

FINAL

LEBANON CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL  
Remote Via Microsoft Teams  
[LebanonNH.gov/Live](http://LebanonNH.gov/Live)  
December 11, 2025  
6:30 PM

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Sarah Riley (Chair), Bruce James (Vice Chair), Susan Almy (Alt.), Erling Heistad, Barbara Hirai, Donald Lacey, Ernst Oidtmann

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Chris Johnson

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mark Goodwin (GIS Coordinator)

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

A. Chair Riley called the meeting to order at 6:31 PM.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

A. November 13, 2025

*Vice Chair Bruce James MOVED to approve the minutes as amended  
Seconded by Mr. Ernst Oidtmann*

*\*The MOTION was approved (7-0)*

Amendments:

Add Meeting Room 1

Correct - Mr. Heistad was in attendance rather than absent

Delete Susan Almy abstention (she was serving in Alternate role today; no voting)

Motions 2 thru 5 change votes to (6-0) from (7-0)

Motion 6 change vote to (7-0) from (8-0)

Pg. 4, line 13, change from less concerns to **fewer** concerns

Motions 7-9, change votes to (6-1) from (7-1)

Motion 10 change vote to (7-0) from (8-0)

Motion 11 change vote to (6-0) from (7-0)

Motion 12 change vote to (7-0) from (8-0)

Pg. 5, line 23 correct spelling to Labombard from LeBombard

Pg. 5, delete lines 32&33

**3. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC:**

**4. PERMIT REVIEW:**

A. **Mark C. & Mary E. Manikian**, Review and Comment on Zoning Board Riverbank Use Variance application. Applicant proposed to construct a new 520 SF garage & associated site

work. Applicant requests a Use Variance pursuant to Article IV, Section 401.5 (Permitted Uses), & 410.8B (Interested Parties) of the Zoning Ordinance. 69 NH Route 4A, Map 84, Lot 46. CC2025-05

Mr. Mark Goodwin started by providing some guidance for this permit review which falls under the City's riverbank protection district which is an overlay district in the Zoning ordinance, and the relevant sections of this were referenced in the packet. ConCom's role is an interested party speaking to how their proposal may or may not impact natural resources. The Zoning Board will take ConCom's input into consideration when they deliberate this request. ConCom can make a recommendation if they choose to do so.

Mr. Don Lacey inquired how this compares to the State shoreline protection; is it more or less restrictive? Mr. Goodwin said that they will also apply to the State on this which is more restrictive as relates to the geographical area, but local is more restrictive in some ways. Their main target audience is to the Zoning Board, and they are seeking relief to what they are proposing to do.

Mr. Mark Manikian, property owner of 69 NH Route 4A, Map 84, Lot 46, started by saying they are respectfully requesting an exception to their regulations on the shoreline. He is director of water quality on this lake and appreciates the work that ConCom does to this end as well. He said that DES has already approved what they are proposing.

They are proposing to build a detached garage next to their house; the sideline setback is not an issue since it is 57 feet to the neighbor on that side. The State, in looking at the plans, wanted the front of the garage flush with the front of the house and the garage front and back equal distance from the lake and the street, 23' feet each way.

Mr. Manikian said that they followed that direction and have proceeded having the work done in compliance with this. If they are allowed to build this, they will be reducing the impervious area by 750 square feet (they are removing the driveway), so runoff into the lake will be decreased by that. Also, they will be installing a cistern to collect all waters coming off of the roof, which will dramatically reduce the water that is running down the hill where the garage is being built. He said this will reduce the organic burden on the lake. They are seeking a variance because the proposed structure is within 50 feet of the shoreland.

Chair Riley asked if any of the native vegetation would be impacted; Mr. Manikian said that no trees would be removed but they would be removing some blueberries and raspberries in the vicinity. Mr. Lacey asked what happens to the water from the cistern, and Mr. Manikian said it will slowly seep back into the ground, similar to a septic tank. The roofline will run perpendicular to the shoreline. Mr. Lacey inquired if they are building a new retaining wall and Mr. Manikian responded that they are not building a new wall but plan to utilize the berry bushes and other vegetation that they are moving and put these in the area near the retaining wall.

