



Stratham Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
May 16, 2018
Municipal Center, Selectmen's Meeting Room
10 Bunker Hill Avenue
Time: 7:00 PM

Members Present: Bob Baskerville, Chairman
Mike Houghton, Selectmen's Representative
David Canada, Member
Tom House, Secretary
Diedre Lawrence, Alternate

Members Absent: Jameson Paine, Vice Chairman
Robert Roseen, Alternate

Staff Present: Tavis Austin, Town Planner

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The Vice Chairman took roll. Mr. Baskerville asked Ms. Lawrence to stand in as a voting member tonight. Ms. Lawrence agreed.

2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. May 2, 2018

Mr. House made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of May 2, 2018 as submitted. Mr. Canada seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Public Hearing

a. **3 Lot Subdivision Application** to create 2 new duplex building lots for condominium development, and one lot to maintain the condominium duplex at 15-17 Union Road, Stratham, NH 03885, Map 10 Lot 76-1&2 submitted by Brock Ehlers, 163 Deer Street, Portsmouth, NH 03801 and Nina & Mark J Merida, 17 Union Road, Stratham, NH 03885. **Applicant requesting continuance to June 6, 2018**

Mr. House made a motion to continue the public hearing for the 3-lot subdivision application to June 6, 2018. Mr. Canada seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Public Meeting

a. Site Plan & Subdivision Regulation Workshop

Mr. Austin explained to the board that the handout before them are just topic areas to be discussed. Draft language changes were not done until a general consensus from the board is complete. Mr. Austin recommended the board set a public hearing, possibly June 20th, and continue as needed by the planning board to address any and all topics for all changes to Site Plan, Subdivision, or Zoning Ordinance amendments. Mr. Baskerville would like a workshop tonight and have the draft verbiage ready for the June 20th meeting.

Mr. Lavery stated he has reviewed proposed changes to the Roadway Cross Sections and the specific changes to the site plan regulations that pertain to the roads. Mr. Austin stated he would like to work with Mr. Lavery, and perhaps RPC and others, is that not every road warrants 28 ft. of pavement. However, based on certain number of residences or businesses served, or average daily vehicle trip, the planning board could establish a threshold for determining when 24 ft. becomes 28 ft. Mr. Baskerville suggested establishing the category for each road in town to determine this. It was suggested that between Chief Scippa and Mr. Lavery collector roads could be established. Mr. Lavery's handout is what is in the Subdivision Regulations so making changes to reflect that packet would be one public hearing and then done. Mr. Lavery explained these updates are a guide for developers but the cross sections have not been updated in a long time.

Road Cross Section

Dead-end streets - proposed 22 ft. width of pavement; Through roads – 24 ft. width of pavement; types of pavement, binder course used to be 3 inches and 1 inch of wearing course which has been changed to 2.5 inches of binder course and 1.5 inches of top course of pavement. Mr. Lavery stated that he hopes with these changes the amount of waivers before the planning board will decrease.

Tear Drop Cul De Sac

Mr. Lavery stated there are a couple of radius changes with pavement width of 22 ft.

Cul De Sac

The proposed change is 22 ft. of pavement around the inside of the cul de sac is 20 ft. pavement width, which two way traffic and fire apparatus can navigate, with the center of the cul de sac being loom seeded with vegetation inside.

91 Driveway Cross Section

92
93 Driveway cross sections don't currently exist. Typically an applicant will file for an
94 individual driveway permit which then Mr. Lavery gives the specs to the applicant. Mr.
95 Lavery would like to incorporate these specs into the site plan regulations.
96

97 Future Connecting Roads or Collector Roads

98
99 Mr. Lavery stated the town has a very active PCAC and this would allow bikers and walkers
100 safe passage.
101

