



**Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes**  
**August 2, 2023**  
**Stratham Municipal Center**  
**Time: 7:00 pm**

**Members Present:** Thomas House, Chair  
Mike Houghton, Select Board's Representative  
Chris Zaremba, Regular Member  
Nate Allison, Alternate Member

**Members Absent:** David Canada, Vice Chair  
John Kunowski, Regular Member

**Staff Present:** Mark Connors, Director of Planning and Community Development

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Mr. House called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm and took roll call. Mr. House appointed Mr. Allison as a voting member for the meeting.

**2. Approval of Minutes**

**a.** July 12, 2023

**Mr. Zaremba made a motion to approve the July 12, 2023 meeting minutes. Mr. Allison seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.**

**3. Public Hearing:**

**a.** JP Morgan Chase & Co. (Applicant) and NP Stratham LLC & Northstar Center LLC (Owners) - Request for approval of a Site Plan and a Conditional Use Permit for a proposed 3,322 square-foot Chase Bank with drive-thru service facilities and associated improvements at 20 Portsmouth Avenue (Tax Map 4, Lot 14). Application submitted by Bohler Engineering, 352 Turnpike Road, Southborough MA 01772. The application was postponed from the July 12, 2023 Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Zaremba recused himself from the public hearing for this application.

Mr. Connors provided some updated materials and plans along with a Conditional Use Permit application for the sign package. The architecture has not been revised. The sign on the south side of the building has been reduced based on feedback from the Board at the last meeting. Additional information on traffic has also been submitted.

Randy Miron from Bohler presented the updated materials. The sign on the elevation facing the

45 plaza has been reduced to fit within the window area, it was previously wider than the window.  
46 The Conditional Use Permit application requests approval for the backlit signage and an increase  
47 in the allowed maximum size of wall signage. There are no free standing signs, so Chase is  
48 requesting 65 square feet of wall signage where approximately 50 square feet is allowed. A waiver  
49 was also submitted to request approval for the building to be set back farther than the maximum  
50 allowed in the Ordinance. Regarding the Board's request to add window muntins, Chase reviewed  
51 the architecture of the surrounding buildings and prefers not to add them. Kevin Kelly from Core  
52 States Group added that the windows on the Chipotle, Starbucks, and Staples buildings have no  
53 muntins, so they believe the original windows will fit better with the area. Chase feels it will make  
54 the building look out of place if muntins were added. Mr. House responded that with the exception  
55 of Chipotle and Starbucks, the other buildings pre-exist the regulations and the regulations have  
56 been changed to promote a traditional New England-style architecture. Mr. Kelly asked if window  
57 muntins are a requirement in the ordinance. Mr. House replied that the Board is looking for New  
58 England traditional architecture. Mr. Kelly replied that they have completed extensive design  
59 customizations to fit that New England architecture style and he thinks that even without the  
60 muntins, the building will still reflect the New England style and with the muntins the building  
61 will simply look different from the surrounding buildings.  
62

63 Mr. Miron stated that the other change to the site plan is with stormwater management. Ken  
64 Knowles from Eaglebrook Engineering & Survey presented those changes. Currently there is sheet  
65 flow towards the fire pond, the detention basin, and to Parkman Brook. They added grading and  
66 plantings to create a naturalized rain garden to catch some of the runoff prior to the fire pond and  
67 ultimately to the woods. There is a net decrease in pavement. Mr. Connors asked if any new  
68 facilities for stormwater are proposed. Mr. Knowles replied there is a long linear bioretention swale  
69 with plantings for infiltration and treatment and then anything beyond that area will continue to  
70 overland flow as it does today. There is a net reduction in impervious surface over the entire plaza.  
71

