



**LEBANON PLANNING BOARD
MAY 24, 2021 - 6:30 PM
REMOTE VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS
LEBANONNH.GOV/LIVE**

1. Call to Order

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

2. Other Business

- A. UVLSRPC presentation re: Keys to the Valley project
- B. Discussion re: Ped/Bike related amendments to Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations
- C. Discussion re: resumption of in-person meetings

3. Committee Reports

- A. **Planning Board Subcommittees:**
 - Planning Board Capital Improvement Program (VACANT/VACANT/Garland/L. Stavis)
 - Planning Board Development Regulations Update (M. Hall/K. Romano/ VACANT / J. Monroe)
- B. **City Council Subcommittees:**
 - Class VI Roads Advisory Committee (J. Monroe)
 - Lebanon Energy Advisory Committee (J. Monroe)
- C. **Other Subcommittees:**
 - City Council Representative (J. Winny/K. Liot Hill)
 - Heritage Commission (VACANT)
 - Pedestrian & Bicyclist Advisory Committee (VACANT)
 - Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission (B. Garland/L. Stavis)
 - UV SubCommittee of the Connecticut River Joint Commissions (B. Garland)
 - Upper Valley Transportation Management Association (VACANT)
 - Mascoma River Local Advisory Committee (K. Romano)
 - Steering Committee for the Implementation of the Master Plan (B. Garland/VACANT /VACANT/J. Monroe)
 - West Lebanon Revitalization Advisory Committee (L. Stavis)
 - Planning & Development Department – Task Status (D. Brooks/ M. Goodwin/T. Corwin/R. Owens)

4. Approval of Minutes

- A. April 26, 2021

5. Adjournment

The order of agenda items is subject to change.

Due to the current situation with the COVID-19 Pandemic, the City of Lebanon is offering its meetings via Microsoft Teams. Members of the public are encouraged to attend 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 Microsoft Teams software or by phone. Please visit LebanonNH.gov/Live for full details.

THE AGENDA, IN ITS ENTIRETY IS AVAILABLE ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE AT [LEBANONNH.GOV](https://LebanonNH.gov)

**Agenda
Planning Board
May 24, 2021**

**Agenda Item #2B
Other Business**

**Discussion re: Ped/Bike
related amendments to
Site Plan Review and
Subdivision Regulations**

FI. Bicycle Storage and Parking

The intent of this section is to enhance bicycle usage, support transportation efficiency by reducing reliance on vehicles for short-distance travel, and improve public health. The requirements of this section shall apply to new developments as well as changes to or expansions of use at existing developments.

1. Residential development. Multi-family dwellings with more than five (5) units must provide:
 - a. *Short-term bicycle parking* for at least 15 percent of units (e.g., 50 units = 8 spaces)
 - b. *Long-term bicycle parking* for at least 30 percent of all building units.
2. Non-residential development. Other uses, including municipally owned buildings, must provide:
 - a. Secure *short-term bicycle parking* or *long-term bicycle parking* for at least ten (10) percent of the number of automobile parking stalls approved by the Planning Board. Alternatively, provide spaces for at least 5 percent of building occupants (measured at average daily peak), whichever is greater, but in no case may the total be less than two (2) rack spaces.
 - b. At least 25 percent of the spaces as *long-term bicycle parking* when the total number of bicycle parking spaces required exceeds 20 spaces.
 - c. Shower facilities. Provide at least one (1) shower available to all genders. Provide one (1) additional shower facility for each additional 50 parking spaces for developments with more than 100 vehicle parking spaces. Facilities must be accessible in the building, or within 200 yards of the building entrance (such as in tenant properties with shared facilities). Provision of changing/locker storage with shower facilities is encouraged.
 - d. Bicycle parking wayfinding signage.
3. When a calculation yields a fractional number of required spaces, the number of spaces shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number.
4. Facilities must adhere to Lebanon's Bike Storage Design Guide, available online on the Planning & Development Department's Documents, Studies and Resources webpages or by request.

