



**Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes**  
**May 19, 2021**  
**Municipal Center, Meeting Room A**  
**Time: 7:03 pm**

Member Present: Tom House, Chair  
David Canada, Vice Chair (7:15-8:15 pm)  
Mike Houghton, Selectmen's Representative  
Robert Roseen, Member  
Pamela Hollasch, Member (8:00 pm)  
Joe Anderson, Alternate Member

Members Absent:

Staff Present: Mark Connors, Town Planner

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

Mr. House called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm and called roll call. Mr. House appointed Mr. Anderson as a voting member.

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

May 5, 2021

Mr. House asked if there were any changes to the meeting minutes. Mr. Roseen stated Rob Scheafer" on Page 3, Line 117, needs to be corrected to read "Rob Graham".

Mr. Roseen made a motion to approve the minutes of May 5, 2021 as amended. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

**3. Public Hearing:**

- a. Robert & Natalie Tilton request for approval of a lot line relocation between 16R and 18R Autumn Way, Tax Map 9 Lot 73 and Tax Map 13 Lot 130). Application submitted by James Verra & Associates, 101 Shattuck Way, Newington, NH, 03801.

Mr. House asked Mr. Connors to introduce the project. Mr. Connors said that the application is for a lot line adjustment between two properties of 15 and 16 acres on Autumn Lane. Both lots have single family homes and outbuildings on them and they are both owned by the same owners. Mr.

42 Scamman was before the Board back in December to present the preliminary plans to the Board. The  
43 only major change is that the smaller lot has been increased in size from 3 acres to 5 acres. By  
44 making it at least six acres that would exempt this from needing to be approved by NHDES. There  
45 are no waivers for this project.

46  
47 Bruce Scamman, James Verra & Associates, stated this application is a straight-forward lot line  
48 adjustment. Mr. Scamman gave the board additional plans. Robert Tilton, owner of both parcels, is  
49 in attendance this evening.

50  
51 Mr. Anderson made a motion to grant the lot line adjustment with conditions as follows:

52  
53 Conditions:

- 54 1) The plans shall be revised to show setback boundaries from both parties to driveway and utility  
55 easement and property deeds shall be submitted for recording.  
56 2) The lot line adjustment plan shall be subject to approval of the Planning Department.

57  
58 Mr. Roseen seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

59  
60  
61 **4. Workshop:**

- 62  
63 a. Housing in Stratham - Requirements for Workforce and Senior Housing and other tools to  
64 incentivize residential development.

65  
66 Mr. Anderson questioned the old Vo-Tech School possible development. Mr. Connors stated  
67 the property owner is marketing the parcel and there is a German Company out of Pease that  
68 liked the property because they could put housing next to where the company would be located.  
69 Mr. Connors stated he invited the property owner to come meet with the planning board and he  
70 stated he would get back to Mr. Connors regarding a meeting.

71  
72 Mr. Connors gave an overview of the memo dated 4/16/2021 regarding workforce and senior  
73 housing. Mr. Connors explained the “How Stratham Regulates Different Forms of Housing”  
74 table submitted to the board. Density requirements must meet whatever NH DES requires. All  
75 senior housing has maximum density. Affordable Senior Housing and Elderly Affordable  
76 Housing is limited to eight (8) units per acre if water and sewer is available. Workforce  
77 housing in cluster subdivisions is six (6) units per structure or one unit per 1-2 acres subject to  
78 bonus criteria. Stratham does not have many 20 acre parcels available in Stratham. Mr. House  
79 questioned if the intention of the single family homes or if it also includes apartments. Mr.  
80 Connors stated it can be done “townhouse” style in a cluster subdivision. Mr. Anderson stated  
81 Ms. Hollasch had mentioned in a prior meeting to allow duplexes by right in many areas. Mr.  
82 Roseen suggested workforce housing be put into the same incentive categories that senior had  
83 been prior. Mr. Canada stated the incentives for senior housing has been successful and it is  
84 time to incentivize workforce housing. Mr. House stated developers may want to come in and  
85 do small apartment buildings. Mr. Canada stated that may be difficult to get the zoning