72 Mr. Miron stated that a cueing analysis was completed by GPI on the Starbucks traffic. Mr.  
73 Knowles presented the analysis. Cameras were installed and recorded traffic for two weeks from  
74 5:00 am to 8:00 pm. The parameters given to GPI to study include when a vehicle backs up and  
75 affects the main driveway, how long that occurs, how many vehicles it is, and does the line back  
76 up to Route 108. There were seven times in two weeks when the vehicle cue backed up from the  
77 order board into the slip lane. Six vehicles can fit and the seventh would wait in the driveway.  
78 However, more often the seventh vehicle would cue up in the parking lot. The back-up would clear  
79 within one to two minutes. Signage at the slip lane is proposed to assist in directing drive through  
80 traffic. Chase met with NHDOT and they came to the conclusion that the entrance to Starbucks is  
81 operating properly and if the entrance was closed off to force traffic farther into the plaza, there  
82 would be traffic continuously backed up at the T intersection where there is no backup now. Mr.  
83 House asked Mr. Connors if the police and fire comments were forwarded to Chase. Mr. Connors  
84 replied yes. Mr. House stated that he understands that the study did not show the backups, but  
85 police and fire have seen it. Mr. Miron commented that any time a traffic pattern is changed, there  
86 is a training period and perhaps there were larger cues when the Starbucks first opened.  
87

88 Mr. Houghton asked what the hours for the bank are. Mr. Knowles replied 8:00 am to 5:00 pm  
89 Monday through Friday, 8:00 am to 1:00 pm on Saturday, and closed on Sunday.  
90

91 Mr. Miron stated that NHDOT has issued the driveway permit and NH DES has issued approval  
92 for the septic system to allow more capacity and for the bank to tie into it.  
93

Mr. Connors recommends that the Applicant return to the next meeting to allow the Board time to review the new materials.

Mr. Allison approached the screen and pointed to some areas where he has concerns with the lack of a turning radius and requested that Chase review that and perhaps add some additional traffic signage.

Mr. Houghton asked if the Applicant is going to provide a written response to the comments from police and fire. Mr. Miron replied yes.

Mr. House commented that the architecture of the proposed building has many jogs and that some of the plans have not been updated. He asked that the plans be updated for approval. Regarding the Portsmouth Avenue elevation, Mr. House believes there is too much glass and he notes that the building is much wider than Chipotle and Starbucks. Those buildings could have more glass due to the narrower width. He commented that the two windows on the left have a wall behind them. Mr. Kelly replied that the two windows in question will be spandrel windows to allow symmetry. Behind those windows will be the equipment room which needs to be closed off. On the right side there will be an office that needs windows. Mr. House asked if any other windows will have spandrel glass. Mr. Kelly replied no. Mr. House commented that at night it appears that the windows will not be lit up evenly and they will not achieve the symmetry that is desired. Mr. Kelly agreed that at night there will be differences in illumination but during the day the building would not look good if the windows are off center. Mr. House does not agree that it will look symmetrical during the day because the spandrel windows will be grey while the rest of the windows are clear. Mr. Kelly believes that from a vehicle passing perspective it will look good. It is the elevation facing Portsmouth Avenue and he believes that the window color difference will not be noticeable from vehicle traffic along Portsmouth Avenue. Mr. House commented that there is pedestrian traffic as well. Mr. Kelly replied that the majority of traffic will be vehicles. Mr. House added that muntins were suggested in the past due to the amount of glass. Mr. Kelly replied that Chase has a sight line security issue and they prefer to increase visibility and window muntins add another obstruction to visibility.

Mr. House asked for a presentation on signage. Mr. Kelly presented photographs showing the back lit signage that Chase is requesting a waiver for. Mr. Connors stated that the photos show the window areas lit up in blue and asked if that is the case. Mr. Kelly replied that is for the 24-hour vestibule. It is not a direct light, it is indirect cove lighting. Mr. Houghton asked what Chase's issues are with downward lighting. Mr. Kelly replied there are other businesses in the area with internally lit signage. The original proposal was for full internally illuminated signage and Chase has reduced the request to halo illumination. Mr. Connors commented that the halo signage is not as concerning as the blue internal lighting and asked if Chase could forego that. Mr. Kelly replied they will talk with Chase to reduce or remove it but he notes that because it is a 24-hour vestibule, it will need some illumination. Mr. Allison commented that his preference is for downward lighting rather than halo lighting. Mr. House commented that he does not hear a strong argument for granting the waiver. Mr. Kelly replied that his impression from the last meeting was that halo illumination would be preferred over full illumination. Mr. House does not recall that.

It was agreed by all that the application discussion would continue at the August 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. **Mr. Houghton made a motion to continue the hearing to August 16, 2023. Mr. Allison seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.**

Mr. Zaremba returned to the Board at 7:45 pm.

