



**LEBANON PLANNING BOARD DEVELOPMENT
REGULATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Remote Via Microsoft Teams
LebanonNH.gov/Live
Friday, June 19, 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:

[2020-06-19_PlnBrd Dev Regs Subcommittee-Item 2a_2020-05-08 Mins.pdf](#)

B. MAY 22, 2020

Documents:

[2020-06-19_PlnBrd Dev Regs Subcommittee_Item 2b_2020-05-22 Mins.pdf](#)

C. JUNE 5, 2020

Documents:

[2020-06-19_PlnBrd Dev Regs Subcommittee-Item 2c_2020-06-05 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 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 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, 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 19, 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 as 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 19, 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 contrast
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

**AGENDA
PLANNING BOARD DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE
JUNE 19, 2020**

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

JUNE 5, 2020

1 **DRAFT**

2
3 **MINUTES**

4 **PLANNING BOARD DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE**

5 **Friday, June 5, 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 Staff present: Rebecca Owens (Associate Planner), David Brooks (Planning Director)

12
13
14 **1. CALL TO ORDER:**

15
16 Chair Hall called the meeting to order at 12:30 pm.

17
18 **A. Review of meeting procedures and NH RSA 91-A “Right-to-Know” requirements.**

19
20 Ms. Owens reviewed the requirements for remote meetings, including noting that all votes
21 must be roll call votes and asked participants to identify themselves prior to asking
22 questions or making comments.

23
24 Chair Hall conducted attendance by roll call vote.

25
26 **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

27
28 **A. May 8, 2020**

29
30 **B. May 22, 2020**

31
32 The Subcommittee did not review or approve the minutes.

33
34 **3. STUDY ITEMS:**

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

38
39 Ms. Owens started reviewing proposed amendments to Section 6.5.B. For proposed
40 Paragraph 3 (street hierarchy), Chair Hall noted that he felt he understood the sentiment of
41 the new language, but questioned whether it was necessary to be in the Regulations. He
42 asked if staff feels that developers are not already addressing this issue. Mr. Martz
43 expressed concern that landscaping needed to be designed for a variety of vehicles, such
44 as very low cars versus SUVs. Ms. Monroe suggested that the proposed requirement gives
45 helpful direction for current landscaping requirements for where and how to utilize additional
46 buffers. Ms. Romano asked staff to provide an example of what is intended. Ms. Owens
47 elaborated upon the variety of elements that can be used in addition to vegetated
48 landscaping to demarcate the hierarchy and give it three dimensionality, such as low walls.
49 She explained that one purpose of such a standard is to augment surface markings and
50 curbing for more clear, efficient and safe wayfinding for each travel mode.

51
52 The subcommittee members discussed the need for clear and understandable language
53 overall and how best to define what the hierarchy should be for different areas of the City.
54 Staff suggested that the language could be changed to require the applicant to define the

1 appropriate hierarchy for each given project, including distinctions about how they are
2 providing for safe mobility across user types. Ms. Monroe suggested providing a checklist of
3 proposed concepts or requirements as long as the Board has some ability to revise the
4 hierarchy if it disagrees with the applicant's proposal. She asked if having each requirement
5 outlined more would benefit the completeness of applications between when they are
6 screened by staff and when revised versions of the applications are received by the
7 Planning Board. Mr. Brooks cautioned against being either too vague or too specific, so as
8 to not create varying interpretations of the regulations for different projects. He confirmed
9 that it is not unusual for staff to request revisions to improve landscaping, lighting, bike
10 parking, wildlife and other design elements prior to Planning Board intake and as a result it
11 would be more effective to have the requirements identified in the regulations.
12

13 Ms. Owens reviewed proposed language for 6.5.B.4 (internal connectivity). Ms. Monroe
14 appreciated the bulleting of related sub-requirements, as they are similar to a checklist, for
15 ease of application. Mr. Martz asked whether it is worth adding more explicit reference to
16 maintenance commitments for internal connectivity infrastructure and also for clarification
17 about the intent of the walkway spacing requirement between parking aisles. Ms. Romano
18 suggested that a diagram may be appropriate to depict what is expected. Ms. Owens
19 showed a photo example of providing regular pedestrian walkways within a parking area.
20

21 The subcommittee members expressed support for the proposal to require connectivity
22 between multiple buildings on a single property and between adjoining properties.
23

24 Ms. Owens reviewed proposed language for 6.5.B.5 (Access Management). Staff noted that
25 access management can improve safety and roadway function by limiting curb cuts and
26 points of conflict. The subcommittee supported the amendment as proposed, citing
27 particular relevance to developments around Route 12A, and alternatives like the underpass
28 adjacent to KMart.
29

30 Chair Hall left the meeting at 1:55 pm.
31

32 Ms. Owens reviewed proposed language for 6.5.B.6 (Shared Streets). Ms. Romano
33 expressed concern about mixing vehicles and pedestrians. Other subcommittee members
34 supported the idea in certain circumstances.
35

36 Ms. Owens reviewed proposed language for 6.5.B.7 (Traffic Control). Staff noted that
37 Section 6.8 allows the Board to require off-site traffic control improvements when necessary
38 and staff will verify if the existing text precludes the need for the proposed language.
39

40 Ms. Romano requested staff to provide examples of bike parking and storage in advance of
41 the next subcommittee meeting, to enhance review of related amendment proposals.
42

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

45
46 There was no discussion.
47

48 **4. ADJOURNMENT:**

49 ***A Motion by Ms. Monroe to adjourn the meeting.***

50 ***Seconded by Ms. Romano.***

51
52
53 *Roll Call Vote:*

- 1 *Members voting in favor included: Ms. Monroe, Ms. Romano, and Mr. Martz.*
- 2 *The vote on the Motion was unanimous (3-0). The Motion was approved.*
- 3
- 4 The meeting was adjourned at 2:12 pm

DRAFT