FINAL

LEBANON PLANNING BOARD
Regular Meeting
Monday, March 8, 2021, 6:30 PM
Remote Via Microsoft Teams
LebanonNH.gov/Live

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS PRESENT:	Bruce Garland (Chair), Matthew Hall (Vice-Chair), Jim Winny (Council Representative), Gregorio Amaro, Kim Chewning, Joan Monroe, Kathie Romano, Jeremy Rutter, and Laurel Stavis
MEMBERS ABSENT:	None
STAFF PRESENT:	David Brooks (Planning Director), Tim Corwin (Senior Planner), Brian Vincent (City Engineer), Rebecca Owens (Associate Planner)

1. Call to Order Chair Garland called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

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

Mr. Corwin shared the State Covid-19 emergency directives and participation details for the online meeting in Microsoft Teams. All members identified themselves.

Chair Garland conducted a roll call of members present as reported above.

2. Notice of Regional Impact

City of Lebanon, 0 Airpark Road (Tax Map 159, Lot 4), zoned IND-L: Applicant requests a review per RSA 674:40, III, of a layout plan to extend Airpark Road. The proposed street extension is intended to serve the City’s Airport Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District. **PB2021-07-LAY**

XYZ Dairy, LLC, 55 Crafts Avenue & 0 Beyerle Street (Tax Map 58, Lots 20 & 18), zoned R-3: Request for a Boundary Line Adjustment. **PB2021-08-BLA**

Mr. Brooks stated that Staff recommends neither application has the potential for regional impact.

A MOTION by Matthew Hall that neither of the applications above has the potential for regional impact.
Seconded by Laurel Stavis

Roll Call Vote:
Voting in Favor – Mr. Winny, Ms. Monroe, Ms. Romano, Ms. Chewning, Ms. Stavis, Mr. Hall, Mr. Garland, Mr. Amaro, Mr. Rutter
Voting Against – None
****The MOTION was approved (9-0).***

3. Public Hearing Items

A. **89 Donuts, LLC (applicant), Miracle Mile Realty, LLC (property owner), 388 Miracle Mile (Tax Map 103, Lot 6), zoned GC:** Request for Site Plan Review to construct a +/-1,332 sq. ft. drive-in restaurant (a Dunkin' Donuts with a drive-through window and walk-in service) within the existing parking lot, together with associated site improvements. **PB2020-32-SPR -** Continued from February 8, 2021.

Rod Finley, P.E., Pathways Consulting, LLC; Greg Sagris, Owner, 89 Donuts, LLC; Erica Wygonik, PE, of RSG, attended on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Finley stated that no changes have been made to the plan since the last meeting.

Mr. Corwin stated that Staff has no additional comments.

Chair Garland invited questions and comments from the Board.

Mr. Hall inquired about the pedestrian crossing and its location. Mr. Finley stated that the location is about 25-30 feet from the drive-thru window. Mr. Vincent had suggested it be located near the stop bar, but most pedestrians would be unlikely to walk that far from the bus stop. Mr. Finley stated that eye contact would be important when crossing the traffic lanes. There was a suggestion of an island or a speed table. Mr. Hall agreed it is enough distance. The developer agreed to change it if needed.

Chair Garland invited public comment. There was none.

Ms. Romano inquired about the lighting waivers. Mr. Corwin stated that light spillage is the purpose of one of the sections, and lighting uniformity ratio information was not provided.

Mr. Hall asked if Staff has concerns about the lighting. Mr. Corwin stated Staff did not.

