



**Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes**  
**February 6, 2019**  
**Municipal Center, Selectmen's Meeting Room**  
10 Bunker Hill Avenue  
Time: 7:00 PM

Members Present: Bob Baskerville, Chairman  
Jameson Paine, Vice Chairman  
Mike Houghton, Selectmen's Representative  
Robert Roseen, Alternate

Members Absent: Tom House, Secretary  
David Canada, Member  
Diedre Lawrence, Alternate

Staff Present: Tavis Austin, Town Planner

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

The Chairman took roll. Mr. Baskerville asked Mr. Roseen if he would be a voting member in place of Mr. House's absence. Mr. Roseen agreed.

**2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes**

**a. January 16, 2019**

Mr. Roseen made a motion to accept the meeting minutes of January 16, 2019 as presented. Mr. Paine seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**3. Public Hearing:**

- a. Site Plan Review.** *Legacy Lane Farm Cabin Colony*, represented by Bruce Scamman, Emanuel Engineering, Inc, requests a Site Plan Permit Application Preliminary Consultation for adding agricultural tourism with the addition of up to 5, 1 bedroom cabins for temporary farm stays at 217 Portsmouth Ave., Stratham, NH, Tax Map 21 Lot 88.

Mr. Austin stated staff recommends the Planning Board accept the application as complete for Site Plan Review. Mr. Austin stated the waivers discussed at the preliminary consultation hearing are submitted in the packet this evening and recommended the planning board approve the waivers submitted in a group since the Site Plan packet is representative of the board's direction during the preliminary consultation. Mr. Austin explained the planning board's focus is "how the use is" not "what the use is" on the property this evening.

Mr. Baskerville asked for clarification that the applicant is going before the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Mr. Austin stated yes, the proposed use of "cottage colony" is a Special Exception under Table 3.6 in the Zoning Ordinance. The project is slated for review before the Zoning Board of Adjustment for "use" on 2/12/2019.

Mr. Paine made a motion to accept the application as complete due to town planning staff input. Mr. Roseen seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Bruce Scamman, Emanuel Engineering, representing Dorothy Thompson, owner of 217 Portsmouth Avenue, Map 21 Lot 88. Mr. Scamman explained the location of the property. Mr. Scamman stated the applicant would like to have a "cottage colony" to allow the public to come and stay on a farm to experience farm life with goats and rabbits and get away from modern technology. The applicant is proposing to put in two phases of cottages; Phase I would be three (3) cottages and if successful two (2) more cottages would be built. Mr. Scamman explained test pits were scheduled for today but the ground was frozen and could not be completed. Mr. Scamman stated there are two (2) other leachfields on site which both passed. Mr. Scamman explained there are five (5) proposed gravel parking spaces, one (1) for each of the cabins, and the visitors will use wagons to take their belongings down to the cabins. There is a 12 ft. driveway proposed to allow an ambulance to reach the cabins in case of emergency, with turn-arounds in both cabin locations. The lighting along the driveway will be motion activated for emergency purposes only. Mr. Scamman explained an aerial of the property to the board. Mr. Scamman stated the Robert's property is largely wetlands, and wetlands at the back of the property. Mr. Scamman explained the cabins are being located in a lower elevation on the property, which is secluded, and will not have any interaction with abutters. Mr. Scamman stated the cabins are 16'x20' and include a kitchen, sitting area, bedrooms, and a bathroom. The cabins will be set on stone for the drip edge and infiltrate back in the ground. Mr. Scamman explained the waivers being requested are:

- 1) No drainage study required per preliminary consultation and a wetlands delineation has been completed and is shown on current plans.
- 2) Data on test pits and percolation tests to be completed when septic plan is submitted.
- 3) Storm drainage plan with supporting calculations are not required per preliminary consultation. Minimal impact is proposed on site and drainage is provided.
- 4) No new landscape and screening is shown on site, it is an existing condition.