- 102 1. Odd Shaped Lots: Mr. Baskerville stated the board discussed deleting the Hammerhead
103 Detail as well and asked confirmation from Mr. Lavery that he still wanted to pursue that.
104 Mr. Lavery agreed. Mr. Deschaine suggested a Conditional Use Permit requirement. Mr.
105 Austin suggested if a dead-end is proposed with a teardrop or cul de sac off of a connector
106 street could there be incentive to install 28 ft. of pavement for the bike and pedestrian
107 lanes coming off of a connector. Mr. Houghton stated Addendum A, Table 1, has four
108 roadway types identified and questions if four captures the future state of what the
109 planning board is looking for, and if the board wants to support the PCAC wouldn't the
110 board agree that any through road must be 28 ft. wide and contain bike lanes. Mr.
111 Baskerville stated Addendum A needs to be addressed as a whole. Mr. Baskerville asked
112 Mr. Lavery about the 400 ft. of frontage requirements when NH DOT requirements could
113 be different. Mr. Lavery explained there is language that states "public works discretion
114 based on traffic studies". Mr. Baskerville stated the footnote #2 states "unless modified by
115 planning board". Mr. Houghton stated the footnote invites the applicant to ask. The board
116 chose to take the footnote out. Mr. House asked about the driveway cross section, on the
117 plan view it shows "18 ft. minimum for common private drives" and above states
118 "measure at right of way, 12 ft. minimum to 18 ft. maximum". Mr. Lavery stated it needs
119 to be clarified to "18 ft. minimum is for shared driveway" and "12 ft. is for single
120 driveway". Mr. Deschaine stated the Typical Road Cross Sections, underdrains were
121 going to be added for onsite conditions. The second note Mr. Deschaine had is specified
122 gravel, process gravel, run gravel, sand, and fabric per DOT item numbers but material
123 specs do not exist for the bituminous. Mr. Deschaine questioned where in the regulations
124 a specific call for construction standards. Mr. Austin stated Addendum A has the table and
125 all the figures and all of Addendum A for construction specifications. Mr. Houghton
126 stated drainage needs to state what the planning board allows and does not allow. Mr.
127 Deschaine questioned if the town wants bio swales and other LID materials within the
128 right of way. Mr. Austin stated if there is a DES endorsed list of LID practices and the
129 applicant's engineer can take it off the DES list and justify to Civilworks, the Planning
130 Board, and the Highway Department that the cost benefit ratio is equal to or better on the
131 town's side than the standard then it should justify granting a waiver to the standard. Mr.
132 Baskerville suggested waiting until Mr. Roseen is in attendance to discuss this issue. Mr.
133 Austin stated it is not the town's responsibility to deal with the developer's runoff. If LID
134 has a role to deal with the water coming off the town road, then Mr. Lavery will have to
135 accept that. Mr. Baskerville questioned the width of sidewalks. Mr. Houghton stated in
136 heavily traveled and high density areas, like the Gateway, the board should strive to have
137 sidewalks in those areas but in the residential/agriculture areas Mr. Houghton would

advocate for wider berth for biking and walking. Mr. Austin stated it might make sense to put 20 ft. of pavement for the benefit of bikes and pedestrians between Betty Lane and Butternut for instance. Mr. Baskerville questioned if a cross referenced document would be ready for the planning board by June 20th. Mr. House prefers wider roads with lanes for bikes and pedestrians. Mr. Canada prefers wider roads. Mr. Austin stated wider usually equals cars driving faster. Mr. Lavery stated it's a significant expense that the town will save on all aspects of maintenance and construction.

2. Mr. Austin questioned lot frontage measurement on a cul de sac. Lot frontage is currently measured along the arch. Mr. Austin asked how it is determined which frontage is the required frontage for the purpose of achieving the 200 ft. of frontage. Mr. Austin asked if any portion of a lot that touches the perimeter of the bulb is the 25% greater frontage. Mr. Canada stated the whole lot has to be 25%. Mr. Austin asked the board if they would like to disincentivize cul de sac development by not giving an applicant the benefit of additional frontage by making the bulb to increase the frontage requirement on the bulb. Mr. Baskerville stated if the frontage is increased the road becomes longer and the frontage is achieved on the straight portion. Mr. Austin asked if the trend is to not encourage dead ends and limit the number of houses on dead ends applications to make the applicant be creative with their property. Mr. Canada stated it would be beneficial to require more frontage on a cul de sac. Mr. Austin explained the square rule for lot frontage to Ms. Lawrence. Mr. Austin stated the board could invoke the "frontage square" and the board will have addressed the regular ordinary development along public road, addressed frontage, and there is a way to account. The square has to sit on the front setback line and be confined on the property. Frontage along a cul de sac setting the square at 25% greater than that required by the base zone for a street road for any lot touching any portion of the cul de sac. Mr. Baskerville asked the board if they would like to increase the frontage on cul de sacs. Mr. Baskerville is not in favor. Mr. Houghton stated if the frontage is increased on the cul de sac it is equalizing the frontage requirement. Mr. Canada, Mr. Houghton and Ms. Lawrence voted to increase the frontage. Mr. House is unsure and questioned what it is being increased to. Mr. Austin stated 25% which equals 225 ft. Mr. Austin stated another alternative would be to make it clear that any portion of the lot that fronts on a road employs the 30 ft. setback along its entire length and the square has to fit. Mr. Austin explained the frontage regarding pork chop lots. Mr. Austin suggested adding a statement which says "cul de sacs approved after a certain date cannot be modified for the purpose of achieving frontage". The board agreed to adding this statement.