A MOTION by Matthew Hall *that the Lebanon Planning Board* ***APPROVE*** *waivers for the application of 89 Donuts, LLC (applicant) and Miracle Mile Realty, LLC (property owner) regarding 388 Miracle Mile (Tax Map 103, Lot 6), PB2020-32-SPR, from the following sections of the Site Plan Review Regulations:*

- **Partial Waiver of Article VI design requirements** – *The applicant requests a general waiver from having to comply with the Article VI design requirements outside of the specific area of the lot proposed to be redeveloped.*

- **Section 5.1.E.5** – *requiring a current survey certified by a land surveyor licensed in New Hampshire*

- **Section 6.2.D** – *landscaping around buildings requirements*

- **Partial Waiver of Section 6.6** – *stormwater design requirements*

- **Partial Waiver of Section 6.7.2.b** – *requiring maximum illumination of 0.5 foot-candles at commercial property boundaries*

- **Section 6.7.3.a** – *Lighting uniformity ratio requirements*

Seconded by Laurel Stavis

Roll Call Vote:
Voting in Favor – Ms. Romano, Ms. Chewning, Ms. Stavis, Mr. Hall, Mr. Garland, Mr. Amaro, Mr. Rutter, Mr. Winny, Ms. Monroe
Voting Against – None
****The MOTION was approved (9-0)***

Mr. Rutter noted that Staff had recommended certain landscaping improvements to the double row of parking. Mr. Finley stated that the double row of parking is not part of the Dunkin' Donuts development site.

Chair Garland invited public comment. There was none.

Chair Garland closed the Public Hearing.

A MOTION by Matthew Hall *moved that the Lebanon Planning Board* ***APPROVE*** *the application of* ***89 Donuts, LLC (applicant) and Miracle Mile Realty, LLC (property owner) regarding 388 Miracle Mile (Tax Map 103, Lot 6), PB2020-32-SPR****, for Site Plan Review to construct a +/-1,332 sq. ft. drive-in restaurant (a Dunkin' Donuts with a drive-through window and walk-in service) within the existing parking lot, together with associated site improvements, as shown on a plan set titled "Site Plan for Miracle Mile Realty 'Dunkin Donuts'" prepared by Pathways Consulting, LLC, dated October 13, 2020, revised January 18, 2021, Proj. No. 12777-01 (15 sheets), including any and all submissions and testimony provided for and during the public hearing, with the following conditions:*

1. The applicant shall make the following revisions to the plan set to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Department and the City Engineer:
    a) Amend the cover sheet to identify the height of each existing building [5.1.E.4.e(7)].
    b) The sidewalk to be constructed to the rear of the Dunkin Donuts building shall be extended westward along the parking area to the western access drive.
    c) Amend the lighting plan to:
        i. Provide that all exterior lighting shall be 3,000K or warmer in CCT.
        ii. Add Sections 6.7.2.c and 6.7.2.d of the Site Plan Review Regulations as plan notes.
    d) Vegetative screening of at least 5 ft. in height shall be provided for the dumpster (Section 6.2.B.8).
    e) Add a note that the property owner is responsible for the maintenance and operation of the stormwater management system in accordance with the "Stormwater Management Facilities Operation and Maintenance Manual for 89 Donuts, LLC," dated December 22, 2020, prepared by Pathways Consulting, LLC, Project No. 12777-01 (Section 6.6.H.2.b of the Site Plan Review Regulations).

   The applicant shall provide the Planning & Development Department with two (2) full size copies of the revised plan set, and a digital copy of the revised plan set saved in a PDF-A format for archival purposes.

2. The applicant shall schedule and hold a pre-building permit application meeting with the Planning Department, City Building Inspectors, City Engineer/Department of Public Works, and Fire Department, in order to help streamline the building permit review process and to review applicable code requirements.

3. The applicant shall obtain approval from the City Council or the City Manager's office for any additional water and/or sewer flows in accordance with the applicable Chapter 136 and 182 of the City Code.

