



**LEBANON PLANNING BOARD DEVELOPMENT  
REGULATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA  
Remote Via Microsoft Teams  
[LebanonNH.gov/Live](https://LebanonNH.gov/Live)  
Friday, June 5, 2020 12:30pm**

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

A. Review of meeting procedures and NH RSA 91-A "Right-to-Know" requirements

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**A. MAY 8, 2020**

**Documents:**

[2020-06-05\\_PlnBrd Dev Regs Subcommittee\\_Item 2a\\_2020-05-08 Mins.pdf](#)

**B. MAY 22, 2020**

**Documents:**

[2020-06-05\\_PlnBrd Dev Regs Subcommittee\\_Item 2b\\_2020-05-22 Mins.pdf](#)

**3. STUDY ITEMS:**

A. Review potential amendments to Site Plan Review Regulations relative to Pedestrian and Bicyclist improvements

B. Discussion of process for identifying and reviewing other potential amendments to Development Regulations

**4. ADJOURNMENT:**

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION NOTICE:** *Due to the current situation with the COVID-19 Pandemic, the City of Lebanon is offering its meetings via Microsoft Teams. Members of the public are encouraged to attend by going to [LebanonNH.gov/Live](https://LebanonNH.gov/Live) where you will find instructions on how to enter the meeting. Members of the public will be able to participate and ask questions through the Microsoft Teams software or by phone. Please visit [LebanonNH.gov/Live](https://LebanonNH.gov/Live) for full details.*

**NOTE:** City Hall is temporarily closed to the public in order to help prevent of the spread of Novel Coronavirus COVID-19. City operations will continue during this time, but in-person transactions will be limited to those of a critical nature. If you have any questions, please contact the Planning & Development Department by sending an e-mail to [planning@lebanonnh.gov](mailto:planning@lebanonnh.gov), or by calling 603-448-1457. The agenda materials will also be posted to the City's website: <https://lebanonnh.gov/agendacenter>.

**THE ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE.**



**AGENDA  
PLANNING BOARD DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE  
JUNE 5, 2020**

**AGENDA ITEM #2A  
APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MAY 8, 2020**

1 **DRAFT**

2  
3 **MINUTES**  
4 **PLANNING BOARD DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE**  
5 **Friday May 8, 2020 – 12:30pm**  
6 **REMOTE VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**  
7 **LebanonNH.gov/Live**  
8

9 Members Present: Matthew Hall (Chair), Joan Monroe, Tom Martz, Kathie Romano

10  
11 Members Absent: n/a

12  
13 Staff present: Rebecca Owens (Associate Planner), David Brooks (Planning Director)  
14

---

15  
16 **1. CALL TO ORDER:**

17  
18 Chair Hall called the meeting to order at 12:39pm

19  
20 **A. Review of meeting procedures and NH RSA 91-A “Right-to-Know” requirements.**

21  
22 Mr. Brooks reviewed the requirements for remote meetings, including noting that all votes  
23 must be roll call votes and asked participants to identify themselves prior to asking  
24 questions or making comments. Mr. Brooks conducted attendance by roll call vote.  
25

26 **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

27  
28 **A. APRIL 24, 2020**

29  
30 The Subcommittee agreed to table the consideration of the draft minutes until the next meeting as  
31 not everyone had had a chance to review them.  
32

33 **3. STUDY ITEMS:**

34  
35 **A. Review potential amendments to Site Plan Review Regulations relative to**  
36 **Pedestrian and Bicyclist improvements**

37  
38 Ms. Owens reviewed follow-up items from the April 24th meeting, including questions about  
39 the interpretation of shall vs. should and what triggers Site Plan Review. She asked the  
40 committee members to think about individual requirements and whether they should be  
41 required (e.g. “shall” or “must”) or permissive (e.g. “should” or “may”). Ms. Owens also noted  
42 that staff was continuing to review the jurisdiction standards for what triggers site plan  
43 review and whether there are opportunities to streamline the requirements and procedures  
44 for smaller-scale projects, perhaps including a minor site plan review process. Ms. Monroe  
45 noted that what may seem like simple applications, like Boundary Line Adjustments, can  
46 become complicated.  
47

48 Ms. Owens continued review of potential amendments in Section 6.2.E (Landscaping of  
49 Parking Areas). The committee discussed the need and importance of landscaping within  
50 and around parking lots. Mr. Hall indicated that he liked the concept of paragraphs 1 and 2  
51 and noted that developers will still have the ability to request a waiver if warranted. Mr. Martz  
52 asked for clarification about the proposed requirement for internal landscape beds between  
53 double rows of parking spaces.  
54

1 Ms. Romano joined the meeting at 1:00pm  
2

3 Ms. Owens reviewed the proposed language of Section 6.2.E.2.3 relative to dividing larger  
4 parking areas into smaller segments. Mr. Hall and Ms. Monroe agreed that the language  
5 was good and that waivers could be considered when necessary.  
6