89 5) Solid waste disposal receptacles and screening is not necessary due to the minor use  
90 of the site. Roadside pickup will be utilized.  
91

92 Mr. Scamman explained the proposed cottage colony will be more seasonal, more  
93 summer and fall, with little activity in the spring and winter. Mr. Roseen and Mr. Paine  
94 questioned if the applicant will be clearing land for the cabins. Mr. Scamman stated no,  
95 all the natural vegetation is going to remain. Mr. Paine questioned if the applicant  
96 would move the first cabin for aesthetics and noise considerations. Mr. Houghton  
97 agreed. Mr. Austin stated the proposed structures comply with the regulations. Mr.  
98 Austin explained one of the recommended conditions, along with the Code Enforcement  
99 Officer's request, is that individual footprints not be shown on a recorded mylar, just  
100 the areas for cabin development. Mr. Roseen asked if an annual, periodic inspection  
101 could be provided for the drip edge to assure it is still functional. Mr. Scamman stated  
102 there is a 2 ft. deep by 2 ft. wide drip edge around the perimeter of each cabin with 8  
103 inches of stone under the entire cabin. Mr. Baskerville, Mr. Austin, and Mr. Houghton  
104 stated the town does not have anything in place for annual inspections. Mr. Baskerville  
105 questioned if the Building Inspector or the Town Planner would perform the inspection  
106 if the Planning Board required it. Mr. Austin stated staff would.  
107

108 Mr. Baskerville opened the hearing up for public comment. No comments for or  
109 against this application came forward. Ronald Roberts, 19 Squamscott Road, requested  
110 a copy of the site plan. Mr. Scamman provided Mr. Roberts with a copy. Nathan  
111 Merrill, 73R College Road, asked for clarification that the "use" will go before the ZBA  
112 next week. Mr. Austin stated yes. Mr. Merrill asked for clarification of what the  
113 agricultural precedent is, since this is a small lot and appears to be an intense  
114 development for the amount of agriculture on the property. Agritourism is supposed to  
115 be subservient to the agricultural use. Mr. Austin explained this "cottage colony" is not  
116 coming forward as agritourism and could occur without the farm. Mr. Austin explained  
117 that Table 3.6 in the Zoning Ordinance has a section called "temporary residential uses"  
118 that includes campgrounds, RV parks, cottage colonies, bed and breakfast, and  
119 hotel/motel. The State of NH definition of agritourism, which the town adopted as their  
120 definition, does include overnight stays. Bettina Kersten, 4 Lucien Way and Co-Chair  
121 of the PCAC, stated support for this project as there are more biking trails crossing  
122 towns with people traveling long distances on bicycles and this project could  
123 accommodate them as they are passing through Stratham. Ms. Kersten requested the  
124 applicant install a fence or natural fencing to prevent children from getting too close to  
125 Route 33. Dorothy Thompson, 217 Portsmouth Avenue, stated she is not opposed to  
126 putting up a deterrent so kids do not go near Rt. 33. Mr. Merrill asked if the Fire  
127 Department gave approval of the narrow, 12 ft., road to get to the cabins. Mr.  
128 Baskerville stated the fire department would not drive down the gravel road, they would  
129 fight a fire from Rt. 33. Mr. Scamman stated he spoke with the Town of Stratham Fire  
130 Chief and he did not voice opposition and the discussion was regarding making sure  
131 there was enough room for an ambulance to access the cabins in an emergency  
132 situation. Mr. Roberts asked if the utilities to the cabins would be above-ground or  
133 underground. Mr. Scamman stated the applicant is proposing underground utilities,  
134 strictly electric, water and sewer at this point, no gas. Mr. Paine questioned if the

smaller septic tanks behind the buildings are within the wellhead radius. Mr. Scamman stated they cannot be within 50 ft.; one is 54 ft. and the other is over the 100 ft. separation distance.

#### Conditions Precedent

- 1) Mylar to be recorded prior to issuance of building permit.
- 2) All proposed exterior lighting to be motion activated.
- 3) The front cabin to move further to add distance from Rt. 33.
- 4) Annual inspection of the drainage drip edge to be performed by Town Planner.
- 5) Applicant to coordinate with NH Dept. of Transportation to secure a driveway permit or documentation stating that no such permit is required.
- 6) Site plan to be modified to illustrate Phase I and Phase II areas for cabin construction for mylar creation and subsequent recordation reflecting areas, not footprints, for three (3) cabins toward the rear and two (2) cabins toward the front of the property with a note stating "for transient occupancy".
- 7) Applicant to obtain NH DES septic approval prior to issuance of building permits.

Mr. Baskerville closed the public hearing for public comment.

