



**WEST LEBANON REVITALIZATION ADVISORY
COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 14, 2021 - 7:00 PM
MEETING ROOM 1, CITY HALL OR
REMOTE VIA VIRTUAL PLATFORM
LEBANONNH.GOV/LIVE**

-
- 1. Call to Order**
 - 2. Approval of Minutes**
 - A. November 16, 2021
 - B. November 23, 2021
 - 3. Old Business**
 - A. Committee Recommendations/Priorities
 - 4. New Business**
 - A. None
 - 5. Other Business**
 - 6. Adjournment**

The order of agenda items is subject to change.

Meetings are open for in-person and remote attendance. Members of the public who wish to attend remotely may do so 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 City's virtual platform or by phone. Please visit LebanonNH.gov/Live for full details.

Agenda
West Lebanon Revitalization Advisory Committee
December 14, 2021

Agenda Item #2A
Approval of Minutes

November 16, 2021

DRAFT

**CITY OF LEBANON
WEST LEBANON REVITALIZATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES, NOVEMBER 16, 2021
LEBANON CITY HALL – MEETING ROOM 1
7:00 PM**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Winny (Chair, City Council Rep.); Chet Clem (Vice-Chair);
Gregoria Amaro; Kevin Purcell (Economic Development Commission
Rep.); Laurel Stavis (Planning Board Rep.); Dean Cashman

MEMBERS ABSENT: Graziella Parati, Lauren Groves

STAFF PRESENT: David Brooks, Planning & Zoning Director

1
2 **1. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Winny called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

3
4 **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

5
6 A. October 19, 2021

7 B. October 26, 2021

8
9 *A MOTION by Mr. Cashman to approve the minutes of the October 19th, and October 26th meetings as*
10 *presented.*

11 *Seconded by Mr. Purcell.*

12 **The Motion was approved (6-0)*

13
14 **3. OLD BUSINESS:**

15
16 **A. Committee Recommendations/Priorities**

17
18 Mr. Winny spoke with the mayor and confirmed the committee's recommendations will be a City Council
19 agenda topic in December. The first item is the Westboro Yard. Within that topic, the committee has
20 identified waterfront access, an amphitheater, a playing field, and a longer-term plan for the city to gain
21 control over more of the property.

22
23 Mr. Clem asked to take the agenda out of order in the interest of guests in the meeting who own nearby
24 businesses. Mr. Clem stated he spoke with business owners earlier in the week to discuss the proposed
25 roundabout and the impact it could have on their properties and businesses. Brian and Spencer Molloy
26 voiced their opinions on the roundabout and on the proposed streetscape plan. They have concerns
27 regarding the potential loss of parking lots and other pertinent space. Ms. Stavis noted there has not been
28 much discussion with the community about an implementation of a roundabout and that she is mainly
29 aware of it from being a part of this group. Mr. Brooks stated that the concept of a roundabout was
30 presented in the 2019 Visioning Charrette. There was discussion about whether or not it is too early to
31 communicate the plans with the public or if it is the appropriate next step. Mr. Brooks stated that the
32 Streetscape plans have only been presented to this committee so far, and that community outreach is the
33 appropriate next step.
34

1 The committee viewed the concept plans to identify where there will be changes to existing conditions.
2 Ms. Stavis noted the change will be disruptive to the community and there was discussion about whether
3 or not it would be more practical to implement all the changes at once or to space it out over time. Mr.
4 Brooks reviewed the traffic analysis prepared by VHB showing that a roundabout would function better
5 than the existing traffic signal. Mr. Brooks also noted that a roundabout could have other benefits,
6 including traffic calming to slow vehicles, a safer intersection for vehicles and pedestrians, and the
7 opportunity to improve the appearance entering the Main Street area.

8
9 There was discussion about looking at these improvements from a traffic versus community perspective.
10 Private property owners will need to make their own decisions about building improvements and who
11 they sell or lease space to, but the City may be able to create some incentives. Improving the streetscape
12 without creating incentives for change will not be fully effective. Another pressing issue that warranted
13 discussion is pedestrian traffic and crosswalks.

14
15 The next topic to be presented to the City Council is the Rail Trail. Mr. Clem felt it should be handled
16 similarly to the announcement of the roundabout by asking the community what they want to see happen
17 with it. Many of the projects require approval of another department such as the NH Department of
18 Transportation. A point that was added under this topic was working toward the relicensing of the dam.