7 Mr. Brooks noted that Section 7.2.A provides that waivers of landscaping requirements shall  
8 not be considered in cases where adequate parking cannot be provided due to landscaping  
9 requirements. He recommended that the Board keep that section in mind as it considers  
10 additional landscaping requirements in and around parking areas. Chair Hall recommended  
11 that the Subcommittee may want to consider Section 7.2.A for modification when  
12 considering other potential amendments. Ms. Romano noted that perhaps the parking lot  
13 landscaping requirements for multi-family projects should be different than for commercial  
14 projects.  
15

16 The Subcommittee spent time reviewing the language of Section 6.2.G (Landscaping of  
17 Additional Front Yard and Adjacent Pedestrian Facilities). Ms. Romano noted that utility  
18 companies occasionally require utility boxes to be located in front yards and do not allow for  
19 alternative locations. She did not want to put an applicant in a position where they could not  
20 comply with a requirement because of a utility company's decision. Waivers were discussed  
21 as a way to address such scenarios.  
22

23 Chair Hall asked for clarification about Section 6.2.G.1 and expressed concern about including  
24 "planned" public pedestrian facilities, which may be too speculative to justify requiring an  
25 applicant to make specific additional improvements.  
26

27 Ms. Owens reviewed proposed changes to Section 6.5 (Coordination of Roads, Parking,  
28 Loading, Recreation, and Safety). She noted that a significant goal is to reference and  
29 incorporate the City's Complete Streets policy into the Board's development regulations. Ms.  
30 Owens reviewed the additional standards that should be considered for reference. Ms.  
31 Romano asked about the intention of paragraph 1 regarding 10' wide internal roads.  
32

33 Chair Hall asked whether it would be possible to streamline the review of proposed  
34 amendments by having Subcommittee members submit comments in advance. Mr. Brooks  
35 noted that such a process may not allow for adequate discussion among the members as  
36 envisioned by the Subcommittee structure. Ms. Romano suggested that the Subcommittee  
37 members be advised of which sections will be reviewed at the next meeting in order to have  
38 time to review them and be prepared for discussion. Staff agreed to provide the members  
39 with an updated copy of the proposed amendments and to alert them of sections to review  
40 in advance of upcoming meetings.  
41

42 Chair Hall left the meeting at 1:55pm  
43

44 **B. Discussion of process for identifying and reviewing other potential amendments**  
45 **to Development Regulations**  
46

47 There was no discussion.  
48

49 **3. ADJOURNMENT:**  
50

51 ***A Motion by Ms. Monroe to adjourn the meeting.***  
52 ***Seconded by Ms. Romano.***  
53

- 1 Roll Call Vote:
- 2 Members voting in favor included: Ms. Monroe, Ms. Romano, and Mr. Martz.
- 3 The vote on the Motion was unanimous (3-0)
- 4
- 5 The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 pm

DRAFT

**AGENDA  
PLANNING BOARD DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE  
JUNE 5, 2020**

**AGENDA ITEM #2B  
APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MAY 22, 2020**

1 **DRAFT**

2  
3 **MINUTES**  
4 **PLANNING BOARD DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE**  
5 **Friday, May 22, 2020 – 12:30pm**  
6 **REMOTE VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**  
7 **LebanonNH.gov/Live**

8  
9 Members Present: Joan Monroe, Tom Martz, Kathie Romano

10  
11 Members Absent: Matthew Hall (Chair)

12  
13 Staff present: Rebecca Owens (Associate Planner), David Brooks (Planning Director)

14  
15  
16 **1. CALL TO ORDER:**

17  
18 Staff asked Ms. Monroe to act as Chair in the absence of Chair Hall's presence, which she  
19 accepted. Ms. Monroe called the meeting to order at 12:47pm. Ms. Monroe conducted attendance  
20 by roll call vote.

21  
22 **A. Review of meeting procedures and NH RSA 91-A "Right-to-Know" requirements.**

23  
24 Ms. Owens reviewed the requirements for remote meetings, including noting that all votes  
25 must be roll call votes and asked participants to identify themselves prior to asking  
26 questions or making comments.

27  
28 **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

29  
30 **A. APRIL 24, 2020**

31 A motion by Ms. Monroe to approve the April 2, 2020 Minutes.  
32 Seconded by Ms. Romano.

33  
34 *Roll Call Vote:*

35 *Members voting in favor included: Ms. Monroe, Ms. Romano, and Mr. Martz.*  
36 *The vote on the Motion was unanimous (3-0). The Motion was approved.*

37  
38 **B. MAY 8, 2020**

39 The Subcommittee agreed to table the consideration of the draft minutes until the next meeting as  
40 not everyone had had a chance to review them.

41  
42 **3. STUDY ITEMS:**

43  
44 **A. Review potential amendments to Site Plan Review Regulations relative to**  
45 **Pedestrian and Bicyclist improvements**

46  
47 Ms. Owens identified four sections in the potential amendments that were identified for  
48 Subcommittee members to review in advance of the meeting, including under Section 6.5,  
49 sub-sections C. Orientation and Form (new), D. Access and Traffic (amended), E. Parking  
50 and Loading Areas (amended), and H. Bicycle Storage and Parking (new). The  
51 Subcommittee began reviewing where it left off after the May 22, 2020 meeting, on Section  
52 6.5.C.