86 through the town voting process, as people do not like the idea of apartments. Mr. Roseen  
87 stated apartments or condos are almost identical to senior housing. Mr. Canada stated  
88 workforce housing in a “cluster” townhouse style would be acceptable. Mr. Roseen agreed.  
89 Mr. Houghton stated a four-story building with a dozen units is not going to be very attractive  
90 to the voters. If a style more like Glengarry was proposed that would be more acceptable. Mr.  
91 Canada questioned what the incentive would be since the town currently allows housing like  
92 Glengarry. Mr. Roseen suggested possibly allowing 24 units on 5 acres. Mr. Canada stated the  
93 challenge will be keeping it affordable. Mr. Roseen asked if there are mechanisms to keep the  
94 property affordable. Mr. Connors stated there is rent and price control depending on meeting  
95 an income threshold. Mr. Connors explained “workforce housing” would be apartments in  
96 place where rent cannot be changed above a certain amount; “affordable housing” is smaller  
97 units but the price cannot be controlled. There are state regulations in place for workforce  
98 housing which is based on income. Mr. House suggested our regulations define both  
99 workforce housing and affordable housing. Mr. Roseen stated Rollins Farm was to be  
100 “affordable housing” and was market driven and didn’t end up being “affordable housing”. Mr.  
101 Houghton suggested “workforce housing” stated minimum 20 acre lot size and planning board  
102 may reduce to 10 acres. Mr. Canada asked how many members would be willing to remove  
103 incentives for senior housing. Mr. Anderson agreed. Mr. House stated workforce housing is  
104 currently needed more than senior housing. Mr. Houghton agreed. The current ordinance has  
105 not produced the intended result for senior affordable housing. Mr. Houghton stated the 55+  
106 housing is not affordable for the average person. Mr. Canada stated workforce housing can be  
107 sold to seniors. Mr. Connors questioned if the board would like to encourage workforce  
108 housing or workforce/market rate housing. The board discussed the options and differences.  
109 Mr. Connors questioned what percentage of workforce housing is suggested. Mr. House stated  
110 other communities have 25%, Mr. Canada stated he would like to see 50%. Mr. Anderson  
111 stated the incentives will make it attractive to the developers. Mr. Houghton suggested  
112 reducing minimum lot size to 10 acres with 50% can be used for market based housing then  
113 that leaves 5 acres (or 5 houses) and the other 5 acres can be a structure with greater density.  
114 Mr. Houghton suggested removing retirement planned community and replace it with  
115 workforce housing, and leave affordable senior housing. Mr. House questioned if there is an  
116 age group associated with “affordable senior housing”. Mr. Connors stated affordable senior  
117 housing is 55+. Mr. House stated elderly housing is associated with 62+. Mr. Connors  
118 suggested consolidating those. Mr. House suggested keeping “affordable senior housing” and  
119 add “55+” and remove elderly line. Mr. Houghton suggested turning the “retirement planned  
120 community, age 55+” into “workforce housing”, and remove the two remaining “workforce  
121 housing” categories. Mr. Roseen stated there should be another category on “workforce  
122 housing” that is not the high unit, low lot size combination. Mr. Connors suggested not  
123 regulating the cost but regulate the size. Mr. Connors suggested having a sliding scale so  
124 minimum 40% affordable with less of an incentive, and more incentive with 60%. Mr. Canada  
125 suggested 5 units per acre which would equal 24 units per 5 acres and free-standing. Mr.  
126 Connors will red-line the zoning ordinance with 3-4 different options for the board to choose  
127 from.  
128

129 **5. Other Business:**

130  
131 a. Route 33 Legacy Highway Planning Initiative Update & Discussion

132  
133 Mr. Connors pointed the board to the summary of the sessions held to date. There were no  
134 residents admittedly opposed to the initiative. One resident sent an email regarding concerns  
135 but their property is on Emery Lane so it would not be part of the zone. One concern  
136 mentioned was the siding on a property. If a resident was to change from wood to vinyl, they  
137 would have to go before the board for review. Mr. Connors stated the board could accept  
138 property owner’s changing siding without review. Another concern was removing trees. Mr.  
139 Connors stated the board could also accept this without review. Mr. Anderson recommended  
140 changing the time of the future sessions from 6:00 pm to 7:00 pm to give residents the  
141 opportunity to attend. Mr. House stated there was talk of going to current historic property  
142 owner’s homes for these discussions. The board discussed property owners who own existing  
143 property on Route 33 who cannot have a commercial businesses unless it’s an owner-occupied  
144 structure. Mr. Roseen questioned if property owners would be allowed to have commercial  
145 business along Route 33 without living on the parcel. Mr. Connors stated yes, without having  
146 to live on the premises. Mr. House said there will be more presentations in the future. Mr.  
147 Connors stated the ordinance should be written, this may take a couple months, to give the  
148 property owners something to look at. Mr. Anderson requested a map of properties affected be  
149 shown at the next meeting. Mr. Roseen questioned the “demolish by neglect”. Mr. Connors  
150 explained this would be a property owner having a historic building and allowing it to degrade  
151 to a point where it’s almost demolished. Mr. Houghton stated architectural features should be  
152 run by the Heritage Commission for their input.

153  
154 b. Miscellaneous Planning Issues

155  
156 Mr. House stated there are currently 3 applicants for the open board position. Mr. House stated  
157 he will call each applicant individually to assess background.

158  
159 **6. Adjournment**

160  
161 Mr. Anderson made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:25 pm. Ms. Hollasch seconded the  
162 motion. All voted in favor.

163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168 *Note(s):*

- 169 1. *Materials related to the above meeting are available for review at the Municipal Center during normal business hours. For more*  
170 *information, contact the Stratham Planning Office at 603-772-7391 ext. 147.*  
171 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*  
172 *agenda.*