Mr. Houghton asked for clarification whether the cabins are intended to be seasonal or year-round. Mr. Scamman explained they are year-round, but more emphasis on the summer months and possibly at Christmas season, February and April school breaks. Mr. Houghton asked for clarification on the intended and/or expected occupancy per unit. Mr. Scamman stated there are two (2) beds per unit and a small couch would allow up to four (4) people, which would be families. Mr. Baskerville would like a condition of approval that the cabins are built roughly per the plans shown with no permanent foundations or expansion of the use without coming back before the planning board. Mr. Austin stated a note could be added to the mylar stating "no permanent foundations", but expansion of use would not be the planning board purview unless said expansion required modification to the site plan. Mr. Scamman stated the site plan shows the cabins cannot be full foundations due to the drainage and an annual inspection will be held. Mr. Scamman explained there is a NH state law regarding transient use, which is 89 days maximum stay, and the Town of Stratham has further defined that as 30 days. Mr. Baskerville asked that Note 2, regarding number of cabins, add a note which states "for transient occupancy, maximum 30 days" on the mylar. Mr. Scamman requested leaving off the "30 days" in the event the town changes the number of days for transient occupancy. Mr. Austin stated staff will overlay the mylar on the site plan for the Chair to approve prior to recordation. Mr. Houghton is not in agreement with the roadside pickup of for solid waste disposal and believes "in season" with kids and families is more than minor use. Mr. Roseen agreed. Mr. Scamman stated a dumpster could be located to the immediate west of the existing accessory structure and would be buffered by the existing garage and house.

Mr. Paine made a motion to approve all of the waivers submitted, excluding the "Solid waste waiver" as discussed and justified. Mr. Roseen seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

181  
182 Mr. Paine made a motion to accept the site plan for the Legacy Lane Farm Cabin  
183 Colony as presented with the conditions of approval and site plan as modified and  
184 discussed by town staff with input from the board. Mr. Roseen seconded the motion.  
185 Motion carried unanimously.  
186

- 187 b. **Site Plan Review.** To facilitate installation of an off-street parking area, widening of a  
188 driveway, and associated infrastructure for the Robinwood Center, at 61 & 62 Stratham  
189 Heights Road, Stratham, NH; Stratham Tax Map 2 & 5 Lots 81 & 14; Exeter Tax Map 67  
190 Lots 3 and 3-1; submitted by Bruce Scamman, Emanuel Engineering, Inc.  
191

192 Mr. Austin stated staff recommends the Planning Board accept the application as  
193 complete for Site Plan Review. Mr. Austin explained this evening's meeting is for the  
194 planning board to review "how" these developments occur on a property, not the "use".  
195 Mr. Austin stated this project is seeking a Special Exception to the Zoning Board of  
196 Adjustment next Tuesday, 2/12/2019 and abutters were mailed based on Stratham and  
197 Exeter. Mr. Austin stated he spoke with Rockingham Planning Commission regarding  
198 Regional Impact due to this project being within 500 ft. of the town border. The board  
199 will need to accept the application as complete, make a determination if this is a project of  
200 regional impact. Staff, as well as Rockingham Planning Commission, agreed this project  
201 does not meet the threshold for regional impact. If the Planning Board determines this  
202 project fits the threshold for regional impact, the process will need to take place, and this  
203 application will reconvene at a later date.  
204

205 Mr. Roseen made a motion to accept the application as complete. Mr. Paine seconded the  
206 motion. Motion carried unanimously.  
207

208 Mr. Houghton made a motion that this project does not fit the threshold for regional  
209 impact notification. Mr. Roseen seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.  
210

211 Sophie Robinson, property owner of 61 & 62 Stratham Heights Road, explained her plan  
212 to keep and work the property and the land for the community. Ms. Robinson stated she  
213 is hoping to start a community center called "Robinwood Center" on the land which will  
214 include four pillars of Community, Justice, Sustainability, and Healing. This project will  
215 have a strong focus on agriculture and teaching the public how to grow their own food,  
216 access will also be given for the public to grow their own food on the land. The center  
217 will offer community discussions and other educational workshops in the barn, and to  
218 accommodate the community a low impact parking lot is being proposed. Bruce  
219 Scamman, Emanuel Engineering, representing the Robinwood Center. Mr. Scamman  
220 explained the location of the farm on Stratham Heights Road which sits at the peak of the  
221 hill. The applicant is proposing to put in a parking lot adjacent to the existing barn. An  
222 existing apartment that is connected between the house and the barn, a carriage house,  
223 and sheds are also being proposed to be used for the Robinwood Center. The applicant is  
224 proposing a porous parking lot and requested the approval state porous pavement or  
225 equal, since there is a chance concrete pavers or something other than pavement may be  
226 used. The infrastructure for drainage will be as discussed at the preliminary hearing and

