

**AGENDA  
PLANNING BOARD DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS SUB-  
COMMITTEE  
MAY 22, 2020**

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

**APRIL 24, 2020**

1 **DRAFT**

2  
3 **MINUTES**  
4 **PLANNING BOARD DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE**  
5 **Friday, April 24, 2020 – 12:00pm**  
6 **REMOTE VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**  
7 **LebanonNH.gov/Live**

8  
9 Members Present: Matthew Hall (Chair), Joan Monroe, Kathie Romano, Tom Martz

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 12:05pm

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.

25  
26 **2. STUDY ITEMS:**

27  
28 **A. Review potential amendments to Site Plan Review Regulations relative to**  
29 **Pedestrian and Bicyclist improvements**

30  
31 Mr. Brooks noted that reviewing and updating the Board’s development regulations is a goal  
32 of the City’s Master Plan and has been part of the Department’s Work Plan for several years  
33 to make sure the procedures are appropriate to the types of development and that  
34 submission and design requirements are up to date with community goals and best  
35 practices.

36  
37 Ms. Owens reviewed an addition to Section 1.3 (Interpretation, Conflict, and Separability) to  
38 clarify the interpretation of required versus permissive statements in the regulations.

39  
40 Chair Hall expressed support for the spirit of the amendment to Section 6.1.B (General  
41 Requirements), but expressed concern that the proposed language is overly broad. Ms.  
42 Monroe agreed that the language is not specific enough. The Subcommittee members  
43 agreed to table this proposed amendment language for further consideration at a future  
44 time.

45  
46 Ms. Romano asked for clarification about the amendment to Section 6.1.C and whether the  
47 proposed language refers to building or fire code issues or just site plan review issues. The  
48 Subcommittee members discussed the thresholds at which the Board might want non-  
49 conforming developments to begin to become more compliant with the Site Plan  
50 Regulations. Staff suggested language to clarify that the section refers to Site Plan Review  
51 regulations.

52  
53 Mr. Martz joined the meeting at 12:40

1  
2 Ms. Owens reviewed proposed changes to 6.2.D (Landscaping Around Buildings).  
3 Subcommittee members discussed the desire to encourage direct and dedicated pedestrian  
4 circulation patterns and to appropriately plan landscaping and other improvements around  
5 those anticipated patterns. The Subcommittee discussed the importance of enforcement  
6 and how and when enforcement can happen. The Subcommittee supported the proposed  
7 language in 6.2.D.3.

8  
9 The Subcommittee spent time reviewing the language of 6.2.D.4 and discussing whether  
10 certain requirements should be mandatory or just encouraged or recommended. There was  
11 discussion about the review process for considering standards that are encouraged versus  
12 required, including whether waivers are necessary for standards that are simply  
13 recommendations. Ms. Romano asked for clarification on whether the proposed language  
14 applies only in certain districts or city-wide, because certain requirements may not fit or  
15 make sense in every district or for every project. Staff noted that the Board has the ability  
16 target certain requirements toward certain districts or to exclude certain districts if it feels  
17 appropriate.

18 Ms. Romano suggested that review of how 'must versus should' standards are interpreted  
19 and applied be brought to the full Planning Board sooner than later so that all members are  
20 in agreement as to what those terms represent, and so that the sub-committee can review  
21 proposed amendments with accurate usage of those terms.  
22

23  
24  
25 **B. Discussion of process for identifying and reviewing other potential amendments**  
26 **to Development Regulations**

27  
28 Mr. Brooks noted that staff will continue to bring forward potential amendments for Article III  
29 (Jurisdiction) and other sections of the regulations for the committee's review as they are  
30 prepared.

31  
32 Chair Hall left the meeting at 1:30 pm

33  
34 The committee members discussed a schedule and process for subsequent meetings of the  
35 Subcommittee.

36  
37 **3. ADJOURNMENT:**

38  
39 ***A Motion by Ms. Monroe to adjourn the meeting.***  
40 ***Seconded by Ms. Romano.***

41  
42 *Roll Call Vote:*  
43 *Members voting in favor included: Ms. Monroe, Ms. Romano, and Mr. Martz.*  
44 *The vote on the Motion was unanimous (3-0)*

45  
46 The meeting was adjourned at 1:35 pm