



## Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes

August 21, 2024

## Stratham Municipal Center

**Time: 7:00 pm**

**Members Present:** Thomas House, Chair  
David Canada, Vice Chair  
Mike Houghton, Select Board's Representative  
Chris Zaremba, Regular Member  
John Kunowski, Regular Member

**Members Absent:** Nate Allison, Alternate Member

**Staff Present:** Mark Connors, Director of Planning and Community Development

## 1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Mr. House called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and took roll call.

## 2. Approval of Minutes

a. August 7, 2024

**Mr. Zaremba made a motion to approve the August 7, 2024 meeting minutes. Mr. Canada seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

### **3. Public Meeting (New Business):**

- a. Shamus Quirk (Applicant), 297R Portsmouth Ave CBC, LLC (Owner) - Request for after-the-fact approval of a Route 33 Heritage District application to allow the construction of a single-family home with vinyl siding at 297 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 22, Lot 23, Zoned Route 33 Heritage District.

Mr. House stated that the Route 33 Heritage District Advisory Committee met just prior to this meeting and they don't have any issues with the application. The house is set back from the road and it does bring in the character of the surrounding areas. The project came before the Planning Board for demolition approval. Mr. House stated his opinion that architecturally, vinyl is okay in the area and the applicant did a great job. He believes that it will be hard to tell that it is vinyl from the road and he likes the farmer's porch which brings out the traditional New England character.

Mr. Connors stated that the Town did not catch the error until the Building Inspector noticed the vinyl siding during the final inspection for the occupancy permit. Ideally the applicant would have requested approval from the Planning Board prior to issuance of the building permit.

45 Mr. Quirk stated that he tried to keep the Seacoast vibe with the color scheme of property - the  
46 woods, the whites and the blues to keep the nautical Seacoast feel. He added nice wood accents  
47 with the garage doors and mahogany decking. They set the house as far back from the road as they  
48 could to give it some privacy. In 2020 he worked on the houses next door and for this home they  
49 tried to make it different but kept it in line with the existing neighborhood.  
50

51 Mr. Canada asked for confirmation that vinyl siding is allowed in the Route 33 Heritage District  
52 with approval from the Board. Mr. Connors replied yes, as long as it is consistent with the character  
53 of the property and the surrounding area.  
54

55 Mr. Quirk stated that the two houses he worked on next door in 2020 have vinyl siding that pre-  
56 dates the revised ordinance passed in 2022.  
57

58 Mr. Zaremba asked Mr. Connors to confirm that the process that should have happened is that  
59 when the building permit was pulled, the project should have gone through the Heritage application  
60 process at that time. Mr. Connors replied yes.  
61

62 There was a general board discussion about the application process. Mr. Kunowski stated that he  
63 does not want to create a hardship for the owner to take down the vinyl and install concrete siding  
64 because that is not viable based on a town error and that this is a process to approve an application  
65 that did not get submitted previously. Mr. Kunowski is in favor of approving the application as  
66 long as it doesn't set a precedent that vinyl siding is okay in the District and that this is not a blanket  
67 approval that vinyl siding is okay. Mr. Zaremba agrees with Mr. Kunowski. Mr. Canada stated that  
68 he does not believe this project sets a precedent as the applicant has demonstrated that he's trying  
69 to make the house fit into the character of the town. Mr. Houghton is comfortable with the  
70 application.  
71

72 Mr. Quirk asked that the permit fee be waived due to the error by the Town. Mr. Connors stated  
73 that is a decision of the Planning Board. The Board discussed the request and determined that this  
74 is a fee that would have been required anyway and needs to be paid.  
75

76 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion to open the public hearing. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion.**  
77 **All voted in favor and the motion passed.**  
78

79 Drew Goddard of 1 Sanctuary Drive spoke. He stated that he is concerned with the precedence but  
80 agrees that in this case it is fine because the house is set back from the road.  
81

82 Bruce Scamman spoke. He stated that there is a 100 by 100 section on that lot that was put  
83 into conservation by mistake when they did the duplexes, that the well was on.  
84

85 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion.**  
86 **All voted in favor and the motion passed.**  
87