4. All engineering review fees shall be paid in full as required by Section 4.7.E.1 of the Site Plan Review Regulations.

Conditions to be Satisfied Prior to the Issuance of a Building Permit

5. The City shall retain the services of an independent third-party inspector, for which the applicant shall be responsible for all inspection fees related to the construction of sewer, water, and temporary erosion control, and for work within the City's right-of-way (water, sewer, road, drainage, and temporary erosion control), in accordance with Chapters 136 and 182 of the City Code and Section 8.2 of the Site Plan Review Regulations. The applicant shall provide funding for inspection services in a form and amount acceptable to the City, and shall sign a Water & Sewer Extension and Inspection Agreement in accordance with Chapters 136 and 182 of the City Code.

6. The development shall be subject to City of Lebanon Impact Fees, pursuant to Section 213 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Impact Fee shall be calculated at the time of Building Permit issuance based on the Impact Fee Schedule adopted on August 13, 2018. In accordance with RSA 674:39, the approved site plan shall be exempt from any future changes in impact fees and methodology for five years from the date of approval; however, any building permits which are issued after the end of that five-year period shall be fully subject to whatever impact fees and methodology are in effect at the time of building permit issuance.

7. All water and sewer fees shall be paid as set forth in City Code Chapter 68.

8. Prior to the start of any construction activities on the property, the applicant shall obtain or update (if appropriate) any required State approvals including, but not limited to, the following:
   a) NHDES Sewer Connection Permit, if necessary

Conditions to be Satisfied Prior to the Issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy

9. As demonstrated by the applicant's traffic study, the Miracle Mile/East Plaza Drive/Listen East Drive intersection is currently underperforming, and its level of service will further erode with the additional traffic that the proposed use will generate. Consequently, to help mitigate the anticipated increase in traffic generated by the applicant's use, the applicant shall be obligated to contribute its fair share to the cost of preparing a traffic improvement plan for the Miracle Mile corridor. Any financial contributions from the applicant required to prepare the mitigation plan of action shall be paid prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. Any dispute between the applicant and the City regarding the applicant's responsibilities pursuant to this condition may be appealed to the Planning Board.

10. The impact fee calculated pursuant to Condition of Approval #6 shall be paid.

11. Third-party engineer or design engineer inspection reports and as-built drawings provided by the applicants (PDF format and CAD .dwg format, using the NH State Plane Coordinate System), including tie sheets, shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to acceptance of any utility improvements by the City.

12. All improvements depicted on the plan shall be completed, and shall be constructed as depicted on the approved plan, including any modifications to the plan as may be approved by the Planning Board in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations and Site Plan Review Regulations.

13. The applicant shall install a security camera mounted on the east side of the building.

General Conditions

14. The applicant shall obtain an Excavation Permit from the Department of Public Works for any site work in the public right-of-way prior to any work in the right-of-way.

15. All required landscape plantings shall meet the minimum size requirements for such plantings set forth in Section 6.2.B of the Site Plan Review Regulations at the time of installation.

16. The applicant shall implement and maintain NHDES Site Specific Best Management Practices before, during, and after construction.

17. The property owner is responsible for the maintenance and operation of the stormwater management system in accordance with the operation and maintenance plan titled "Stormwater Management Facilities Operation and Maintenance Manual for 89 Donuts, LLC," dated December 22, 2020, prepared by Pathways Consulting, LLC, Project No. 12777-01 (26 pages), and such responsibility shall run with the land. (Section 6.6.H.2.b of the Site Plan Review Regulations).

Seconded by Jim Winny

Mr. Hall inquired about the timing of required monetary contributions per the proposed future traffic mitigation condition of approval.

Ms. Romano requested an additional condition of approval requiring a camera to be installed for the east side of the building.

Chair Garland reopened the Public Hearing to allow comments by the applicant.

Mr. Sagris stated that he plans to apply for a building permit within a month to allow for any changes that need to be made. Mr. Corwin suggested changing the timing of the traffic mitigation condition from the Building Permit stage to the Certificate of Occupancy stage. Mr. Sagris stated that he has no objection to adding language to the motion about the camera facing the east side of the property.