5. Bicycle parking should be located with convenient access to a principal building's main entrance and/or to a recreational facility and its associated transportation network, such as a public street or path.
6. Locate parking/storage in a well-lit, highly visible area.
7. Shared **bicycle parking** facilities are encouraged.
8. **Bicycle parking** may be required by the Planning Board for commercial uses whenever any new use is established, or any existing use is expanded for which more than ten (10) automobile parking spaces are required.
- ~~— Shower and changing/locker storage facilities are encouraged to be provided in non-residential development. Facilities should be accessible in the building, or within 200 yards of the building entrance (such as in tenant properties with shared facilities). One facility is equivalent to at least one shower stall and five locker units. When provided, there should be at least one facility for every four (4) bike spaces required.~~
9. The Planning Board may adjust any of the amounts in this section upward or downward based on factors such as the site context, including location, site characteristics and layout, the types of users and/or residents, the amount of vehicle parking provided, and other pertinent factors.

[...]

**Agenda
Planning Board
May 24, 2021**

**Agenda Item #4A
Approval of Minutes**

APRIL 26, 2021

DRAFT

**LEBANON PLANNING BOARD
Regular Meeting
Monday, April 26, 2021, 6:30 PM
Remote Via Microsoft Teams
LebanonNH.gov/Live**

ROLL CALL OF

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bruce Garland (Chair), Matthew Hall (Vice-Chair), Joan Monroe, Kathie Romano, Jeremy Rutter, Gregorio Amaro

MEMBERS ABSENT: Karen Zook (Council Representative), Laurel Stavis, Kim Chewning

STAFF PRESENT: David Brooks (Planning Director), Tim Corwin (Senior Planner), Rebecca Owens (Associate Planner), Mark Goodwin (GIS Coordinator)

1. Call to Order Chair Garland called the meeting to order at 6:31 PM.

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

Mr. Corwin shared the State directive 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. An overview of the meeting agenda was outlined.

2. Other Business

A. Discussion re: Ped/Bike - Related Amendments to Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations

Ms. Owens led the discussion of the amendments as presented in the meeting packet. The bicycle storage design guide was included. The goal for this meeting was to gather additional feedback and answer questions prior to a legal review and the preparation of a new version. A number of definitions were clarified.

Ms. Owens introduced the section on Design Standards. The Complete Streets information is no longer in a footnote but in its own location. The universal design includes clear demarcation of where bicyclists and pedestrians can walk or ride with clear pathways and adequate facilities. Signage would conform to updated manual regulations. Land use and traffic calming are covered along with dedicated routes. Most safety issues occur on private property and are not reported or regulated. Most communities are moving to more defined requirements. Board members commented on issues in parking lots or in and around cars. Sarah Riley, a Conservation Commission member, cited the example of a parking lot situation needing additional consideration.

Ms. Owens made comments on the Orientation and Form section. Desired building entrance designs would reduce the distance from a public way to the building entrance, which should be clear. Examples of various entrances were shown. A welcoming façade would be desirable. There would be new requirements for screening of multi-family parking and promoting options for more curb appeal.

1 Ms. Owens noted aspects of the Access and Traffic section. There are no major changes to sidewalk
2 requirements. It would be up to the Planning Board members if section D regarding sidewalks would be
3 included. Mr. Corwin stated that every development must comply with zoning regarding parking, which
4 would be reviewed as necessary under current regulations. Site plan review is not required for single
5 family homes.

6
7 The Board members discussed pedestrian safety, transit, ride sharing, and necessary sightlines. The
8 members considered changes to requirements for short and long-term bicycle storage and parking. Some
9 adjustment for larger developments would be needed, and the requirement could be a range with specifics
10 based upon discussion with each developer. A limit of 20% based upon the number of units was
11 suggested. Councilor Erling Heistad offered that providing a bicycle hook along with each parking space
12 in underground parking would be useful. Researching other towns could offer other options. Ms. Owens
13 noted that there would be another discussion.