19
20 The third item of discussion was Bridge Park. There was discussion over renaming the park after a
21 significant member of the West Lebanon Community. A remediation plan is being prepared because the
22 property was over-cleared. New plants will need to be installed in the Shoreland buffer. It was noted that
23 there was a significant trash problem that was addressed. A suggestion arose that having the community
24 help remove trash can make it feel like it is something created by them, something that is theirs.

25
26 The next topic was planning and zoning changes and how to improve the appearance and use of run-down
27 buildings. There has been talk about changing zoning regulations such as heights which was previously
28 met with resistance from the community, but is now supported by this committee.

29
30 One of the major zoning issues is the proposed elimination of drive-throughs from the district. Post-
31 pandemic, it is unlikely that businesses will seek permits without the accessibility of a drive-through.
32 Changing this zoning and permitting issue will eliminate the cycle of the inability to progress as a
33 community. Mr. Brooks suggested that drive-throughs are not beneficial in a downtown setting, but are
34 appropriate for a general commercial setting.

35
36 The next item of discussion was the Seminary Hill School that the city and school board are working on
37 together. The potential idea would be to create a community center of some sort. Currently, the city
38 owns the Dana House building but not the land.

39
40 The future of the committee was also discussed, including whether it should be extended or whether a
41 civic association should be created that would be more flexible for gathering volunteers, fundraising, etc.
42 After meeting with the mayor, the best option appears to be continuing this committee in a scaled-down
43 version along with a civic group. There is a rough idea of the future and what should be recommended to
44 City Council but nothing concrete yet. There are a few remaining small items to be presented to the City
45 Council.

46
47 **4. NEW BUSINESS:**

48
49 No discussion.

50
51 **5. OTHER BUSINESS:**

52

1 No discussion.
2

3 **6. ADJOURNMENT:**
4

5 **A MOTION by Mr. Purcell to adjourn the meeting.**

6 **Seconded by Mr. Cashman.**

7 ***The Motion was approved (6-0)**
8

9 The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.
10

11
12 Respectfully submitted,

13 Megan Mraz
14

Agenda
West Lebanon Revitalization Advisory Committee
December 14, 2021

Agenda Item #2B
Approval of Minutes

November 23, 2021

DRAFT

**CITY OF LEBANON
WEST LEBANON REVITALIZATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES, November 23, 2021
LEBANON CITY HALL – MEETING ROOM 1
7:00 PM**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chet Clem (Vice-Chair); Gregorio Amaro, Kevin Purcell (Economic Development Commission Rep.); Dean Cashman, Lauren Groves

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jim Winny (Chair, City Council Rep.); Laurel Stavis, Graziella Parati

STAFF PRESENT: David Brooks, Planning & Zoning Director

1
2 **1. CALL TO ORDER:** Vice-Chair Clem called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

3
4 **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

5
6 A. None

7
8 **3. OLD BUSINESS:**

9
10 **A. Committee Recommendations/Priorities**

11
12 Mr. Brooks discussed the similarities between the goals of the 2016 Downtown Visioning Study and the
13 2019 West Lebanon Village Visioning Charrette in terms of proposing new zoning regulations. Since the
14 goals of a more active and attractive streetscape are highlighted in both studies, he felt there was some
15 basis for applying the Lebanon Downtown (LD) District regulations to West Lebanon. But it was noted
16 and previously discussed that the LD regulations do not allow for new drive-through facilities. In West
17 Lebanon, there are currently four drive throughs, all of which are banks. Mr. Brooks confirmed that if an
18 existing bank was to relocate, any business that moved into the property would be granted use of the drive
19 through as it is grand-fathered in. Mr. Brooks suggested that drive throughs may be individually
20 successful but may not be ideal for the overall downtown. Architect Dan Winny noted in an email to the
21 Committee that drive-throughs tend to favor national chains and take up an excessive amount of space
22 that can make a downtown unwalkable. Mr. Brooks stated his opinion that another vision study would
23 not be beneficial at this stage. Mr. Clem questioned whether the zoning of Lebanon is ideal for West
24 Lebanon or if it is the wrong fit.