The driveway will be replaced by grass. Chair Riley said that there are best practices about putting in perennial, dense native plants (that do not need to be watered) rather than grass, and these native plants do better than grass. They have deep roots and they help stabilize the soil. She has concerns about that much lawn so close to the lake. Mr. Manikian said that they can do this, and that they are open to suggestions. She would be interested in seeing a reduction in lawn and less nutrient intensive and maintenance intensive vegetation. There are lists of these plants available for him to access, and she referred him to the "Soak Up the Rain Program" for more tips and best practices for water management. He said that he has his own well and sewer.

Vice Chair James said that he is encouraged that they will not be removing any riparian trees near the lakeshore, and that this is a relatively minor impact, and in some ways positive (e.g. capturing the runoff water). Mr. Manikian said that any work they do, they think about the water quality.

Ms. Hirai asked if there are regulations around the lake. Mr. Lacey lives nearby and said that all herbicides are forbidden, but that many residents ignore the regulations.

Vice Chair James said that it seems that this is a minor impact compared to much that has already been done in the vicinity of this shoreline. He complimented Mr. Manikian on doing his homework.

Mr. Manikian said that they have also planted many tall grasses near the water. He said no trees on his property have been cut, ever.

***Vice Chair James MOVED that they recommend to the Zoning Board to accept this application for an exception, with the recommendation to the owner to consider some native plantings, instead of the lawn, in the grassy area.  
Seconded by Mr. Ernst Oidtmann***

***\*The MOTION was approved (7-0)***

Ms. Hirai said the applicant was very careful and thoughtful about this project and this could be a model on how to work on the lake and wondered if they could work with whoever is enforcing the regulations to help support this type of thing with their neighbors. Mr. Lacey said that there is no enforcement and he ended by saying this was an exemplary application and he too thanked Mr. Manikian. The applicant in turn said he would write about herbicides, and other harmful chemicals, in an upcoming article that he writes for his neighbors who also own lakefront property.

## **5. STUDY ITEMS:**

- A. Review and comment on proposed Zoning Amendments – continued from November 13, 2025.

### **Map Amendments:**

**Amendment 7: Labombard Road:** During the November 13, 2025 meeting, Mr. Reichert explained that this area is fairly well developed. The Hatch property already has 47 acres of conservation area, and they have added Elks/Dartmouth Coach, and they removed all properties on Etna Road, based on feedback from property owners there. All that is green on this map is included in this amendment. Chair Riley said she has concerns about converting RL-1 into GC-1. She said it's important to take into consideration the topography and the tree lines and how it is zoned (e.g. Hatch property would be surrounded by GC-1).

Ms. Hirai has some concerns about the large parcels on the upper parts. Chair Riley posed if they could add steep slopes protections to GC-1. Mr. Goodwin said that small changes are okay, as is taking away from a map but not *adding* to it.

On December 11, 2025 the Conservation Commission resumed their discussion about **Map Amendment 7** for the next approximate 1 ½ hours, including looking at **Amendment 10** and the chart of proposed **Permitted Uses and Uses by Conditional Use Permit** (see Agenda packet), and addressing concerns and

questions and hearing from the public. Table of uses is key and Mr. Goodwin along with ConCom also discussed this at length.

Amendment 7 seeks to Rezone the several key properties in the Labombard Road area. GC-1 allows for more density, such as dense, multi-family housing. RL-3 is the most restrictive.

Mr. Goodwin said that for the western section, they are thinking of what is currently in place and what the intensity of this same area could be with zoning changes.

