



Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes
May 5, 2021
Municipal Center, Meeting Room A
Time: 7:00 pm

Member Present: Tom House, Chair
Robert Roseen, Member
Pamela Hollasch, Member
Joe Anderson, Alternate Member

Members Absent: David Canada, Vice Chair
Mike Houghton, Selectmen's Representative

Staff Present: Mark Connors, Town Planner

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

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

2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes

April 21, 2021

Mr. House stated he had a few corrections. On Line 39 there is a preposition missing. On Line 100, page 3, it is an incomplete sentence that should be corrected. On Line 172, there is a word missing.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to approve the minutes of April 21, 2021 as amended. Mr. Roseen seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Public Hearing:

- a. *Request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to operate a dog training business (classified under the Stratham Zoning Ordinance as a kennel) at Stratham Plaza, 72 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 9, Lot 18-112. Application submitted by Racheal King-Reynolds, The Wagging Tail LLC, Exeter, NH.*

Mr. House asked Mr. Connors to briefly introduce the application. Mr. Connors stated that the application before you is for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a kennel in the Gateway District. He noted that the proposed business is not a traditional kennel. It is more of a dog

43 training facility. However, the Zoning definition states that any business that boards or trains
44 more than five dogs is classified as a kennel, so the Town classifies this use as a kennel. Mr.
45 House stated there are other requirements placed on kennels in other parts of Stratham, is that
46 correct. Mr. Connors said in other zoning district of Stratham, the Town requires a minimum
47 five-acre lot for a kennel and extended setbacks - that is listed in the Zoning Ordinance Table
48 of Uses, however the Gateway District has its own Table of Uses and that requirement did not
49 carry over to the Gateway District. The Gateway District Table does not include kennel at all,
50 so it would be considered not permitted. However, the Gateway District allows any deviation
51 from its zoning requirements to be granted relief through a Conditional Use Permit. Mr.
52 Anderson asked why it was different for the Gateway District. Mr. House said he was unsure.
53 Mr. Anderson said it clearly isn't listed, it is what it is, I was just curious. Mr. Connors said the
54 Gateway District and Town Center District allows for the most flexibility through the
55 Conditional Use Permit process, so that was likely deliberate on the part of the Town to include
56 more regulations but also to allow for a more flexible review process. Mr. House said also the
57 Town may not have expected a kennel as a future use. Mr. House asked for a motion to open
58 the public hearing. Motion made by Mr. Anderson and seconded by Ms. Hollasch.
59

60 Mr. House requested the applicant, Racheal King-Reynolds, present to the Planning Board. Ms.
61 King-Reynolds said that her business was established in 2017. It is a dog training based on the
62 Seacoast. We do not keep dogs overnight or board dogs. Our business is limited to Monday
63 through Friday, during the day. We also provide obedience training.
64

65 Mr. Anderson stated he had a question. I'm trying to understand the business better. You said
66 you are a dog trainer, so it is not like a doggy daycare, you leave your dog for shorter periods
67 of time? Ms. King-Reynolds said she knew that was one of the areas of concern. We are
68 definitely not a doggy daycare. The biggest difference between a doggy daycare and us is that
69 at a doggy daycare, there is no scheduled dropoff, there is no training, there's a large amount of
70 dogs who stay all day long running around. We are a training facility for specific types of dog
71 training. If a dog is not being worked with at that moment, they will be crated, they will not be
72 running around. Dogs will need to be scheduled. They cannot come in at will. There will be
73 limits of how many dogs we will see on a given day.
74

75 Mr. Anderson asked what the average duration a dog is there for? Ms. King-Reynolds said it
76 depends what they are there for. We also offer adventures/outings for dogs, so we may take
77 them to Stratham Hill Park for exercise. Mr. Anderson said from your example, if you go to
78 Stratham Hill Park, it sounds like it's a limited number of dogs? Ms. King-Reynolds said yes,
79 they will be with a trainer, and it will be between one to five dogs.
80

81 Ms. King-Reynolds said it will be well staffed with a ratio of about a one staff person to 4-5
82 dogs, much lower than for a typical doggy daycare. Exercise and adventures would be
83 conducted off-site. She said the business will be deep cleaned once a month. We are all about
84 safety.
85

