 at 6:30 pm.  
389

390 The Historic District Commission would conduct a Public Hearing on Article 21 (Downtown  
391 Historic District Regulations), and sections of Article 25 on Wednesday, March 17, 2021 at 4:30  
392 pm.  
393

394 The Planning, Licenses, and Development Committee will meeting on the topic of Congregate  
395 Living and Social Services License on Wednesday, March 24, 2021 at 7:00 pm.  
396

397 Ms. Kessler noted information about these public hearings will be available on the Project  
398 Website: [www.keenebuildingbetter.com](http://www.keenebuildingbetter.com).  
399

400 Following these hearings the City Council will hold a public hearing on the ordinance at the  
401 earliest on May 6 and a take effect date for the proposed Land Development Code is anticipated  
402 for July 1, if it is voted on.  
403

404 Ms. Kessler added staff is always available to the public.  
405

406 It was decided the March 8 meeting will be canceled as it relates to this item.  
407

408 Adjourn

409 The meeting adjourned at 7:57 pm  
410

411 Respectfully submitted,  
412

413 Krishni Pahl,  
414 Minute Taker  
415

416 Reviewed and edited by,  
417 Tara Kessler, Senior Planner