Ms. Monroe asked about the recommendation for a traffic light in the applicant's traffic study. Mr. Vincent stated that the applicant's traffic engineer identified it as warranted for a signal, but the City and applicant decided it was not the best choice for a number of reasons. Per the proposed traffic mitigation condition of approval, a study of the Miracle Mile corridor from Poverty Lane to the bridge will be undertaken to determine the best recommendations for changes.

Mr. Brooks noticed different plan project numbers in the motion, which need to be consistent.

Chair Garland closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Hall and Mr. Winny agreed with the suggested changes to the motion.

Roll Call Vote:
Voting in Favor – Ms. Stavis, Mr. Hall, Mr. Garland, Mr. Amaro, Mr. Rutter, Mr. Winny, Ms. Monroe, Ms. Romano, Ms. Chewning
Voting Against – None
****The MOTION was approved (9-0).***

[*Note: the motion for agenda item 3.A that appears above is as amended.*]

B. **Brady Sullivan Prospect Hills, LLC, 0 Prospect Street (Tax Map 108, Lot 2), zoned R-3:** Pursuant to Section 14.1.B.1.c of the Subdivision Regulations, a request for an extension of time to achieve active and substantial development of Phase II of a project identified as Prospect Hills, a 171 unit Planned Unit Residential Development located off Moulton Drive and Prospect Street, Tax Map 108, Lot 2 (phase 2) and Lot 14 (phase 1). **PB2021-02-EXT -** Public Hearing continued from February 8, 2021

Jon Rokeh and Atty. Marc Pinard appeared on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Rokeh stated that Brady Sullivan took over an abandoned project, which needed a large amount of clean up. Phase I needed to be completed to begin Phase II, and they are now ready to begin Phase II. They are committed to beginning the infrastructure work in 2021. All through 2018, 2019, and 2020 they were working on items that needed to be finalized prior to beginning Phase II.

Mr. Pinard stated that much work and expense had been invested to date, and the project was making progress. The applicant is asking for an extension of two years. The character of the neighborhood has not changed since the project was originally approved; the area is and has been residential, so approval of the extension to begin construction is warranted. There has been no change in zoning, so there is no vesting issue, so the applicant's position is no extension is needed because the project is still approved. Nothing has changed and they should be permitted to move forward. The applicant is committed to break ground this year and has made significant progress as evidenced in the meeting packet information. The global pandemic has affected the applicant's ability to do business. They've made substantial progress in making sure that the plans, working with the Planning Department, were designed properly. For those reasons, an extension is a reasonable request.

Mr. Corwin noted that the applicant is also asking to suspend the security that has been posted for Phase II, and that the applicant has requested a waiver to suspend the bond until construction begins. Mr. Pinard stated that construction may not start for several months, which would mean a savings in carrying costs. The bond would be back in place when the applicant is ready to break ground. The plan is to construct the multi-family units first, then the other units. The project is likely to be completed by 2024, but the applicant is asking to go a bit longer due to potential issues.

Mr. Corwin noted that at the last meeting, the applicant was granted a waiver from the missed December submission deadline. The applicant must now demonstrate good cause for extending the time frame to achieve active and substantial completion. If the Board denies the extension, that would close the application and no action would need to be taken on the other waiver requests.

Chair Garland noted that the focus is on the term "good cause," and to reach a consensus as to whether the applicant has demonstrated "good cause"; that would then lead the Board to consideration of the other waiver requests.

Mr. Hall asked the applicants why nothing was physically done by the deadline. Chair Garland noted that this project has been going on for many years before this extension request. Mr. Rokeh stated the current plan was approved in 2016 and was extended in 2018. The extension granted in 2018 was to record the plat, and that has been completed. They are now asking for an extension to begin the construction process for Phase II. For the last two years, they have been actively working with the City on finalizing every item, doing as-builts for Phase 1, getting plans recorded, and working on easements that the City needed. There were issues with Phase 1 that they wanted to make sure were completely cleaned up before beginning the Phase 2 construction process.

