FINAL

MINUTES
PLANNING BOARD DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
Friday, November 13, 2020 – 12:30pm
REMOTE VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS
LebanonNH.gov/Live

Members Present: Matthew Hall (Chair), Kathie Romano, Joan Monroe, Jerry Rutter

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

---

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Hall called the meeting to order at 12:32 pm.

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

Ms. Owens reviewed the State directive and participation details for the online meeting in Microsoft Teams. All members identified themselves.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. October 30, 2020

p2, line 17: add "of" after "height"
p2, line 21: correct "Ms." Monroe

A Motion by Ms. Romano to approve the October 30, 2020 minutes as amended. Seconded by Ms. Monroe

Roll Call Vote:
Members voting in favor included: Mr. Hall, Ms. Romano, Ms. Monroe, Mr. Rutter
****The Vote on the Motion was unanimous (4-0).***

3. STUDY ITEMS:

A. Proposed amendments to Site Plan Review Regulations relative to Mobility and Access improvements - final review

Ms. Owens reviewed the proposed final amendments to the Site Plan Review Regulations starting with updated definitions. Ms. Romano asked for further information about car shares versus carpooling. Ms. Owens gave examples. Mr. Hall recommended that the subcommittee focus on the substantive regulations rather than the definitions.

Ms. Owens reviewed proposed amendments to Section 6.2 (Landscaping) which are intended to ensure accommodation of pedestrian and bicyclist improvements.

Mr. Hall asked questions about requiring electric vehicle parking spots (Section 6.5.E.7) and locker rooms and shower facilities (Section 6.5.F.2.d). He expressed an overarching concern about requiring such improvements as opposed to incentivizing them. He noted the costs associated with such improvements could be a significant hurdle for many businesses and that developers should receive incentives.

Ms. Romano noted that the requirement for electric vehicle parking seems reasonable if it only applies to larger projects. She expressed concern with requiring businesses to provide locker and shower facilities. Ms. Owens noted that the electric vehicle requirements addresses future capacity, i.e. being ready to provide the improvements, not necessarily requiring the improvements up front.

Mr. Hall questioned whether incorporating requirements for electric vehicle charging would have any impact on the demand for and use of electric vehicles. There was discussion of the proposed language and applicability to residential v. non-residential uses. Mr. Hall suggested that as use of electric vehicles increases, employers or businesses will update their facilities to accommodate those users. Ms. Owens noted that intent of the language was to ensure readiness to upgrade.

Ms. Monroe noted that electric vehicle usage is more substantial in other areas of the country and the infrastructure has been provided. She agreed that the necessary infrastructure will be provided as demand increases. She noted that telecommuting may increase in response to the pandemic and that parking standards and requirements may be changing as a result.

Mr. Rutter asked about scaling up the provision of electric vehicle spaces over time. He suggested that demand will eventually be generated by forces beyond our control, but that it makes sense to be ready in advance. Ms. Romano recommended changing the proposed language to clarify applicability to residential and non-residential uses. She expressed reluctance about creating requirements that are then frequently waived by the Board.

Mr. Hall suggested incentivizing the requirement for showers and locker facilities rather than making it a requirement.

Ms. Monroe noted that some companies that provide shower, locker room and fitness facilities for their employees have better success attracting and retaining employees. Ms. Romano felt that making it a choice is acceptable, but it should not be a requirement. Mr. Hall reiterated that similar improvements should be encouraged, but not required. He felt that the Planning Baord should not be involved in establishing policies such as this, but that perhaps the Council could do so.

Ms. Owens provided examples from other communities in the state or region of how incentives have been provided. Ms. Romano liked the idea of including clear thresholds above which improvements would be required and below which such improvements would only be encouraged. Mr. Rutter agreed that a threshold was needed. Ms. Romano recommended that the other community examples should be provided to the full Board when the proposed amendments are presented to them. Ms. Owens suggested that a presentation to the full Board would be appropriate.

Ms. Romano suggested that there should also be thresholds associated with the short-term and long-term bicycle parking requirements in Section 6.5.F. She asked if the requirements would apply to any size project, whether 3 units or 300 units. She again expressed concern about creating requirements that are then frequently waived. Mr. Rutter suggested that projects of 5 units or more would be an appropriate threshold above which bike parking should be required.

Mr. Hall thanked Ms. Owens for her work in addressing the subcommittee's previous comments on the proposed amendments.

Ms. Romano asked about 6.5.C.5 and whether it would affect the massing of buildings. Ms. Owens noted that staff is still working on further amendments to address the concerns about large buildings.

Ms. Owens asked if it would be helpful for the regulations to include graphics depicting some of the proposed regulations. The subcommittee members agreed that graphics would be useful. Ms. Romano asked about including information on costs.

4. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

A. Proposed amendments to Site Plan Review Regulations relative to Minor Site Plans

No discussion.

B. Proposed amendments to Subdivision Regulations - second review

No discussion.

5. **ADJOURNMENT**:

The Committee agreed to hold its next meeting at 12:30 pm on Thursday, December 3, 2020.

A Motion by Ms. Romano to adjourn the meeting.
Seconded by Mr. Rutter.

Roll Call Vote:
Members voting in favor included: Mr. Hall, Ms. Romano, Ms. Monroe, Mr. Rutter
****The Vote on the Motion was unanimous (4-0).***

The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 pm

Minutes prepared by David Brooks, Planning Director