86 Mr. Roseen said if you had to estimate, what percent of dogs will you be training on-site versus
87 off-site? Ms. King-Reynolds said the day would start at the facility but if it is for exercise or an
88 adventure, they would be taken off-site. If they're being kept on-site, there is a small

89 designated area outside for dogs to go to the bathroom. Mr. Roseen said same question, what
90 percent of dogs would you estimate would use the bathroom facilities on site versus off-site?
91 Ms. King-Reynolds estimated that about 75 percent of the time would be off-site. Mr. Roseen
92 asked what the average stay would be? Ms. King-Reynolds said it depends on the activity.
93 Could they be there for six hours at a time? Ms. King-Reynolds replied possibly. Mr. House
94 said you won't have dogs overnight or on the weekends. Ms. King-Reynolds replied never. Ms.
95 Hollasch asked if the business would provide transport to off-site locations. Ms. King-Reynolds
96 said that they would. Mr. House asked if grooming would be provided. Ms. King-Reynolds
97 said no, there is a groomer a couple doors down.
98

99 Mr. Roseen said it seems to me that the biggest concerns are noise and dog waste. If you can
100 address those why wouldn't you have more than 15 dogs? Ms. King-Reynolds said I don't
101 believe in doggy daycare. It's a very structured business. Mr. Anderson asked if the abutting
102 businesses know of the business coming in. Ms. King-Reynolds said yes, the association had to
103 vote to accept the business. Mr. Connors said all of the owners in the condo association were
104 notified by the Town for this application.
105

106 Mr. House asked for clarification for the location of the business in the shopping center. He
107 noted that a dog groomer and veterinarian were also located in the center. Mr. House asked if
108 anyone in the public had any comments.
109

110 Catie Madeiros, said she is the real estate agent representing the landlord for this unit. She said
111 that there is no upstairs abutting business to this unit, only on the sides. She also noted that
112 there is already a veterinarian and groomer in the shopping center. The issues that have been
113 brought up are already being dealt with by the other tenants and it doesn't seem to be an issue.
114 After multiple discussions, we came to the conclusion this business would be a good fit for the
115 plaza.
116

117 Rob Graham, owner of property on Marin Way, said he supported the business being in
118 Stratham.
119

120 Mr. House asked if there was anything else. Mr. Connors asked if the applicant had a chance to
121 review the proposed conditions of approval. Mr. King-Reynolds said yes, she was fine with
122 them, she would just ask that the Town provide a few hours notice before an inspection. Mr.
123 Connors said that would not be a problem.
124

125 Mr. Roseen said he supported the application but how should dog waste be addressed? Ms.
126 King-Reynolds briefly went over her processes for disposing of dog waste from the application.
127 Mr. House asked how often the dumpster was emptied? Ms. Madeiros said the dumpster was
128 emptied once a week.
129

130 Mr. House asked for a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Anderson made the motion,
131 seconded by Mr. Roseen. All voted in favor.
132

133 **Ms. Hollasch made a motion that the Planning Board approve a Conditional Use Permit**
134 **to allow a dog kennel at Unit 112 of the Stratham Shopping Center at 20 Portsmouth**

Avenue subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall obtain all necessary building and safety approvals required by the Stratham Building and Fire Departments.
2. The business shall be operated in general conformance with the descriptions and materials provided by the Applicant.
3. The business shall be responsible for ensuring that all dogs remain leashed at all times when outdoors at the site, including while entering or exiting the facility.
4. The Applicant shall be responsible for the prompt collection and disposal of animal waste in the trash receptacle.
5. Overnight boarding of animals at the facility shall be prohibited.
6. No more than 15 dogs shall be maintained inside the facility at one time.
7. The Applicant shall provide Town staff periodic access to the facility to ensure adherence to the conditions of the Conditional Use Permit approval.

Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

b. Request for approval of a site plan amendment to make a series of minor improvements to an existing UPS distribution facility at 8 Marin Way, Tax Map 1, Lot 9, including new equipment staging areas, loading docks, a retaining wall, and minor modifications to building architecture, parking and utility connections. Application submitted by Jones & Beach Engineers, P.O. Box 219, Stratham, NH 03885.