He said a logical focus for Map amendment 7 could be for the areas currently zoned IND-L proposed to go to GC-1, if they look at the list of possible uses, if all of these were approved, are any of these uses new, that cannot be done today? That is what to focus on. For example, if a bus terminal gets added under GC-1, but you can already do a bus terminal under IND-L, then there is no difference if GC-1 gets adopted. No net change. He added that between Rt 120 and Labombard Rd., it is probably a wash with a change to GC-1

***Vice Chair James MOVED that the Conservation Commission make the following recommendation to City Council under Map Amendment 7, with the caveat that there are uncertainties and ambivalence in the Conservation Commission's understanding about what uses will be allowed under GC-1:***

***that the GC-1 designations be divided into three sections:***

***1-The Western portion one between Route 120 and Labombard Road would be provisionally accepted but the Conservation Commission has concerns about the remaining wetlands in that section.***

***2-The Northern portion would proceed as written.***

***3-The Southern portion, they do not accept and recommend that it be left as RL-1 and RL-3 because it is near conservation land and it would be better protected with these current designations rather than with GC-1, and, the topography is somewhat limited there with steep forested slopes.***

***Seconded by Mr. Don Lacey***

Mr. Jay Campion, largest property owner in the areas being discussed, spoke next and said that the wetlands protections are the same, regardless of what the zone is. The proposed change would make a hotel a permitted use, currently allowed because of a variance. What this would do, for example, is that it would allow Mr. Campion to add 40 rooms (such as for sports teams that come to the area). So, the use change would be a good thing in his opinion. He said that the GC-1 uses are more conducive to what they are trying to accomplish in this area, such as trying to get a Trader Joe's here. Under IND-L, they cannot do this, whereas under GC-1, they can.

He said that with the exception of the Elks properties, they have been discussing these changes for two (2) years, and he does not think changing this now is a good thing. He thinks they should be voted on one way or the other. He reiterated that the wetland protections are the same, no matter which way they are zoned.

Lastly, he said that these changes would allow for the restrictions of residential density to be put in the hands of the Planning Board which is a positive for the City of Lebanon and for him.

***\*The MOTION was approved (6-1)***

### **Amendment 8: Heater Road**

The amendment would change the parcel to GC-1. There are extensive wetlands in this area and Chair Riley said that their protections won't be changed under Amendment 8, just the uses that will happen adjacent to them will change.

Vice Chair James said that given what they've heard previously from the owner, he suggests that they pass this amendment; Ms. Hirai agreed. The protections won't be changed for the extensive wetland that are there, just the uses that will happen adjacent to them will change. Vice Chair James's logic is that there has already been extensive disturbance of this land, and the owner has had the land leveled, drainage seems to be effective, and so GC-1 would be most logical at this point in time.

***Vice Chair James MOVED that the Conservation Commission approve Map Amendment 8  
Seconded by Ms. Hirai***

***\*The MOTION was approved (7-0)***

#### **Amendment 9: Wildlife Corridor Map and Text**

This amendment requires one to go through a process in order to build or change it. The uses are not changed but there will be an extra layer of Planning Board scrutiny.

The proposed blue area is considered a concentrated wildlife habitat and it deserves wildlife protection.

***Vice Chair James MOVED that the Conservation Commission recommend that the City Council accept this amendment.  
Mr. Oidtmann seconded***

***\*The MOTION was approved (7-0)***

***Vice Chair James MOVED to extend this meeting 30 minutes  
Seconded by Ms. Almy***

***\*The MOTION was approved (7-0)***

#### **Amendment 10: Northern Lebanon Use Tables & Text**

Mr. Goodwin said that this is a planning analysis and discussion and not resources. It will modify uses in certain zoning districts.

***Vice Chair James MOVED to have ConCom accept this Amendment as written (recognizing that it is the purview of the Planning Department staff who have created the technical language associated with the planning process and zoning changes and he does not think that Con Com is in a position to interpret this one way or the other)  
Seconded by Mr. Lacey***

***\*The MOTION was not approved (3-4)***

***Ms. Almy MOVED that the Conservation Commission does not feel capable of anticipating what this amendment will do to the natural resources and therefore can neither endorse nor refute the amendment.***

***Seconded by Vice Chair James***

***\*The MOTION was approved (7-0)***

#### **Amendment 13: EV Regulations Section 607.8 (LEAC Sponsored) **\*\*Withdrawn****

**Amendment 21: EV Regulations Section 607.8 \*\*New – Added for ConCom review 12.11.25**

Chair Riley shared that this is an addition to the amendments based on recent results by LEAC.