227 installed for the parking lot. The driveway will be slightly widened and an infiltration  
228 trench or swale will be installed along the driveway to collect the run-off coming down  
229 the driveway. An underdrain will be installed in the state right-of-way which will lower  
230 the water table by running underneath the existing swale. The parking lot will have  
231 drains that run to the town catch basin. The applicant is proposing functions on the site  
232 with 40 parking spaces proposed and a grass parking lot has been added across the street  
233 as needed. Mr. Scamman stated Southeast Land Trust, who holds the easement on this  
234 property, has been notified and the applicant has been in direct contact to work with them  
235 on this parking. The existing driveway is steep and will be safer for the public pulling out  
236 onto Stratham Heights Road if they could pull out on a more level basis. The applicant is  
237 proposing a cross walk and to work with the town on locating this cross walk. Mr. Austin  
238 stated the recommended condition is the recorded mylar not show a cross walk location,  
239 but instead include a note the applicant is to work with DPW. Mr. Austin stated one of  
240 the discussions which may appear at the Zoning Board hearing are the large events and  
241 what will trigger a discussion with the Stratham Police regarding a detail. Mr.  
242 Baskerville asked for clarification on whether the barn exterior is remaining as is and to  
243 explain the elevation of the interior that is being renovated and what is intended. Mr.  
244 Scamman stated the exterior of the barn is not changing. New roofing and new copper  
245 around parts of the building have been recently done but no exterior changes other than  
246 maintenance. Mr. Scamman stated the applicant is proposing a commercial grade kitchen  
247 in the carriage house to teach canning and other agricultural processing, as well as prepare  
248 food for events at the center. The larger events may also be catered. The food waste  
249 from the kitchen will be composted, the bathrooms will be composted, and this project  
250 will be a low impact facility.

251  
252 Mr. Houghton questioned if the applicant has met with the Building Inspector/Code  
253 Enforcement Officer and the Fire Chief regarding the change of use, the intensification of  
254 use, and introduction of the public. Mr. Scamman stated he has met with Shanti Wolph,  
255 Building Inspector, and he stated a Fire Protection Engineer will be required as part of the  
256 requirements for the Certificate of Occupancy. Mr. Houghton asked for clarification of  
257 the number of parking spaces in the parking lot. Mr. Scamman confirmed forty (40)  
258 spaces. Mr. Houghton asked what type of screening is planned for the parking lot. Mr.  
259 Scamman stated there is existing vegetation on one side of the parking lot and the  
260 applicant is not opposed to working with the town and the abutting neighbors to  
261 accomplish a more robust barrier and the parking lot has been moved back after guidance  
262 from the planning board at the preliminary hearing. Mr. Scamman stated the applicant is  
263 proposing to plant blueberry bushes at the front of the parking area. Mr. Austin  
264 questioned the grade difference between top of pavement and the abutter. Mr. Scamman  
265 stated it is at grade. Ms. Robinson stated she spoke with the abutters and, per their  
266 request, two phases are being proposed. Phase I will start with 20 parking spaces and if  
267 more spaces are needed Phase II will add another 20 spaces. Mr. Baskerville asked if the  
268 applicant would put a stockade fence or stone wall to block the headlights from the  
269 abutters. Ms. Robinson stated she is willing to work with the neighbors to meet their  
270 needs regarding headlights. Mr. Roseen stated concern with phased porous parking  
271 which may cause issues with construction and the applicant may want to resolve the  
272 concerns regarding screening and construct the forty (40) space parking lot all at once.