- b. Bradford Sawler (Applicant and Owner) - Request for approval of a Site Plan Application to convert approximately 1,000 square-feet of an existing residential property into office space for a building company and to construct additional parking areas at 240 Portsmouth Avenue (Tax Map 22, Lot 89), Zoned Route 33 Heritage District. Survey prepared by Boudreau Land Surveying, 2 Beatrice Lane, Newmarket NH 03857. This application was tabled from the July 12, 2023 meeting.

Mr. Connors stated that a new site plan with some parking changes and exterior lighting was submitted after the last meeting. Mr. Connors drafted a motion with conditions if the Board approves the application. There are three waivers from the previous plan and a fourth waiver is required for the lighting plan.

**Mr. Zaremba made a motion to accept the application as complete. Mr. Houghton seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.**

**Mr. Zaremba made a motion to open the public hearing. Mr. Houghton seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.**

Mr. Sawler described the changes to the site plan. He is pleased with reversing the one-way flow. He rotated the dumpster 90 degrees to allow easier access by the trash hauler. He added to the site plan two proposed maple trees to flank the arborvitaes, the flow of traffic, stop bars, and the bollard lighting. Mr. Allison suggested Mr. Sawler use a deer-tolerant variety of arborvitae. Mr. Zaremba has no comments. Mr. Houghton likes the changes. Mr. Allison commented that the revised parking looks more functional.

Mr. Connors presented the waiver requests. One is to allow parking close to the front setback due to wetlands restrictions on the property. The second is for nine parking spaces which exceeds the maximum amount allowed in the Heritage District. The third waiver is from a complete stormwater analysis. The final waiver is from a full photometric lighting plan.

Mr. Connors read aloud the proposed conditions: work with the Town Planner to clean up some minor technical comments; provide an NHDOT driveway permit or a letter from NHDOT stating a permit is not required; if NHDOT requires changes to the driveway, the Applicant shall return to the Planning Board for review; any waste be stored in the building or dumpster enclosure; submit details on the exterior lighting; store construction vehicles or trailers in parking spaces or on the gravel access driveway; replace the floodlights with downcast lighting; properly maintain the existing landscaping; resurface the entire driveway prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy; adding a Heritage District marker to the building; and complete all conditions prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Mr. House initiated discussion on the waiver from Section 3.10.6.d.i of the Zoning Ordinance regarding the number of parking spaces. The Board discussed the waiver and there were no concerns on granting the waiver. **Mr. Houghton made a motion to approve the waiver to allow two additional parking spaces over the seven allowed for a total of nine. Mr. Allison seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.**

Mr. House initiated discussion on the waiver from Section 3.10.6.d.ii of the Zoning Ordinance regarding the front setback for parking. The Board discussed the waiver and there were no concerns

on granting the waiver. **Mr. Zaremba made a motion to grant the waiver from Section 3.10.6.d.ii of the Zoning Ordinance with respect to the Route 33 right of way. Mr. Allison seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.**

Mr. House initiated discussion on the waiver from Addendum C of the Site Plan Regulations for the minimum requirements for the Town of Stratham Stormwater Regulations. The Board discussed the waiver and there were no concerns on granting the waiver. **Mr. Zaremba made a motion to grant the waiver for Addendum C, Stormwater Regulations. Mr. Allison seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.**

Mr. House initiated discussion on the waiver from Section 5.8.1.d of the Site Plan Regulations to submit a photometric plan. The Board discussed the waiver and there were no concerns on granting the waiver. **Mr. Houghton made a motion to grant the waiver from Section 5.8.1.d of the Site Plan Regulations to submit a photometric plan. Mr. Zaremba seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.**

**Mr. Zaremba made a motion that the Planning Board approve the Site Plan and Route 33 Heritage District application submitted by Bradford Sawler consistent with the application materials and site plan by Boudreau Land Surveying, last revised July 28, 2023 to convert 991 square-feet of an existing structure to office uses for a building company and associated improvements at 240 Portsmouth Avenue, Map 22, Lot 89, subject to the following conditions to be incorporated prior to plan signature or as otherwise noted:**