25
26 Mr. Brooks noted that there is language to grand-father projects on existing buildings in downtown
27 Lebanon and there would be similar zoning guidelines for West Lebanon. He also pointed out that re-
28 zoning is bound to create non-conformities which is why grandfathering exists. He noted that there is no
29 obligation that the City have a single set of regulations for all of the downtown areas, but he understood
30 that to be the intent of the Committee's motion earlier in the summer. Though West Lebanon will never
31 be downtown Lebanon, the community and boards need to decide what direction they want to go. Mr.
32 Brooks confirmed that re-zoning is a cumbersome process and it likely will not happen at an expedited
33 pace as the Department has many other obligations and priorities at the same time. Discussion continued
34 between Mr. Brooks and Mr. Clem regarding the process of amending zoning and what has inhibited the
35 movement in West Lebanon thus far.

1
2 Mr. Clem recognized that one of the differences this time around is the excitement surrounding West
3 Lebanon. There is momentum from the demolition of Westboro and from the block party that has created
4 enthusiasm and support and a willingness/motivation to move forward.
5

6 Mr. Brooks stated that the current proposal would result in one set of regulations for the downtowns as
7 opposed to the various adaptive regulations. He suggested that the community could proceed with
8 amendments to dimensional standards for the Central Business (CB) District, but the conversation about
9 uses could happen later after more community discussion. Drive-through uses are one of the few
10 differences between the LD regulations and the CB District regulations, so they would still not be
11 dramatically different. Mr. Amaro said there is a drive-through culture already and questioned if it would
12 give way to a town of nothing but drive-throughs. Mr. Clem strongly urged including property owners in
13 these discussions. Mr. Clem asked if it would hurt the community to remove a potentially helpful tool
14 (drive-thoughts)?
15

16 There was discussion about building height regulations in the CB District. Mr. Clem noted that in many
17 communities, there is a push to increase density where it can be accommodated. Building upward has
18 become so vital in recent years with rapid population growth. There was discussion about Form Based
19 Codes being used to streamline the review process by outlining what a community is looking for. Part of
20 the challenge of growing West Lebanon is that there is no style to work off of or work toward.
21

22 The committee discussed bifurcating the roundabout from the rest of the streetscape project for financial
23 reasons and until there can be more community discussion. The committee felt the funding would be
24 more beneficial for the greenway. There was discussion on the dry bridge project which may be getting
25 delayed again because of the railroad. At this rate, the hope is that the bridge will be completed in 2023
26 and 2024.
27

28 Ms. Groves asked for numbers to clarify the rate of failure of the roundabout v. a signalized intersection
29 from a traffic study. There was discussion on options specific to the roundabout such as how many lanes
30 it may include and if more lanes are actually beneficial. Mr. Brooks said the traffic numbers are based on
31 background growth and standard assumptions that may or may not align with reality. Those projections
32 show failure at about the same rate if the volume of traffic keeps growing. In terms of moving traffic, the
33 roundabout moves vehicles slightly better than a signal at peak times and in off-peak times. There was
34 also discussion on how traffic circles are challenging to build because an entire intersection cannot be
35 shut down for construction; traffic has to continuing moving.
36

37 The committee continued discussion on the benefits and drawbacks of splitting the streetscape and
38 roundabout into separate projects. The general consensus of the committee was to bifurcate them.
39

40 There was discussion on spacing on the road/sidewalks. Many businesses are concerned about parking so
41 the committee discussed where additional parking could be implemented. The concept of additional
42 parking behind the buildings on the east side of Main Street quickly got lost in details that were not yet
43 determined. There is still an opportunity to construct additional off-street parking to replace up to 11 on-
44 street spaces and the additional room within Main Street could be used for more streetscape
45 improvements. Mr. Clem suggested parking arrangements between businesses and property owners
46 because there is currently an abundance of unused space. Mr. Brooks noted that there must be agreement
47 among business owners because the city cannot force parking arrangements on any business.
48

49 Mr. Brooks screen-shared the Google Doc draft of the committee's recommendations and the group
50 discussed the proposed topics. The document was sub-titled "Top 10 Priorities". Mr. Clem suggested
51 that from then until the next meeting, people could chime in, make comments, and propose changes
52 within the document.

1
2 Mr. Clem opened the last ten minutes to questions from folks in virtual attendance. While there were no
3 questions, there were some commendations for what the committee is doing as a whole.
4

5 **4. NEW BUSINESS:**

6
7 No discussion.
8

9 **5. OTHER BUSINESS:**

10
11 No discussion.
12

13 **6. ADJOURNMENT:**

14
15 **A MOTION by Dean Cashman to adjourn the meeting.**

16 ***Seconded by Kevin Purcell.***

17 ****The Motion was approved (5-0)***

18
19 The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 pm.
20

21
22 Respectfully submitted,
23 Megan Mraz
24
25