Mr. Paine asked for clarification on the hours of operation. Mr. Scamman stated the farm operations can start very early in the day, per state law, but the classes will possibly start at 7:00-7:30 am to possibly 8:00-10:00 pm. Ms. Robinson stated classes after 8:00 pm would be a rare occurrence and special events may be later but rare occurrences. Mr. Paine questioned if there will be large scale events at the center. Mr. Scamman stated the applicant is planning to host an annual picnic for the organization with possibly 200-300 people in attendance. Ms. Robinson explained the Robinwood Center is primarily educational, workshops, and some larger events through the center on permaculture or a fundraiser, possibly a couple per year. In addition to that request the applicant is requesting an exception for special events which would be outside the Robinwood Center and through an LLC which Ms. Robinson owns. Ms. Robinson stated she would like to pursue this with the town and neighbors at a later date since the town does not have anything in place for hosting large events. Mr. Austin stated the planning board needs to have a workshop to discuss this issue since there are many Stratham residents with barns that want to utilize their barns for such uses. Mr. Austin stated that composting toilets and the septic will limit the number of people attending functions. Mr. Baskerville asked if the applicant is proposing a sign on the house side of the road. Ms. Robinson stated yes. Mr. Baskerville asked for the location of the sign on the site plan. Mr. Austin stated the Zoning Board has the authority to request an advisory opinion of the Planning Board. If the board would like to take action on what specifically needs to be on the mylar to be recorded to satisfy the requirements of Site Plan Review or if the board would like to put to some advisory thoughts together for the Zoning Board which can be listed and sent directly to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for the Special Exception hearing. Mr. Roseen asked staff why it is recommend to remove the crosswalk from a specific location. Mr. Austin stated staff is not recommending a specific location to be recorded on a mylar at the registry of deeds depicting the crosswalk as the town DPW may have a better location.

Mr. Scamman explained the waivers to the board.

- 1) High intensity soils information is not necessary because no drainage study is required.
- 2) A storm drainage plan with supporting calculations were not requested during the preliminary meeting. NH DES approved best management practices have been implemented to handle storm water from proposed impervious areas and include a bio swale and porous pavement.
- 3) Solid waste disposal receptacles and screening would cause an unnecessary hardship because kitchen scraps will be composted. The small amount of leftover solid waste will be dealt with via roadside pickup.

Mr. Houghton stated he is conceptually in agreement with the solid waste waiver due to the intended use of the Robinwood Center, but a function center with a high intensity of use will require more than compost. Mr. Baskerville agreed. Mr. Scamman stated the applicant is willing to put in a temporary dumpster location for large events. Mr. Houghton agreed with a roll-off for a large event. Mr. Austin suggested a "trash plan" for large events. Mr. Austin suggested the waiver be granted with a notation on the recorded

mylar of a dumpster location for large events and add an advisory comment to the ZBA that the applicant submit a “solid waste management plan” for large events.

Mr. Baskerville opened the hearing up for public comment.

Joshua Cooper, 9 Orchard Hill Road, stated he is in favor of the establishment of Robinwood Center and the goals to promote sustainable agriculture, as well as the proposed walking paths granting student’s access to Stratham Middle School, but is concerned with the changing to the property and the proximity to the neighboring residences which will affect the quality of life for the neighbors. Mr. Cooper stated concern over noise and light from the parking lot being located right next to his property. Mr. Cooper voiced concern with the view in the winter as now he looks out to see the barn and in the future his view will be the parking lot. Mr. Cooper voiced concern over the added traffic and danger of his children using the crosswalk. Mr. Cooper questioned if a study has been done regarding the effect of having a crosswalk at that area. Mr. Cooper would like to find some middle ground to block the sound and light from the proposed parking lot. Mr. Cooper read the Zoning Ordinance and understands there are vegetative buffers and visual blockade for noise dampening and blocking site line. Mr. Cooper stated the applicant mentioned she would be open to installing rows of Evergreen trees around the parking lot. Mr. Cooper requested that all lights to be installed be limited to hours of operation and low lying, or pathway, lights. Mr. Austin explained the Zoning Board has to meet six criteria to grant a Special Exception and will be required to determine that the proposed use poses no detriment to property values in the vicinity or change in the essential characteristics of a residential neighborhood on the account of location or scale of buildings or other structures, parking area, access ways, odor, smoke, gas, dust or other pollutant, noise, glare, heat, vibrations, or unsightly outdoor storage of equipment, vehicles or other materials. Mr. Austin explained some instances special exceptions are different than the surrounding residential use. Table 3.6 contemplates the proposed use the applicant is applying for in residential neighborhoods. Mr. Austin stated the ZBA will also look at “no creation of traffic safety hazard or substantial increase in level of traffic congestion in the vicinity...”. Mr. Austin explained by the Planning Board determining where the driveways are, or are proposed, including width and locations gives the ZBA the information that the Planning Board’s review and approval confirms it complies with the regulations. Mr. Scamman stated the evening activity on the site is expected to be minimal so the proposed lighting is two (2) motion controlled, downward facing, dark sky friendly, LED lights at the end of the barn. The applicant is not proposing lights at the parking lot.