14
15 Chair Garland noted the lack of proposed language for fire. Mr. Brooks stated that Staff is continuing to
16 reach out to the Fire Department to get that resolved. Staff would also like an adjustment to the Planning
17 Board fee schedule for advertising. The current charge is \$35 per application, but it is costing \$175 or
18 more for an ad. Only a small percentage is being covered, and Staff is proposing a higher amount.

19 20 21 **B. Review and discussion of Open Space Plan**

22
23 Mr. Brooks noted that several Conservation Commission members were on tonight's call. An Open
24 Space Plan as recommended in the Land Use and Natural Resource chapters from the Master Plan was
25 prepared by a consultant, and there is a final draft that has been reviewed by the Conservation
26 Commission. It is being presented to the Planning Board and City Council for comments and feedback
27 with the goal of finalizing and adopting it within the next few months.

28
29 Mr. Goodwin gave a presentation on the plan that has been developed over the past two years and aligned
30 with the Master Plan. There was a need for an Open Space Plan, which was developed in-house. It is
31 ready for public comment, and the Conservation Commission has already reviewed it. New benchmarks
32 for 78% developed/22% undeveloped, which still allows much room for development, were discussed.
33 The goal would be infill and redevelopment.

34
35 Ms. Romano noted there was no discussion on prime agricultural land, and there should be greater
36 emphasis on what is left. She asked if there is anything preventing a road from DHMC to Route 10.
37 Mr. Goodwin noted there is an easement on Indian Ridge, but it would not exclude a road and utilities but
38 it would be challenging. He noted that forest management important, both for working forests and
39 protected forests.

40
41 Mr. Hall commented that while it is great to have that much protected land, there are consequences to the
42 targets in the plan. Recent studies report that open space policy leads to housing prices going up and tax
43 revenue going down. There is a dearth of housing at present. If the move is toward less development,
44 prices will go even higher, pricing many people out of Lebanon. There are consequences to the policies
45 that should be considered.

46
47 Mr. Goodwin noted that tax revenue benefits from larger, consolidated housing projects. There are
48 always unintended consequences, but experts say it is necessary to go in that direction. With the right
49 zoning, it is possible to increase density to still provide adequate housing, and 18,000 acres would still be
50 in play.

Mr. Brooks suggest that if there is agreement in what the City is trying to achieve, it would be necessary to update other tools. There is no true conservation district. Some zoning doesn't line up with the Master Plan, and everything is still in play. Councilor Heistad noted that lots of community effort went into developing the Master Plan. It is important to determine what it envisioned. It is up to the Planning Board to determine how to achieve it.

Mr. Goodwin stated that a number of other techniques are available, not just down-zoning. Some communities are doing something different. With the right tools and people, the City can do something different.

The Board members discussed the need to let the public know the location of protected lands, and creating a map was suggested.

C. Overview of Proposed 2022 Zoning Amendments

Mr. Corwin gave a brief presentation with the focus on housing opportunities and natural resource protection. The Zoning Regulations are being brought up to date. The goal is increasing housing opportunities using a variety of tools, both small and large measures, to create affordable housing opportunities. Creating accessory dwelling units while meeting lot size requirements and allowing special exceptions rather than prohibiting them are possibilities. It is also possible to create a new residential district. Planning Staff will bring proposals to the Planning Board later in the year. The Master Plan calls for increasing housing opportunities. Encouraging development where the City wants to see it and protecting natural resources are important. Encouraging energy efficient development, adjusting school impact fees, and making parking updates are also goals. The Planning Board can suggest and review zoning requirements.

3. Committee Reports

A. Planning Board Subcommittees:

Planning Board Capital Improvement Program (VACANT/VACANT/Garland/L. Stavis) – Mr. Hall expressed an interest in participating on the CIP subcommittee again.