53  
54 Subcommittee members agreed to change "Respond" as the leading verb in paragraph 1 to

1 "Orientation", a noun that is consistent with the other paragraphs and more understandable  
2 to regulation users, although as Mr. Martz commented, "respond" and similar verbiage may  
3 be familiar to the architects who commonly manage many of the development applications  
4 reviewed by the City.

5  
6 Subcommittee members expressed varying interpretations and favorability of the concept  
7 under Section 6.5.C.2, "Highlight the primary entrance". The proposed intent of the  
8 standard, to make the active portion of buildings (e.g., storefronts and entrances) on a  
9 property visible to public areas (e.g., streets) was agreed upon as a helpful way to invite  
10 interest and invite economic engagement, as well as to make the walkability from public  
11 areas, like on-street sidewalks as convenient as possible between the entrance and public  
12 way. Ms. Monroe cited Best Buy and Price Choppers as examples of buildings with their  
13 "sides", instead of entrances, facing the main road/frontage. Mr. Martz asked and Ms.  
14 Owens confirmed that the requirement would be applied to major renovations and new  
15 construction. Ms. Romano suggested changing the requirement to not apply commercial  
16 plaza uses, or to update the wording from "The primary entrance(s) to the building shall be  
17 oriented toward the street on which the lot has frontage" to say "toward the public way"  
18 instead. Ms. Monroe agreed that it would help to make the language clearer for the public.  
19 Mr. Martz noted that a similar concept for architects and developers is to design  
20 developments and communities where "buildings talk to other buildings".

21  
22 There was discussion about what "frontage" means and Ms. Owens referred to the recently  
23 adopted amendment to the Zoning Ordinance that includes a definition for "principal  
24 frontage". She also noted that this requirement complements the best practice for new  
25 construction to have vehicle parking located to the side and rear of buildings and not on the  
26 principal frontage in front of buildings. Ms. Romano also asked if it would help for this  
27 paragraph to be more specific about where it applies, such as in a downtown area rather  
28 than to a multifamily project. Ms. Monroe added that more specificity about treatment of  
29 existing or new construction developments that have internal roadways may be worth  
30 reviewing. Ms. Owens provided the example that corner entrances can be a way for  
31 shopping plazas that are L-shaped or U-shaped to highlight entrances so that they are  
32 visible and welcoming from both the internal roadway and public roadway (principal  
33 frontage).

34  
35 David Brooks joined the meeting at approximately 2:00pm.

36  
37 Subcommittee members accepted the addition of Section 6.5.C.3, "Adaptable entrance  
38 design", following clarification of the requirement's intent by Mr. Brooks. Mr. Brooks provided  
39 the examples of 195 Mechanic Street and Panera. He noted that each building has multiple  
40 entrances to various tenant spaces, in order to make the building on the whole more  
41 adaptable to future modifications. Mr. Brooks said that the idea is that you would have 3-4  
42 possible entryways into a single building space so that there is future flexibility, in contract  
43 to big box stores, which typically have one entrance and cannot as easily be reused.

44  
45 Subcommittee members accepted the addition of the first three sentences under Section  
46 6.5.C.4, "Parking structure design". Mr. Martz spoke of a parking structure in Hanover,  
47 potentially with reference to West Wheelock Street, that demonstrates comparable intent.  
48 Ms. Romano also mentioned an example, which she emailed to Subcommittee members.  
49 Ms. Owens elaborated that the intent of having either some variation of uses in addition to  
50 structure parking, or to have some variation in the architectural of the structured parking it to  
51 reduce the monolithic presence of such structures and to increase their overall property land  
52 value as parking is not as valued as many other uses.

53

1 Subcommittee members varied in opinions about the fourth sentence of Section 6.5.C.4,  
2 which requires, with various compliance path options, for garages to be minimized as part of  
3 building design along the principal frontage. Ms. Romano cited Quarry Hills condos as a  
4 development where such a requirement could not be applied. Mr. Martz noted that he  
5 understands the intent of the requirement but asked whether it could be a "should" instead  
6 of a "must" and if staff can provide examples that include single family homes and duplexes.  
7 Ms. Monroe indicated that she has followed practices for years that say housing is more  
8 people-friendly when the garage is not the majority of what you see and can access at the  
9 frontage, and that it is less welcoming than features like porches. However she also  
10 understood Ms. Romano's perspective and asked if this requirement might be brought to the  
11 rest of the Planning Board for consideration.

12  
13 Subcommittee members were reminded by Mr. Brooks of the time before review began of  
14 Section 6.5.D. Access and Traffic.

15  
16 **B. Discussion of process for identifying and reviewing other potential amendments**  
17 **to Development Regulations**

18  
19 There was no discussion.

20  
21 **3. ADJOURNMENT:**

22  
23 ***A Motion by Mr. Martz to adjourn the meeting.***  
24 ***Seconded by Ms. Romano.***

25  
26 *Roll Call Vote:*

27 *Members voting in favor included: Ms. Monroe, Ms. Romano, and Mr. Martz.*

28 *The vote on the Motion was unanimous (3-0). The Motion was approved.*

29  
30 The meeting was adjourned at 2:27 pm