

FINAL

MINUTES
PLANNING BOARD DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
Friday, June 5, 2020 – 12:30pm
REMOTE VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS
LebanonNH.gov/Live

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

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

1. CALL TO ORDER:

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

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

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

Chair Hall conducted attendance by roll call vote.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. May 8, 2020

B. May 22, 2020

The Subcommittee did not review or approve the minutes.

3. STUDY ITEMS:

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

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

The subcommittee members discussed the need for clear and understandable language overall and how best to define what the hierarchy should be for different areas of the City. Staff suggested that the language could be changed to require the applicant to define the appropriate hierarchy for each given project, including distinctions about how they are providing for safe mobility across user types. Ms. Monroe suggested providing a checklist of proposed concepts or requirements as long as the Board has some ability to revise the hierarchy if it disagrees with the applicant’s proposal. She asked

if having each requirement outlined more would benefit the completeness of applications between when they are screened by staff and when revised versions of the applications are received by the Planning Board. Mr. Brooks cautioned against being either too vague or too specific, so as to not create varying interpretations of the regulations for different projects. He confirmed that it is not unusual for staff to request revisions to improve landscaping, lighting, bike parking, wildlife and other design elements prior to Planning Board intake and as a result it would be more effective to have the requirements identified in the regulations.

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

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

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

Chair Hall left the meeting at 1:55 pm.

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

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

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

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

There was no discussion.

4. ADJOURNMENT:

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

Roll Call Vote:

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

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

The meeting was adjourned at 2:12 pm