Barry Schiffman, 55 Stratham Heights Road, stated the distance from the parking lot to his bedroom on the second floor is less than the distance of the parking lot to the applicant’s bedroom. Mr. Schiffman stated concern that the nature of what the applicant is proposing is going to create varied traffic flow at different times. Even ten (10) cars lined up in the driveway attempting to get out onto Stratham Heights Road is going to create a problem. Mr. Schiffman requested the use of the property, the driveways and cross walk, be examined by a professional traffic safety engineer to prevent a serious accident from happening. Mr. Schiffman questioned where the composting food waste



will take place. Mr. Scamman stated most of the composting will be across the street, at the tree line. Mr. Schiffman stated he is not against holding weddings at the property, but stated concern with repeated usage and whether this will change the nature and value of the neighborhood.

David Tosatti, 72 Stratham Heights Road, questioned what the impact to his property is when the public parks on his property. Mr. Scamman stated a 24 ft. aisle way is being proposed with parking along the stone wall. Ms. Robinson explained the property is in a conservation easement and being a certified organic business they will be held to those standards. Ms. Robinson explained that Southeast Land Trust, who holds the easement, has only approved the property for occasional events. Mr. Austin explained the planning board is required to determine if the parking on that side of the street that the users have safe access, according to the regulations, to and from Stratham Heights Road to the parking area. Mr. Roseen explained, for point of reference or context, the barn side has a little over 700 ft. of frontage and the farm side has a little over 1,000 ft. of frontage. The barn side could have three (3) homes at 200 ft. of frontage per home with a driveway 10 ft. off the property line. The farm side could have five (5) homes or a residential subdivision. Mr. Houghton explained the intensification of use and the impact, based on a potential special exception from the zoning board is not for the planning board to solve this evening. Mr. Houghton explained the planning board can only speak to and try to resolve the site plan related issues.

Lester Cuff, 50 Stratham Heights Road, questioned the drainage for the property. Mr. Scamman stated there is a swale that runs into the field, with a catch basin on the north side with a culvert that runs under the road, onto Ms. Robinson's property. Mr. Cuff explained the water runs down the hill and towards his property and has concern of more water being drained in that area. Mr. Roseen stated the planning board would not approve a waiver if drainage concerns existed.

Mike McDonnell, 67 Stratham Heights Road, questioned if the planning board is planning to postpone this evening for a site walk of the property. Mr. McDonnell voiced approval for what Ms. Robinson is planning for this property. Mr. McDonnell voiced concern with parking along the rock wall and headlights. Mr. McDonnell questioned the physical elements of the crosswalk. Mr. Austin explained the crosswalk will be defined by the Department of Public Works on the location, materials, and will most likely require abutter notification for input. Mr. McDonnell questioned the location and size of the composting facility. Mr. Scamman stated the compost will be located at the back of the existing field, across the street from Mr. McDonnell. Mr. McDonnell questioned how much land on the street side and the farm side is currently in conservation and cannot be developed. Ms. Robinson stated the entire property on the south side at 62 Stratham Heights Road and 6.5 acres at 61 Stratham Heights Road. Mr. Scamman explained that agricultural does not say it cannot be developed, the list of development is limited. Barns, driveways, anything associated with agriculture, including houses if they are to house farm employees, etc. Mr. McDonnell questioned if the applicant is planning on keeping the farm. Ms. Robinson stated yes and Mr. McDonnell wished her good luck.