Chair Riley recommends that the City Council adopt this amendment because this will provide more charging opportunities in rentals and also in new construction, and encourages low power, level 2 charging, so it demands less from the power grid.

***Ms. Hirai MOVED that the Conservation Commission recommends the City Council adopt Amendment 21. The potential for EVs will reduce the deleterious impact on the natural environment both in Lebanon and beyond.***

***Secoded by Erling Heistad***

***\*The MOTION was approved (7-0)***

Next, resident Dan Nash got up to speak about two amendments, first **Resident Amendment #2, Petitioned Amendment 2:Map Amendment Rezone Parcel 26-2 on Etna Road from IND-L and RL-3 to**

**GC-1. This is a proposal to rezone all or part of 26-2 to GC-1.**

He was unable to attend (remote connectivity issues) as he has planned for the November ConCom meeting. See pages 2&3 of 6 of the November 13, 2025 Minutes. The Conservation Commission approved a MOTION that they do not recommend approval of this proposed amendment as there are significant natural resource elements that exist on parcel 26-2. Also, it is in direct conflict with proposed zoning amendment #6 which the Conservation Commission strongly endorses.

Mr. Nash pointed out that there are almost 400 preserved acres next to the 14 acres in question. There are another 18 acres that are already RL-3. They anticipate over time being able to build 3 more tree-top apartment buildings, with approximately 375 units on this parcel. The land already has water, sewer, power, and roadway access. The goal they have been pursuing for the past two years was to increase opportunities for housing. If they decline this, the parcel has no use for the owner. He noted that there is *no major water feature through this property*, noting ConCom inaccuracies.

**Petitioned Amendment #1: Map Amendment Rezoning of Parcel along Old Pine Tree Cemetery Rd. from RL-2 to R-3.**

Chair Riley said that they are not against more density but ConCom was opposed to the use of a zoning change to go about this; it is perhaps not the best way though they do not know what that would be. They are not against having increased density, rather the mechanism of how it was proposed.

Vice Chair James said that the important thing is that Mr. Nash's comments are now entered into the public record today and that Mr. Nash has succinctly entered his concerns about both of these Proposed Amendments.

As an aside, Mr. Nash had provided Mr. Reichert with maps of the proposed changes, in advance of this meeting, but Mr. Reichert was unable to attend today's meeting. He added "A picture is worth a thousand words."

**6. COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

A. Biodiversity Group (Invasives)

B. Stewardship  
-Ranger

Neal Montibello, our Conservation Ranger, remains very active and is able to continue his work due to the Conservation Commission funding an additional \$5,000 (above and beyond the \$10,120 that they funded earlier this year). He has been able to work on boundary blazing.

Mr. Goodwin had not budgeted for the Jackson property mowing, and the bill just arrived. There will be a deficit of approximately \$275-\$300 maximum. Mr. Goodwin asked for an additional \$300 from the Conservation Commission Lost Fund, which will provide these funds to use if needed.

***Mr. Heistad MOVED to approve these additional funds of \$300 from the ConCom Lost Fund. Seconded by Chair Riley***

***\*The MOTION was approved (7-0)***

-Trail Coordinator  
-Monitors and Stewards

- C. Wild about Lebanon
- D. Amphibian Crossings
- E. LUCT/Current Use
- F. Other Subcommittees

**7. OTHER BUSINESS:**

- A. FYIs
- B. Follow Up
- C. Workshops and Educational Opportunities

**8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

**9. ADJOURNMENT:**

***Vice Chair James MOVED to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Ms. Almy***

***\*The MOTION was approved (7-0)***  
**The meeting ended at 9:26PM.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Cinda Mersel  
Recording Secretary