- 1. The applicant shall work with the Town Planner to incorporate minor/technical comments into the final plan.**
- 2. A NHDOT Driveway Permit shall be obtained for the use or documentation from NHDOT submitted that a permit is not necessary. If NHDOT requires significant modifications to the driveway, parking, or circulation pattern, the applicant shall return to the Planning Board for approval of the plan modifications.**
- 3. A note shall be added to the plan that all waste will be stored indoors or within the dumpster enclosure.**
- 4. A detail for the bollard and the bollard exterior lighting shall be added to the plans or submitted to the Planning Department.**
- 5. The waivers and the date of Planning Board approval shall be noted on the plans.**
- 6. The hours of operation of the office use shall be noted on the plan.**
- 7. A note shall be added to the plan that construction equipment or trailers shall not be stored on the property outside of designated parking spaces or in the gravel access way.**
- 8. A detail for the bollard exterior lighting shall be added to the plans or submitted to the Planning Department. The building mounted lighting on the attached accessory building shall be replaced with fully downcast lighting.**
- 9. A note shall be added to the plan that existing landscaping, including landscaping within**

the driveway island, will be preserved and maintained.

**10. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the entire driveway will be resurfaced or reconstructed.**

**11. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, a historical/heritage marker shall be posted on the building commemorating the history of the property.**

**12. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, all improvements depicted on the plan shall be installed.**

**Mr. Houghton seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.**

## **2. Other Business:**

- a.** Lone Tree Homes, LLC (Owner), Great Island Builders, LLC (Applicant) - Request for approval of an Expedited Planning Board Review application to allow a series of minor exterior improvements associated with the renovation of a bakery at 100 Portsmouth Avenue, Map 13, Lot 86, Zoned Professional Residential.

Mr. Connors described that the Expedited Planning Board approval process allows a public hearing to be waived in certain circumstances. The former bakery at the property is being renovated by the new owner. The building inspector noticed some changes to the site during a routine inspection which require Planning Board review. Mr. Connors also visited the property and noted that some lighting has been installed that is not downcast and requires a waiver. Mr. Connors believes the lighting is not out of character with the site, so he has no objection to the Board approving the waiver.

Mr. House asked if the application is complete. Mr. Connors replied yes.

**Mr. Houghton made a motion to accept the application as complete. Mr. Zaremba seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.**

**Mr. Houghton made a motion to open the public hearing. Mr. Zaremba seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.**

Mr. House confirmed with Mr. Connors that a public hearing is not required for Expedited Site Plan applications. Mr. Connors confirmed.

**Mr. House made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Zaremba seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.**

John McCormack with Great Island Builders spoke on behalf of the bakery owner. The bakery owner would like to place a container in the back left area of the building. There is an existing shed the bakery owner would like to replace with a 20-foot standard shipping container for secure storage.

Mr. McCormack described the take-out window which is an additional change from the original site plan. The window is not a drive-through. It has already been installed and Mr. McCormack

was not aware that Planning Board approval is required for it. The window is located mid-way on the side of the building. The window has a black, anodized frame to match the black exterior of the building.

Mr. Houghton asked the hours of operation. Mr. McCormack does not know the exact hours, but it is primarily a morning and lunch operation. Mr. Houghton asked if the lighting on the take-out window would be on only during operation. Mr. McCormack replied yes.

Mr. Houghton asked if the two sheds are remaining. Mr. McCormack replied that one shed will be removed and the one directly behind the building that is not visible from the street will remain.

Mr. McCormack contacted the bakery owner who replied that the hours of operation are 7:00 am to 4:00 pm. They are currently closed on Mondays but plan to move to seven days per week.

Mr. House and Mr. Houghton are okay with the take out window lighting being on only during the hours of operation. Mr. Zaremba asked if the wall sconces at the take out window are the ones that are not downcast. Mr. Connors replied yes. Mr. Zaremba agreed he would be okay with their use only during pickup hours.

Mr. Houghton asked if trucks would back up to the shipping container. Mr. McCormack replied no and that the long side would face the parking lot and the doors would face the building for easier access. Dry goods are proposed to be stored in the container. Mr. Houghton prefers that screening, like fencing, be added. Mr. McCormack asked if there is a specific type of fence preferred, for example vinyl or wood. Mr. Connors suggested landscaping as well. Mr. House asked if the container has wheels. Mr. McCormack replied no, it will be at ground level but on top of pressure treated 4x4s. Mr. House asked Mr. Houghton if the screening should cover the entire container as the container is about eight feet tall. Mr. McCormack asked if the Town has regulations that limit the height of fencing. Mr. Connors replied that he believes within the setback, fences must be less than 6 feet, but outside the setback there is no requirement.

