

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

**AGENDA ITEM #2B  
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.

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