



Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes
August 19, 2020
Municipal Center, Meeting Room A
10 Bunker Hill Avenue, Stratham, NH
Time: 7:00 PM

Members Present: Mike Houghton, Selectmen's Representative
Tom House, Member
David Canada, Member
Robert Roseen, Member

Members Absent: Colin Laverty, Member
Pamela Hollasch, Alternate Member

Staff Present: Tavis Austin, Town Planner

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Mr. House called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and took roll call. He also announced that the conference line was active and available for those who chose not to attend in person; contact information is provided on the Planning Board agenda posted on the Town website.

2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes: August 05, 2020

Mr. Houghton made a motion to approve the August 05, 2020 meeting minutes and Mr. Roseen seconded the motion which passed with a unanimous vote. Minutes approved.

3. Public Meeting:

Mr. Austin outlined the discussion items presented on the agenda. The primary focus of the meeting was the Board's planned workshop on proposed Gateway Zoning District Amendments as discussed briefly at the August 05th meeting. The two other items listed on the agenda are recommended to move to the September 02, 2020 meeting. The Board generally consented to moving the MS4 and Driveway Regulation discussion to the September 02, 2020 meeting.

Mr. Austin outlined the drafted amendments to the Gateway zoning language and indicated the materials were available on the Town website for those participating via

38 telephone. He noted further the cover memo, previously presented to the Select Board, to
39 outline staff's process for making the proposed changes.

40 Mr. Austin commented the first big change is the proposed removal of the Gateway Road
41 infrastructure requirement. He clarified that the Gateway Road corridors should still be
42 preserved for future development, but this change would remove the road paving,
43 streetlights, and landscaping sections of the zoning district.

44 Mr. Canada commented that the roads take up too much space for the likely density that
45 could be built without infrastructure and might limit development of required well or
46 septic areas. Mr. Austin again clarified that the corridors of the Gateway Roads are
47 recommended to stay, but the physical road development could be removed.

48 Mr. Roseen asked the Board consider, prior to making amendments, that perhaps the
49 existing regulations are fine as written. He questioned whether the zoning is the real issue
50 stating those developments that have occurred under the Gateway regulations are pretty
51 good.

52 Mr. Houghton stated the approved projects referenced are good, much better than prior to
53 their development, but none were truly Gateway compliant. Mr. Canada added concern
54 over the large number of waivers required to enable development to occur under the
55 current regulations.

56 Mr. Houghton commented on the distinction between Central and Outer Gateway streets
57 and recommended the Board consider parking lot corridors—extensions of drive aisles—to
58 further the Gateway Road network while not require true Gateway roads as intended by the
59 regulations.

60 Mr. Roseen questioned if the Board was considering such a broad cut of the regulations
61 because of the lack of a clear vision of infrastructure.

62 Mr. Houghton stated that was a good question. The Board discussed the need to make
63 amendments to allow what development may occur absent infrastructure without the need
64 to infrastructure improvement type related waivers. Mr. Roseen suggested getting into the
65 weeds of the changes.

66 Mr. Austin gave an overview to the Board of the yellow and green highlighted sections of
67 the materials presented and provided an explanation to assist in guiding the discussion.

68 Board discussed the various highlighted sections starting at the beginning of the Gateway
69 Regulations Section 3.8.

70 Mr. Canada agreed with the recommendation to consider removing the TRC as many of
71 their tasks are rather subjective and more suitable for the Planning Board. Mr. Roseen
72 discussed concept of high performance permitting.

73 Mr. Austin stated the intent of the TRC was to be similar to high performance zoning,
74 where those projects that comply with the regulations spend, proportionately, less time at

75 meetings making Board presentations than those projects requiring waivers or other
76 exceptions to the regulations; a condition that cannot currently exist with the regulations as
77 written where density and infrastructure are contemplated.

78 Mr. Houghton continued noting perhaps street improvements—streetlights, street trees—
79 still be required along Portsmouth Ave. Board generally concurred with that suggestion.
80 Rm. Houghton also noted that setbacks along Portsmouth Ave. should be considered.

81 Mr. Canada suggested edits to the lighting section 3.8.7 (f) as it calls for no light spilling
82 over property line and conflict with Site Plan regulations which allow 0.2 FC of light to
83 cross property line. Mr. Austin stated he would work to have the two sections coordinate;
84 though currently the Gateway Regulations, as written, would supersede the Site Plan
85 Regulations.

86 Board discussed the table of uses 3.8.8. Mr. Austin pointed out the Board’s discussion of
87 drive-through and the lack of a current definition. He stated draft language would be
88 forthcoming for the next workshop. Mr. Canada suggested removal of single and two-
89 family within the District and suggested increasing multi-family to “4+” rather than the “3-
90 8” as written. Mr. Roseen suggested removal of “self-storage unit” from the District.
91 There was discussion of removal of the “Open Space/Conservation” as a use.

92 Board turned to Table 1: There were discussions generally related to removing maximum
93 footprints and amending the multi-family to “4+” consistent with earlier discussion. Mr.
94 Austin suggested holding off on amendments to “frontage buildout” until the remainder of
95 the regulations and amendments thereto were considered.

96 Mr. Houghton suggested that absent the density contemplated by current regulations,
97 perhaps there is no longer a need for both Central and Outer zone Districts. Board
98 discussed and agreed with idea of removing of the “outer zone” to create one Gateway
99 District.

100 Board discussion of removing 3.8.8 Table 7 entirely. Board had general conversation
101 about other areas as highlighted in the materials.

102 Mr. Canada discussed making sure regulations provide opportunity for establishing a
103 checklist of non-subjective items for TRC to utilize in reviewing projects. He added for
104 section 3.8.9 v, adding requirement, for example, to submit all building elevations as
105 current language is not clear.

106 Mr. Roseen started a discussion on adding vinyl to the approved materials list. Board
107 discussed. Consensus was to remove 3.8.9 Xviii as written and to propose “Other
108 materials not listed by Conditional Use Permit” or similar language.

109 Board discussed next steps for their Gateway Work and determined September 16th
110 meeting would be next workshop with Mr. Austin to make those changes as discussed
111 tonight prior to 16th for Board review. Mr. Houghton asked about public hearings in
112 response to Mr. Austin suggesting public forums on Gateway changes. Mr. Houghton
113 asked if public hearing on Gateway changes could be separate from other amendment

114 considerations. Mr. Austin confirmed that was possible.

115 Board agreed that September 02, 2020 meeting would be in person as it followed the site
116 walk planned for the same evening.

117 **4. Adjournment**

118 Mr. Canada made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:09 PM. Mr. House, seconded the
119 motion which passed with a unanimous vote.

120 Note(s):

121 1. Materials related to the above meeting are available for review at the Municipal
122 Center during normal business hours. For more information, contact the Stratham
123 Planning Office at 603-772-7391 ext. 147.

124 2. The Planning Board reserves the right to take items out of order and to discuss and/or
125 vote on items that are not listed on the agenda.