Mr. Hall, noting that the applicant said they have been working on a large number of supplementary issues for Phase I and had not been prepared to commence work on Phase II, asked why they did not ask for an extension well before the deadline. Mr. Pinard responded that Mr. Rokeh can talk about the timing of filing for extensions as he relies on Mr. Rokeh for those matters. Mr. Pinard noted that Brady Sullivan closed down a year ago due to the pandemic. Everyone was sent home and there was a period where they tried to figure out how to keep people working in a safe way, where to best put their resources, and how to reopen the office and job sites. The company is located in Manchester, and they tried to keep people working safely and to decide where to best put their resources among their project sites located in various areas. In dealing with the pandemic they were not in the position to get into the ground up in Lebanon, and of the past two-year period, nearly a year was consumed by the pandemic. They've been doing their best, but it wasn't possible to get up to Lebanon during the spring season and into the summer season. The unprecedented global pandemic fits the definition of "good cause". They're asking for an extension with a commitment to get into the ground notwithstanding the pandemic. They are planning to shift resources to make this happen. It's the global pandemic that is the good cause.

Mr. Hall noted that the City and surrounding area has still seen a lot of development during the pandemic, from firms from across New England. Mr. Pinard replied that the applicant has been working through the pandemic, but they had to pick and choose where to work and that in hindsight, they wished that they had gone to Lebanon and that they would have focused there, because they don't relish this process and that it's an imposition to everyone involved. In hindsight, he would have considered doing something differently, but it's just the way it rolled out.

Ms. Romano noted that the Board has a lot of things to take into account here. She remembers the problems with Phase 1 and they did not seem to be things that happened based on bad luck; rather, they seemed to be quality issues, homeowner dissatisfaction issues, and incompletion of things that should have been completed – not good faith problems. Ms. Romano stated that the applicant is asking to suspend the bond, and she wonders if the reason for the extension request is not so that the applicant can begin construction but to sell the development. Mr. Pinard stated that the premium for the $10M bond is $175K per year. They paid this when they were not in the ground. But now that the plan is recorded, they want to suspend it until they get into the ground and reimpose it when construction begins.

Mr. Winny noted the goal is substantial completion, yet there hasn't been any groundbreaking, and that yes, the pandemic is an issue but there were things that still could have been done during the pandemic, and there was also a whole year before the pandemic, and there still hasn't been ground broken. Mr. Winny wondered what would be different this time. Mr. Winny expressed concern that the project has been dragged out and will continue to be dragged out. Ms. Monroe observed that the original plan for the project is dated October 5, 2011, so that not only has this been extended multiple times, but that we don't know if Phase II will drag along just as Phase I did. During the pandemic, City staff were back in the office after a month, and the Planning Board began meeting on-line right away. The day after the Board approved the Dartmouth student housing project in March or April, the applicant began construction. Projects both large and small have continued, really adding to the City's housing stock. One of the reasons the Board has previously discussed tightening up its regulations to limit the number of extensions that can be approved is that eventually the technology and the advancement of planning is way beyond what the original plan contained. We've become more aware of the significance of addressing climate change and other environmental changes. Due to significant environmental changes, the City is tightening regulations regarding extensions. It is even more important to work in a timely fashion, and the current plan is outdated. In conclusion, Ms. Monroe stated that the excuses being used as to why it has not happened are specious because other companies have been able to do more, and that the plan is outdated due to technological developments.

Ms. Chewning commented that she's struggling to find good cause. While the pandemic may offer some level of excuses, she heard the applicant say that in the last year they still made a choice not to be in Lebanon, and when she hears that, it raises red flags as opposed to establishing that there was "good cause" for this additional delay. She also heard the applicant say that work will commence "sometime in 2021", or "maybe in the next few months". None of this is reassuring.

Mr. Pinard stated that the plans are current, and that if they reapplied, they would bring in the same plans. Mr. Garland agreed but stated that that is not relevant to demonstrating "good cause". Mr. Pinard stated that they have given explanations, not excuses, and that there are compelling reasons to require an extension, which includes the pandemic.