Mr. Allison asked what the counter is on the right side of the building and if there will be stools. Mr. McCormack replied he believes it is just a standing area; he will confirm with the owner the use; and asked if Planning Board approval is required for seating. Mr. Connors replied yes, approval is required for outdoor seating. Mr. Zaremba asked if the bollard near the counter and window will remain. Mr. McCormack replied he does not know but there has been no talk of removing it. Mr. Zaremba recommends retaining the bollard if people will stand there. His personal experience is that the parking lot in the past has been confusing. He also cautioned that someone might drive to the take out window if it was removed. All agreed and Mr. Allison suggested painting the bollard a brighter color.

Mr. House asked if the pavement is being resurfaced and striped. Mr. McCormack replied the property owner is taking care of resurfacing and he asked if the owner needs to submit anything for the pavement. Mr. Connors replied if they are changing the parking then they need Planning Board approval. Mr. House noted that the lot is currently not striped. Mr. Connors replied the property is pre-existing, non-conforming and would benefit from a change and Planning Board review. Mr. McCormack thought the owner was paving and changing the curb cut and asked if they had approached the Town for approval. Mr. Connors replied no and he will reach out to the property owner. Mr. McCormack added that they would be happy to stripe the parking lot however the Town deems appropriate. Mr. McCormack asked if the Board has any preference on diagonal

339 or straight in parking. Mr. Connors instructed Mr. McCormack to submit a plan for review and  
340 Mr. Houghton added that he assumes the owner would want to maximize parking. Mr. House asked  
341 if anyone will park on the side of the building with the counter. Mr. McCormack replied he does  
342 not think so. Mr. House suggested a “green” area with picnic tables would be nice.

343  
344 Mr. Zaremba asked about the water heater enclosure. Mr. McCormack replied that it was removed  
345 when an on-demand water heater was installed.

346  
347 Mr. House asked that the site plan be updated to reflect the new container, the removal of the shed,  
348 the removal of the water heater enclosure, any new screening, the dumpster location with  
349 screening, and to remove notes on the plan that no longer apply (e.g. water heater and canopies).

350  
351 Mr. House asked if there will be a canopy over the front door. Mr. McCormack replied no. Mr.  
352 House asked if the canopy on the shed is still there. Mr. McCormack replied no.

353  
354 Mr. Connors replied that if there are parking changes, the application can remain open and they  
355 can come back in two weeks. Mr. McCormack asked if that precludes them from opening. Mr.  
356 Connors replied yes. Mr. McCormack asked if the Board could issue a conditional approval if they  
357 get some of the items back to the Board for approval prior to the next meeting. Mr. Connors replied  
358 that is up to the Board and that parking changes require a separate application. Mr. McCormack  
359 replied that he believes that would be submitted by the property owner and he represents the bakery  
360 owner, but he can contact the property owner and relay the message that he needs to file an  
361 application for the parking lot.

362  
363 Mr. Connors stated the Board can continue the application until the next meeting or approve with  
364 conditions. Mr. Zaremba is comfortable with approving with conditions. Mr. House agrees but  
365 stated the Board needs to act on the waiver.

366  
367 Mr. House stated the waiver request is to Sections 5.8.1.b ii and iii to allow exterior lighting that  
368 is not fully shielded and up-lighting of the structure. Mr. House opened up the discussion and stated  
369 that he does not have a problem with the lighting while the business is open. Mr. Houghton asked  
370 if the waiver would be granted with that understanding or should there be a condition. Mr. Connors  
371 replied that there should be a condition stating when the lighting would be allowed. Mr. Zaremba  
372 asked if what he sees in the photo of the front of the building are lights under the windows. Mr.  
373 McCormack replied yes, those are lights that shine up to the canopies. Mr. Zaremba questioned if  
374 they are considered up cast. Mr. Connors replied yes and that is why two paragraph citations are  
375 listed in the waiver. Mr. House commented that the awning will block the light from shining into  
376 the sky. Mr. Allison is in agreement to grant the waiver.