Mr. House asked Mr. Connors to introduce the application. Mr. Connors noted the property houses a UPS Distribution Facility. Last year the Planning Board approved a site plan to expand the parking area and make modifications to the access driveway at the site. Those improvements have been implemented. This application involves a few minor modifications to the site and the building architecture. There is almost no expansion of impervious surface cover however. Mr. House asked if the application was complete. Mr. Connors said yes, I would recommend the Board find the application to be complete.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to open the public meeting, seconded by Ms. Hollasch. Mr. Coronati, of Jones & Beach Engineers, displayed the site plan to the Board. He noted that the areas slated for improvements were colored in red on the plan. He noted that there were several improvements planned, but they are all minor. He pointed out where new overhead doors would be installed on the building, as well as where a new sidewalk would be constructed to access an emergency exit. He indicated where improvements would be made to loading docks and a retaining wall. He showed areas of the pavement that would be restriped to meet the specifications of UPS. He said most of the changes were planned for the back of the building. He noted that in meetings with UPS, there were some last minute changes to the plan. UPS no longer wants to add pavement markings for trucks on the rear of the property. They would also like to make some minor changes to a concrete pad. These changes were long discussed, but there were some last minute changes requested by UPS in meetings with their engineers.

184
185 Mr. Coronati noted that the applicant was requesting waivers from needing to provide a
186 Landscape Plan stamped by a landscape engineer and from the stormwater requirements. He
187 noted that the increase in impervious surface cover totaled less than 200 square feet.
188

189 Mr. Roseen said that the big retrofit that UPS did just a few months ago was far in excess of the
190 Town requirements. Mr. House asked if they were installing any additional drainage on the rear
191 of the site. Mr. Coronati said that because of the location of the existing catch basins and the
192 grades of the property, there was no need to add additional drainage facilities. Mr. House asked
193 for some clarification on the grade of the concrete pad. Mr. Coronati noted that it would be
194 flush with the sidewalk. Mr. House noted that some of the parking would be reduced with the
195 changes to the striping. Will you still have enough parking for the use? Mr. Coronati replied
196 yes, we added a great deal of parking last year. The Town Planner has also requested we revise
197 the plan to update the parking calculations, proving that we meet the Town requirements, and
198 we are happy to do that. Mr. House asked for some clarification on how trucks would access
199 the site. Mr. Coronati said that the same access pattern that is utilized now would continue to
200 be utilized. The changes will improve the accessibility for truck traffic.
201

202 Mr. House asked if there were any questions from the public. There were none. Mr. Roseen
203 made a motion to close the public hearing. Second by Mr. Anderson. All voted in favor.
204

205 Mr. Anderson made a motion that the application was complete with a finding that it did not
206 pose a regional impact. Second by Ms. Hollasch. All voted in favor.
207

208 Mr. House noted that there were two waivers requested of the Site Plan Regulations -- to waive
209 the requirement to provide drainage calculations and to waive the requirement that a Landscape
210 Plan be submitted and stamped by a licensed landscape architect. Mr. Roseen noted that last
211 year's site plan added tremendous capacity to address drainage. Mr. Roseen made a motion to
212 approve the waivers, seconded by Mr. Anderson. All voted in favor.
213

214 **Mr. Anderson made a motion to approve the amended site plan to permit a series of site**
215 **improvements to the UPS distribution facility at 8 Marin Way (Tax Map 1, Lot 9)**
216 **consistent with the application and site plan prepared by Jones & Beach Engineers, last**
217 **revised April 14, 2021, and the architectural plans by TPD Architects, LLC, dated April**
218 **13, 2021, subject to the following conditions:**
219

- 220 1.) The Applicant shall revise the plan to include the square footage of the building, including
221 its land uses, and the approximate square footage of the various building uses. The applicant
222 shall also add parking calculations consistent with the uses of the site.
223
- 224 2.) Applicant shall add a note to the plans that the existing treelines along the north and east
225 property boundaries shall not be disturbed.
226
- 227 3.) The Applicant shall include a photometric plan showing the site will meet the Town's
228 exterior lighting requirements or add a note that no exterior lighting improvements are proposed.
229
- 230 4.) Within 90 days of the conclusion of the work, the Applicant shall provide the Town an As
231 Built Plan set to be kept on file.