Mr. Rokeh noted that Phase II was approved for the Moultons back in 2007, but the plans were completely redesigned based on the new Alteration of Terrain standards. They will have an updated alteration of terrain permit meeting the most current AOT standards within the next few months, which is one of the reasons that their plan is to begin in the summer.

A MOTION by Matthew Hall *that the Lebanon Planning Board* ***DENY*** *the application of Brady Sullivan Prospect Hills, LLC, regarding Phase II of the Prospect Hills development (Tax Map 108, Lot 2), originally approved as PB2016-22-EXP-FMAJ, for an extension of time pursuant to Section 14.1.B.1.c of the Subdivision Regulations to achieve active and substantial development as required by Section 14.1.B.1.b of the Subdivision Regulations, PB2021-02-EXT, noting the lack of active and substantial development or building by December 10, 2020, and not finding good cause for such lack of activity.*

Seconded by Kim Chewning

Roll Call Vote:
Voting to Approve – Ms. Monroe, Ms. Romano, Ms. Stavis, Ms. Chewning, Mr. Hall, Mr. Garland, Mr. Amaro, Mr. Rutter, Mr. Winny
Voting Against - None
****The MOTION was approved (9-0).***

C. **Basic Holdings, LLC, 5 & 11 Oak Ridge Road, (Tax Map 4, Lots 5 & 6), zoned R-3:** Request for Final Major Subdivision Review, Site Plan Review, and a Conditional Use Permit for a proposed Planned Unit Residential Development (PURD) pursuant to Section 501.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, containing 22 residential units together with related site improvements and amenities. **PB2020-31-FMAJ -**Public hearing to commence on January 11, 2021 if the Board finds that the application is complete. Continued from February 8, 2021.

Jeff Shapiro, Owner; Rod Finley, P.E.; and Nate Stearns, Attorney, attended on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Finley gave an overview of past and future plans. The project is now named "Occom Path," which is the same as the proposed road name. There will be a merger of #5 and #11 Oak Ridge. Renderings of the three types of units were shown. The majority are two-story, single family units. The configuration of the units and amenities were explained. There will be 22 units, which the Planning Board may allow under the 12% density increase. The water and sewer extensions were granted by the City Council, and there will be a private sewer in the development that connects to Pinewood Village and goes on to the Hanover system. Stormwater management was explained, and a complete plan set is available. All previous issues and considerations raised by the Planning Board during design review have been addressed.

Mr. Corwin stated that Staff recommends the application is complete enough for the Planning Board to accept jurisdiction and commence review.

The minutes from the site visit held during design review will be provided to Mr. Amaro, Mr. Rutter, and Ms. Chewning.

Ms. Monroe noted that the ground would be suitable at present for a new site visit. Mr. Finley confirmed that the site markings should still be there. Mr. Corwin stated that per Section 4.11.D, following submission of an application, the Board can visit the property.

A MOTION by Matthew Hall *that the application of* ***Basic Holdings, LLC, 5 & 11 Oak Ridge Road, (Tax Map 4, Lots 5 & 6), zoned R-3*** *is complete enough for the Planning Board to accept jurisdiction and commence review.*

Seconded by Joan Monroe

Roll Call Vote:
Voting in Favor – Ms. Stavis, Mr. Hall, Mr. Garland, Mr. Amaro, Mr. Rutter, Mr. Winny, Ms. Monroe, Ms. Romano, Ms. Chewning
Voting Against - None
The MOTION was approved (9-0).

Mr. Shapiro confirmed that the shared garages will be physically divided.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Finley stated that the community garden could be fenced, there will be a street sign for the development, that there is sufficient road width to accommodate cars in the driveways and allow adequate site lines, and that refuse and recycling cans will be provided for each unit; Mr. Shapiro stated that the buildings are not sprinkled, that there will be basements in all units, and that benches would be possible in the common areas; and Atty. Stearns stated that the units could be converted to condominiums, but it would require Planning Board approval.