377  
378 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion to grant the waiver from Section 5.8.1.b ii and iii from the**  
379 **Town’s lighting regulations. Mr. Allison seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the**  
380 **motion was approved.**

381  
382 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to approve the Expedited Planning Board Review Application**  
383 **submitted by Great Island Builders LLC to allow a series of minor exterior improvements**  
384 **associated with the renovation of a bakery at 100 Portsmouth Ave, Map 13, Lot 86, Zoned**  
385 **Professional Residential, consistent with the application materials subject to the following**  
386 **conditions:**

387 **1. The Applicant shall revise plans to remove the second shed, the canopy awning on**



shed 1, and the hot water heater and to include the trash enclosure and parking layout.

2. The take out window exterior light shall be turned off after 4:00 pm or whenever the business is closed.
3. The storage container will be screened by a fence or landscaping. The Applicant will work with the Town Planner on appropriate screening of the container.
4. Refuse shall be either stored inside an existing structure or in a dumpster that is housed within a fully-screened enclosure. Details of the enclosure shall be subject to the approval of the Town Planner.
5. The canopies shall remain on the building so long as there is uplighting.
6. The bollard near the takeout window shall be painted yellow.

**Mr. Zaremba seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.**

- b. Michael Flanagan, James Flanagan, and Ellis S. Grossman (Owners), James Flanagan (Applicant) – Request for modifications to a Route 33 Heritage District Application approval granted by the Planning Board on November 2, 2022 in order to modify two conditions of approval related to the demolition of a barn at 249 Portsmouth Avenue (Tax Map 22, Lot 6), Zoned Route 33 Heritage District.

Mr. Connors introduced the project. One condition of the November Planning Board approval was that Mr. Flanagan work with Mr. Connors to complete demolition by June 1, 2023. The demo is not complete. Additionally an application was required to be submitted to screen the block building after the barn is removed and the application has not been submitted. Mr. Connors asked Mr. Flanagan to appear before the Board to discuss these items.

James Flanagan spoke on behalf of the owners. Mr. Flanagan's brother has been collecting books for 25 years and he was unaware of the volume. Mr. Flanagan and his brother started the cleaning part of the project in May by boxing up the books, but they are quite heavy. They have progressed to the last room that will be cleaned out. An additional room has collapsed and is therefore inaccessible. Mr. Flanagan proposed a date of September 4, 2023 for the final removal of salvageable items and the final demo to be completed 60 days after September 4, 2023. The Owners will also complete a site visit with the demolition contractor to show what portion of the barn will remain, which is the shed on the eastern end and a cement block building inside the barn. Regarding the exterior of the block building and the screening required, Mr. Flanagan asks to wait until demolition is complete because the block building may be damaged during demo. If the block building is standing after demo they will return for approval of a renovation.

Mr. House read aloud the request submitted by Mr. Flanagan. Mr. Flanagan explained that he does not know how long the demo process will take so he proposed a start date with a 60-day completion date. Mr. Connors commented that a recent demo project took only one and a half days to complete. Mr. House added that his recollection is the demo contractor might want to salvage some wood and that could take more time.

Mr. Zaremba asked how this project was originally brought to the Board. Mr. Connors replied the Building Inspector and Fire Chief deemed the structure to be a hazard and ordered demolition. The Heritage Commission reviewed and approved the project. Mr. Zaremba asked if the fire department's order has a date for completion. Mr. Connors replied that the owners disconnected the electric service which was the main concern for fire.

Mr. House asked for a Board discussion on the draft motion and conditions. The Board and Mr. Flanagan had a productive discussion on the timing of the demolition and the next steps for renovations. It was determined that the renovation project application should be submitted to the Building Department. Once the application is submitted to the Building Department, Mr. Connors will review the plans to determine if any additional review by the Planning Board is needed.