Bettina Kersten, 4 Lucian Way, PCAC Co-Chair, stated excitement with the proposed project. Ms. Kersten stated concerns with the crosswalk and invited the public to the Safe Routes to School meeting on 1/7/2019 at 6:00 pm at the Stratham Memorial School. The past six months have been spent evaluating how the residents walk and cross streets, and how they can accomplish this safely. Ms. Kersten asked to work with the Highway Department and applicant to look at the area because a crosswalk is not the answer, the whole road needs to be looked at and it's a dangerous spot.

Mr. Scamman stated the applicant contemplated asking for speed bumps along the road and met resistance with some town officials because it is a public road. Mr. Scamman stated the applicant is willing to work with the Highway Department and Town Officials regarding the crosswalk.

Nathan Merrill, 73 College Road, stated support for this project and stated with an ever-increasing population people build houses next to farms and asked that, in the spirit of cooperation, the abutters work with Ms. Robinson as well.

Mr. Houghton reiterated the applicant take aggressive measures to protect abutter's privacy and impact. Mr. Austin stated written communication should be provided and signed by all, which states the applicant and abutters met, include where and when, to memorialize the agreement.

#### Conditions

- 1) Applicant to add a note to the mylar which states "solid waste plan required when 50+ participants or police detail is required for an event".
- 2) Applicant to add a general location of a dumpster location on mylar.

Mr. Houghton made a motion to continue this public hearing to March 6, 2019. Mr. Paine seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Austin reminded the public that the March 6, 2019 hearing will not be noticed and the agenda will be posted online.

- c. **Boundary Line Adjustment Application** to facilitate a minor boundary line adjustment between Tax Map 8 Lots 55 and 54; *a.k.a* 5 Greta's Way and 36 River Road; submitted by Bruce Scamman, Emanuel Engineering, Inc.

Mr. Austin explained this application is two amenable neighbors proposing a land swap of equal land quantity with both resulting lots in compliance with the zoning regulations. The subdivision regulations require a public hearing due to a boundary line moving. Staff recommends the board approve the submitted complete application.

Mr. Houghton made a motion to accept the application as complete. Mr. Paine seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Bruce Scamman, Emanuel Engineering, representing Gerald Carbone, Deena Lewis, Charlie Case, and Sherry Walworth. Mr. Scamman explained the plan to the board. Mr. Scamman stated the old property line was within the pool fence area and this boundary line adjustment will allow it to be a more straight line. The acres swap is the same, Mr. Case and Ms. Walworth gain some additional frontage, and Mr. Carbone and Ms. Lewis' property frontage will be 284 ft. Both properties were created when 1 acre zoning was required so the properties do not meet the 2 acre minimum.

Mr. Baskerville opened the meeting for public comment. No public comments came forward.

Mr. Roseen made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Houghton seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Roseen made a motion to approve the boundary line adjustment as presented with the following conditions:

- 1) Applicant to submit mylar in accordance with site plan regulations and approved by staff.

Mr. Paine seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **4. Public Meeting:**

- a. Skate Park. Preliminary Consultation for proposed Town Skatepark at 68 Bunker Hill Ave.

Mr. Austin stated this application is for a town project on town property. Mr. Austin explained the application was not a required site plan review but the Select Board required the project go before the Planning Board as an advisory position, and final approval will be by the Select Board. Mr. Austin stated it has not been determined if the Select Board will obligate the recordation of the Site Plan for this project. Mr. Austin explained staff has no further comments at this time and that this project will possibly be before the Planning Board for a hearing on February 20, 2019.

Mr. Roseen stated he will be abstaining from comment and vote due to his involvement with the Skate Park Committee on the design of this project.

Michael Tallone, 5 Rollins Farm Drive, explained the Skate Park Committee, along with the Town of Stratham Recreation Director, Seth Hickey, and the Select Board came together a year ago to work together to propose developing the space on the north side of the tennis courts at Stevens Field. This location currently has over 12,000 SF, the committee is in the midst of a contract with a skate park design company, and the proposal is to design a 7,500 SF structure which will be finished in concrete to be used for scooters, skateboards, bicycles, inline skates, etc. Mr. Tallone explained the board has site maps and plans which were drafted by Mr.