Planning Board Development Regulations Update (M. Hall/K, Romano/ J. Rutter / J. Monroe)

B. City Council Subcommittees:

Class VI Roads Advisory Committee (J. Monroe) – The Committee took a break from meetings, and is now continuing to work on roads.

Lebanon Energy Advisory Committee (J. Monroe) – no report

D. Other Subcommittees:

City Council Representative (D. Whittlesey/K. Zook)

Heritage Commission (J. Rutter)

Pedestrian & Bicyclist Advisory Committee (G. Amaro)

Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission (B. Garland/VACANT)

UV Sub-Committee of the Connecticut River Joint Commissions (B. Garland)

Upper Valley Transportation Management Association (VACANT)

Mascoma River Local Advisory Committee (K. Romano)

Steering Committee for the Implementation of the Master Plan (SCIMP - B. Garland/K. Chewning /VACANT/J. Monroe)

The Department will be working with individual boards and committee to evaluate chapters of the Master plan to determine if they are still accurate and express the current vision. If the vision is still accurate, then the Department will work on updating actions and strategies. If not, some chapters may require a new visioning process. The future of SCIMP was discussed. Different boards are in charge of specific chapters. The volume of effort in reporting and tracking became overwhelming, and the Department lost momentum along with boards and committees. Mr. Brooks noted that it may be updated by committee areas. New revision dates may be needed, perhaps a 5 to 8-year plan and not 18 years as before.

West Lebanon Revitalization Advisory Committee (L. Stavis)

Planning & Development Department – Task Status (D. Brooks/ M. Goodwin/T. Corwin/R. Owens)
Mr. Brooks noted that Kathy Urffer of the Connecticut River Conservancy will attend the City Council meeting tentatively June 2, 2021 regarding the dam relicensing process. There will be a discussion of what role the City should play in the process conclusion.

The Keys to the Valley project has been finalized. The effort involved 3 regional planning commissions, and two years were spent putting material together with responses from the public. The website (keystothevalley.com) is excellent and includes great information. There will be lunchtime presentations and discussion of pieces of the report in May.

Mr. Brooks stated that the CIP process is underway. There is one spot left on the committee, which provides a very interesting look at the City's prioritizing and budgeting process. The projects go to the CIP Committee in late July and to the Planning Board in late August.

City Manager Mulholland has announced that, barring some change in COVID rates, the City Council will be back to meeting in person in June, with other boards following in July or later. The Planning Board can consider going back to in person with a quorum physically present. The Teams meetings will remain an option, and in May the Board can discuss going back to in person meetings.

Mr. Brooks noted that there is a prospective developer for the Iron Horse project, and a meeting was to happen earlier in the day. It may come to the Board for conceptual discussion.

Mr. Hall inquired about the Prospect Hills appeal. Mr. Brooks stated that Staff is pulling together information for a certified record. Mr. Corwin noted that the appeals board hearing is similar to a superior court hearing but is supposed to be an expedited process.

4. Approval of Minutes

A. March 22, 2021

*Matthew Hall moved to approve the Planning Board minutes of March 22, 2021, as presented.
The motion was seconded by Kathie Romano.*

Roll Call Vote:

Voting in Favor – Mr. Amaro, Mr. Rutter, Ms. Monroe, Ms. Romano, Mr. Hall, Mr. Garland

Voting Against – None

**The MOTION was approved (6-0)*

5. Adjournment

*A MOTION by Matthew Hall to adjourn the meeting.
Seconded by Kathie Romano*

Roll Call Vote:

*Voting in Favor, Mr. Garland, Mr. Amaro, Ms. Monroe, Ms. Romano, Mr. Rutter, Mr. Hall
Voting Against - None*

**The MOTION was approved (6-0).*

The meeting was adjourned at 9:17 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Holly Howes
Recording Secretary