Mr. Houghton asked for confirmation that an exposed block building is prohibited in the Heritage District. Mr. Connors confirmed. Mr. Houghton asked Mr. Flanagan to show the Planning Board a plan for the exterior renovations. Mr. Flanagan said he has a vision, but he cannot create a plan until the barn is demolished and he can measure the block building. He is requesting for permission to put a roof on the building to protect the interior and then he can assess and present additional renovations. Mr. Houghton clarified that the Board's concern is that Mr. Flanagan is not proposing to submit renovation plans until next year. Mr. Flanagan asked how he obtains approval for a roof. Mr. House replied that he should apply for building permit. Mr. Flanagan asked for confirmation that he does not need to return to the Planning Board for approval of the roof due to the presence of the property in the Route 33 Heritage District. Mr. House summarized that there is a flat roof currently and Mr. Flanagan would like to construct a pitched roof over the flat roof which will segue into the future exterior. Mr. Allison commented that he thought Mr. Flanagan wants to remove the flat roof and replace with a pitched roof. Mr. Flanagan corrected that there is no roof on the block building currently and when the barn is demolished, the block building that he wants to salvage will be exposed. Mr. Allison asked if Mr. Flanagan has spoken with an architect. Mr. Flanagan replied he can do that but he needs dimensions that he does not have until demo is complete. He would like to have a permit for the roof in hand prior to demolition so he can preserve the structure over the winter while he creates a plan for the renovation to begin next spring. Mr. Zaremba stated there are two items to review: the first is a building permit for the new roof and the second is the Planning Board conditions on the approval. Mr. Connors agreed that the new roof can be an interim step. Mr. Flanagan replied he wants the roof to be the final roof and asks if he needs approval from the Heritage Commission or the Planning Board for the roof design. He suggested he could also construct a flat roof with a tarp as an interim measure until next spring. Mr. Houghton stated that if Mr. Flanagan has a roof plan, he could get in front of the Heritage District Commission quickly. Mr. Connors recommends Mr. Flanagan talk with a contractor to make sure he can install the roof first and then the veneer walls later. Mr. Allison asked when he last appeared before the Heritage Commission. Mr. Flanagan replied he did not go before the commission, they performed a site walk at his property. He suggested again that he install a temporary flat roof with a tarp for the winter. Mr. House commented that contractors can build in the winter but if Mr. Flanagan does not yet have a contractor, then any work will likely be next year because contractors are all busy.

Mr. Zaremba commented that Mr. Flanagan should present a date of when he can supply plans for approval. Mr. Flanagan replied that he cannot provide plans until he knows the dimensions of the building and what the historical commission will approve. He added that it seems the best idea will be to install a temporary flat roof, hire a contractor and submit a plan next year. Mr. Connors asked when can Mr. Flanagan submit plans next year. Mr. Flanagan cannot predict a date. The Board members assisted with the timing discussion and it was decided that a design can be submitted by January 15, 2024.

**Mr. Houghton made a motion that the Planning Board approve modifications to Conditions 1 and 2 of the approval of a Route 33 Heritage District application, submitted by James Flanagan and granted by the Board on November 2, 2022 to demolish a barn at 249**

Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 22, Lot 6, Zoned Route 33 Heritage District to read as follows:

1. The applicant shall begin demolition of the barn at 249 Portsmouth Avenue by September 4, 2023. The applicant shall complete all demolition and have all equipment off the site by November 3, 2023.
2. Before January 15, 2024, the applicant will submit a Route 33 Heritage District application to the Town outlining plans for a new structure or screening of the concrete existing structure.
3. All other conditions of the November 2, 2022 Planning Board approval shall remain in full effect.

Mr. Zaremba seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.

Mr. Flanagan asked if he is approved to install a temporary roof without a building permit. Mr. Connors replied that he can do that or if he installs an actual roof, he can pull a building permit.

c. Miscellaneous Community Planning Issues

Mr. Connors announced there will be a couple applications for the next meeting and also some workshop items.

Mr. Zaremba asked if the Town has restrictions on interior lighting or is it outside the purview of the Planning Board. Mr. Connors replied it is not typically something the Board reviews, but in the case of a lighting waiver request, it is a fair topic for discussion. Mr. House has a recollection that the subject was discussed in the past relative to car dealerships. Mr. Houghton replied that the direct answer is that there is no regulation. Mr. House asked if it is something we can regulate and restrict to emergency power only or minimal usage. Mr. Connors replied that the blue lighting proposed by Chase is very noticeable. Mr. Allison noted that in that case, the interior lighting shines to the outside so there is an impact in terms of its presentation.

4. Adjournment

Mr. Houghton made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 pm. Mr. Zaremba seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion was approved.