503 Roseen. Three test pits and soil evaluation have been completed and shown on the  
504 current site map. Mr. Tallone stated the area has been surveyed and once the survey  
505 is complete the design will be completed.  
506

507 Mr. Baskerville asked for clarification if the Skate Park will be gated. Mr. Tallone  
508 explained Stevens Park is currently “dawn to dusk” hours. Mr. Roseen explained  
509 some of the issues of controlled access, no nighttime lighting, and drainage came  
510 about after discussion with Public Works, the police, etc. Mr. Austin explained this  
511 skate park is more of an “open design” which removes many of the concerns that  
512 Chief Scippa had regarding “hiding” spaces. Mr. Tallone stated the design also aims  
513 to address Chief Scippa’s concern that the police had a line of sight to visibly see  
514 everyone at the park for safety purposes. Mr. Roseen explained the “master plan”  
515 parking area for the board. Mr. Houghton asked for clarification whether the  
516 requested appropriation is shown on the current plans. Mr. Roseen explained “future  
517 phase” is not included in the current appropriations. Mr. Paine asked for clarification  
518 that the “vegetation” from the planting plan will not block the view for the police and  
519 safety concerns. Mr. Roseen explained this plan is a “concept” and within the next  
520 week a plan with the complete details will be submitted. Mr. Houghton requested  
521 the board receive information from the engineer which evaluated the property to the  
522 south of Stevens Park as it relates to drainage concerns. Mr. Austin questioned if  
523 skate parks have estimated occupancy. Mr. Tallone explained similar towns, with  
524 similar square footage area of skate parks, is 20-40 maximum.  
525

526 Mr. Austin reiterated the items below for the applicant to include in the next  
527 submission.  
528

- 529 1) A more defined boundary where the park would be installed within the reserve  
530 area.
- 531 2) Documentation on an existing town stating “X amount of square footage”  
532 generates “X amount of traffic” including the highs and lows.
- 533 3) Applicant to include a minimum of eight (8) stalls be located on the property and  
534 landscaped in a manner similar to that represented to the Select Board.
- 535 4) The Skate Park be located in such a way to maximize distance from abutting  
536 properties.
- 537 5) Infiltration to be installed as outlined.  
538

539 Mr. Baskerville stated the information brought forward this evening is not complete  
540 to move forward. David Moore, Town Administrator, stated the preparation of a  
541 citizen’s group who brought forward a petition and who will have an opportunity at  
542 Town Meeting to speak to this petition so the information they can point to in  
543 preparation and support of their Article seems appropriate and they have up to March  
544 14, 2019. Mr. Moore explained February 11, 2019 is the last meeting of the Select  
545 Board to vote on warrant articles and February 25, 2019 is the last date to publish the  
546 warrants for town meeting. Mr. Austin recommended the applicant notice the public  
547 hearing for the March 6, 2019 meeting date once the updated information is received  
548 at the planning department.

549  
550 b. Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Workshop  
551

552 David Moore, Town Administrator, explained the Capital Improvement Plan before  
553 the board this evening. Mr. Moore stated the CIP is not something that happens just  
554 at budget time and is a major opportunity to educate people on what the town does,  
555 involves more people in the prioritization of the expenditure of public funds, and  
556 provides better services into the future. Mr. Moore stated there are many  
557 opportunities to combine some of these projects and to allow for the funds to build up  
558 over the course of a five (5) year period to be used flexibly to respond to opportunities  
559 and to implement some of the projects. There is an opportunity to for more flexibility  
560 to rely on Department Heads to manage the workload. Mr. Moore invited the board  
561 to contact him regarding any thoughts or ideas. Mr. Austin explained that in the  
562 statute 674.4 speaks to the establishment of the master plan and 675 speaks to the CIP  
563 and the CIP is how the master plan is implemented. Mr. Austin explained this CIP  
564 will most likely come before the planning board at least quarterly moving forward.  
565 Mr. Baskerville stated the planning board has not received any updates on the Master  
566 Plan. Mr. Roseen stated he is the planning board representative for the Master Plan  
567 and, if requested, would give the board a presentation of the status. Mr. Scamman,  
568 member of the Budget Committee, stated it would be helpful to list the “year closure”  
569 on the items.

570  
571 Mr. Paine made a motion to support the Capital Improvements Program request as  
572 presented. Mr. Roseen seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.  
573

574 **5. Adjournment**  
575

576 Mr. Houghton made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:45 pm. Mr. Paine seconded the  
577 motion. Motion carried unanimously.