3. Private and Dead End Roads: Mr. Austin stated he is unsure of the legality of the town to make the declaration that no private road shall be created. An early discussion was that all dead end roads should be private because it was not an effective use of town infrastructure. Mr. Baskerville stated in some towns frontage is only along a classified highway and there is a clause in the RSA to approve private roads for frontage. Mr. Austin stated that currently the regulations state that all private roads have to be built to town road specifications. Mr. Austin will look into the legality of declaring no private roads, and suggested the board request all public roads in the future. Mr. Austin stated he will do more work on the handout, private versus public, and how to address the issue. Mr. Canada stated he is opposed to short or dead end street due to Mr. Lavery's concerns with

185 plowing, etc. and questioned Mr. Lavery on why he is opposed to private roads. Mr.
186 Lavery stated short and dead end roads cause a lot of maintenance on public works and
187 worries about the town potentially taking the roads over in the future which are not in the
188 town's best interest. Mr. Baskerville questioned if a road is in bad condition and a
189 homeowner pays larger association fees because they are on their own road, does their
190 assessment reflect the poor road they live on. Mr. Deschaine explained the market drives
191 the property assessment, not the fact of where you live and services.

- 192
193 **4. Recommend Change to Site Plan Requirements and/or Signage:** Mr. Austin stated all of
194 this item is a zoning ordinance change. Mr. Austin explained every vehicle that bears the
195 company name is a sign for that business. The suggestion is that any and all vehicles that
196 bare the company name cannot park the vehicle for the purpose of being a sign or
197 advertisement. Mr. Austin suggested all vehicles be to the side or rear of the property and
198 screened. There was a recent incident with the Code Enforcement Officer with a vehicle
199 that parked at the front of a parking lot bearing the name of the business and it did not
200 move. Mr. Austin stated one way to address this issue is in the sign regulations and/or
201 include in the "accessory storage" amendment. Mr. Deschaine suggested the regulations
202 be changed to clearly delineate site plans will be required to designate employee parking,
203 business parking, and customer parking and said parking, except for customer parking,
204 shall be out of site, screened, etc. Mr. Baskerville requested Mr. Austin move ahead with
205 this item for change. Mr. Austin and Mr. Baskerville were questioned if the town has a
206 good definition of when an amended site plan is required. Mr. Baskerville questioned the
207 board on when a change is minor does an applicant need to come before the board. Mr.
208 Austin explained a recently approved site plan applicant would like to add 12,000 SF of
209 parking area to the rear of their approval and he is requiring them to do an amended site
210 plan. The question becomes, when does an amended site plan, on a gateway property,
211 trigger a Technical Review Committee meeting.

212
213 Mr. Houghton made a motion, upon receipt of Nate Merrill's resignation from the TRC, the
214 board appoint Becky Mitchell as his successor. Mr. Canada seconded the motion. Motion
215 carried unanimously.

216
217 Mr. Houghton stated 17 Doe Run Lane, a small potential buildable lot which the town
218 acquired as a tax deed, has been voted by the selectman as surplus property and have asked the
219 town administrator pursue its potential sale. Mr. Deschaine stated 41.14.a the planning board
220 and the conservation commission needs to be notified of the possibility and ask for
221 recommendations from those boards.

222
223 Mr. Canada made a motion that the planning board has no recommendation to the town sale of
224 the land at 17 Doe Run Lane. Mr. House seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

225 226 **5. Adjournment.**

227
228 Mr. House made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:12 pm. Ms. Lawrence seconded the
229 motion. Motion carried unanimously.