232
233 **Ms. Hollasch seconded the motion. All voted in favor.**
234

235 **4. Public Meeting:**
236

237 a. 'Off Lovell Road' Preliminary Consultation, tabled from April 17, 2021
238

239 Mr. House noted that Mr. Connors had distributed some additional materials relating to the
240 application. Mr. Connors noted that the Conservation Commission discussed the proposal at
241 its April meeting as recommended by the Planning Board. The Conservation Commission
242 Chair prepared a letter summarizing the Commission's comments that has been distributed to
243 the Planning Board. Mr. Connors said he understood the Heberts plan to go to the Select
244 Board on May 17th if the Board has any additional comments. Mr. Anderson asked if the
245 Heberts were present. Mr. Connors said he told them he didn't believe it would be necessary
246 for them to be physically present since they have appeared before the Board twice before,
247 though they are aware of the meeting tonight.
248

249 Mr. Anderson said the Select Board is the authority on this and not us, but I just wanted to
250 weigh in with my feelings on it. I don't really any see what is in it for the Town. The Town
251 Planner has noted some comments, and I agree with them. Any of the proposals would
252 significantly impact the Town's use of its land. Ms. Hollasch noted that she agreed with Mr.
253 Anderson. She is concerned that it would set a precedent that the Town would need to
254 negotiate with any property owner to provide access to a land-locked parcel. If we were to
255 recommend it, we would have to have some very strong reasons to do so, otherwise it is a
256 concern because this is not the only land-locked parcel in Stratham.
257

258 Mr. House noted that this is just a Preliminary Consultation and the Planning Board had done
259 its job by providing comments. In my opinion, this is now between the Heberts and the Select
260 Board. Mr. Anderson said the Planning Board and Conservation Commission input was
261 requested and should help the Select Board. Mr. Roseen said that he Mr. Roseen said that he
262 did not think the Town would prioritize this parcel in its future planning, since it is not very
263 large. Mr. Roseen said it will be up to the applicants to provide a persuasive plan to the Select
264 Board if they can. Mr. House said he did not want to get too far ahead on this issue. It was the
265 Planning Board's job to provide its comments, which we have, and are documented in the
266 meeting minutes.
267

268 b. Route 33 Legacy Highway Update
269

270 Mr. Connors noted that the letter the Board reviewed at its last meeting was sent out to all
271 property owners along the corridor. Mr. House noted that the Public Input Sessions are next
272 Thursday, May 13 at 6 pm and on Saturday, May 15, at 10 am. Mr. Connors said if you are
273 interested in participating over Zoom, you should email planning@strathamnh.gov. Mr.
274 House noted that Nate Merrill from the Heritage Commission and Route 33 Legacy Highway
275 Ad-Hoc Committee would be participating. Mark will be discussing the Neighborhood
276 Heritage District model. There was some discussion of logistics for the sessions. Ms.
277 Hollasch asked if the Planning Board would hear a summary of input gathered at the sessions.

Mr. Connors said yes, there would be a report back at the next meeting.

c. Miscellaneous Planning Issues:

Mr. Roseen said he looked forward to continuing the discussion related to affordable housing. He just saw a PBS documentary on the issue and feels this is a good issue for the Board to tackle this year. Mr. Anderson asked for the status of the Water Source Quality Plan. Mr. Connors said that he did not have any new updates, but would check with Rockingham RPC on its status.

5. Adjournment

Mr. Anderson made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:12 pm. Ms. Hollasch seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

Note(s):

- 1. Materials related to the above meeting are available for review at the Municipal Center during normal business hours. For more information, contact the Stratham Planning Office at 603-772-7391 ext. 147.*
- 2. The Planning Board reserves the right to take item, out of order and to discuss and/or vote on items that are not listed on the agenda.*