Mr. Rutter inquired about unit floor plans. Mr. Finley stated that the applicant has prepared these, but they were not included with the application as they are not required to be submitted

Ms. Monroe observed that the Board’s regulations would soon be requiring color temp lighting of 3,000K or warmer. She suggested the applicant provide electric vehicle charging as an amenity.

A MOTION by Matthew Hall to continue the hearing of Basic Holdings, LLC, 5 & 11 Oak Ridge Road, (Tax Map 4, Lots 5 & 6), zoned R-3 to Monday, March 29, 2021, at 6:30 PM.
Seconded by Kathie Romano

Roll Call Vote:
Voting in Favor – Ms. Monroe, Ms. Romano, Ms. Chewning, Ms. Stavis, Mr. Hall, Mr. Garland, Mr. Amaro, Mr. Rutter, Mr. Winny
Voting Against – None
****The MOTION was approved (9-0)***

4. Other Business

A. **XYZ Dairy, LLC. 55 Crafts Avenue & 0 Beyerle Street (Tax Map 58, Lots 20 & 18), zoned R-3:** Conceptual review per Section 4.3 of the Site Plan Review Regulations for a proposed major subdivision. **PB2021-05-CON -** Rescheduled from February 8, 2021

Chet Clem of Lyme Properties attended representing XYZ Dairy.

Mr. Clem stated that the issue of the property ownership began in August of 2020. It has been determined that XYZ Dairy, LLC, does own the segment of Beyerle Street that was in question. There has been incomplete information to date regarding the property, and XYZ Dairy is asking that the conceptual review remain open. They have asked for a lot line adjustment to be scheduled for the April 12, 2021, meeting when they will present the full subdivision application.

Chair Garland referred to a March 4, 2021 letter from Mr. Clem, Sr. regarding a plat signing.

Mr. Brooks stated that the City attorney notified the City that the City has no right, title, or interest in the unbuilt portion of Beyerle St. platted in 1892, which covers everything to the west of Crafts Ave. The City's attorney is still researching the unbuilt portions of other streets in the area. It is expected that once it is known which paper streets exist and which do not, the City records will be corrected.

Chair Garland stated that next month the Board would consider the boundary line adjustment and schedule a conceptual review of the major subdivision, if needed.

Chair Garland explained the need for Board members to take the training on the Welcoming Lebanon Ordinance, which takes about half an hour. Each member will need to sign an acknowledgement document stating that they have completed it.

Mr. Brooks stated that he would send a link to the Board members for the training. There are also two more live sessions, March 24 at 7 PM during the City Council meeting and March 31 at 7 PM. Mr. Brooks asked that the Board members let Staff know when they have completed the training, so Staff can provide the document to sign.

5. Approval of Minutes

A. February 8, 2021

A MOTION by Kathie Romano to approve the minutes of the February 8, 2021, Planning Board Meeting as presented in the March 8, 2021, Planning Board meeting packet.
Seconded by Joan Monroe.

Roll Call Vote:
Voting in Favor – Mr. Garland, Ms. Monroe, Ms. Romano, Ms. Stavis, Mr. Rutter, Ms. Chewning, Mr. Amaro, Mr. Winny, Mr. Hall
Voting Against - None
****The MOTION was approved (9-0).***

6. Adjournment

A MOTION by Matthew Hall to adjourn the meeting.
Seconded by Laurel Stavis.

Roll Call Vote:
Voting in Favor – Mr. Garland, Mr. Winny, Ms. Romano, Ms. Stavis, Mr. Rutter, Ms. Chewning, Mr. Amaro, Mr. Hall, Ms. Monroe
Voting Against - None
****The MOTION was approved (9-0).***

The meeting was adjourned at 9:13 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Holly Howes
Recording Secretary