88 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion that the Planning Board approve the after the fact approval of**  
89 **a Route 33 Heritage District application to allow the construction of a single-family home**  
90 **with vinyl siding at 297 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 22, Lot 23, Zoned Route 33 Heritage**  
91 **District. Mr. Houghton seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**  
92

94     4. Public Hearing (Old Business):

95

96     a. Copley Properties LLC (Applicant), C.A.N Realty Trust and GGF Limited Liability Co (Owners)

97       – Request for approval of a Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit at 89 and 91 Portsmouth Avenue

98       (Tax Map 13, Lots 22 & 23), zoned Professional/Residential, to construct a mixed-use

99       development to include six residential units in three buildings and two office buildings totaling

100      12,624 square-feet of general office and medical office uses and to allow encroachment into

101      wetland buffer. Application submitted by Emanuel Engineering Inc., 118 Portsmouth Avenue,

102      Stratham NH 03885. This application was tabled from the July 10, 2024 meeting.

103

104     Mr. Connors stated that this is the third time with this application. The applicants made some

105     modifications requested by the Town and he thinks the application is in good shape for a

106     conditional approval. He stated there are some items in the staff memo that should be discussed.

107

108     Bruce Scamman of Emanuel Engineering spoke on behalf of the applicant. Regarding landscaping,

109     they added a tree in front of the building. He stated that they cannot add trees under the power

110     lines, but there is a dense population of trees and they added three large arborvitae to the plan. He

111     stated that they added a row of lilac bushes between residential units. Drew Goddard of Copley

112     Properties stated that there are a number of existing trees that will remain. He stated that he is

113     trying to make the landscaping look period correct with the style of buildings and is not commercial

114     driven landscaping. He added that they are building a beautiful building that he wants to show off

115     and would like the landscaping to look natural.

116

117     Mr. Scamman addressed the request for sidewalks along Portsmouth Avenue. He stated that

118     traditionally NHDOT does not require them and the ones he has seen are out of the right of way

119     which would put the sidewalks on the property. He demonstrated that the land drops off towards

120     Portsmouth Avenue by about eight feet. He doesn't think that sidewalk installation makes sense

121     with the fill that would be needed. Mr. Canada stated that ultimately the Board would like to see

122     sidewalks throughout the entire district and asked Mr. Scamman what is his recommendation for

123     the long-term. Mr. Goddard stated he is agreeable to providing an easement for future sidewalks.

124     Mr. House asked Mr. Connors if the Master Plan suggests sidewalks on both sides of the street.

125     Mr. Connors replied only up to Bunker Hill Avenue. Mr. Scamman described the complexity with

126     the need for handrails and ADA compliance. Mr. Goddard stated that he does not own up to

127     Butterfield so sidewalks would be very segmented. Mr. House stated that comment is voiced all

128     the time but they have to start somewhere. Mr. Canada stated that he believes it is quite important

129     to hold developers to put in sidewalks, otherwise it will be a multi-million-dollar project for the

130     Town down the road. He added that in this case, the applicant has provided a road in the back and

131     that may be a good contribution as well. The other board members agreed. The applicant agreed

132     to provide a five-foot sidewalk easement with a 5-foot grading easement in the front and a road

133     easement in the back of the property.

134

135     Mr. Goddard stated that he would like to not have the architectural plans as a condition of approval.

136     He stated the site plan regulations focus on the site plan and not the architectural building in the

137     Professional/Residential District. He added that he has been working with the Heritage

138     Commission on the architecture and he does not see himself deviating from what is currently

139     proposed. He stated that he received comments from the Heritage Commission on both buildings,

140     mostly on size and stature of the standalone secondary barn and siding materials. Mr. Goddard

141     stated he is 100% on board with taking those recommendations, but he prefers not to have that as

142     a condition of approval. Mr. Scamman stated that they are not changing the size of the building

143 the sense of square footage. Mr. Goddard stated that he would potentially be changing the wall  
144 heights to lower the overall height.  
145

146 Mr. Connors clarified that the application meets the architectural standards and Nate Merrill of the  
147 Heritage Commission provided comments that he would like to see implemented and that he would  
148 work with the applicant. Mr. Connors is concerned that because the Planning Board approves the  
149 project, it is out of the ordinary to delegate the approval to the Heritage Commission. He  
150 recommends that the applicant come back to the Planning Board for a public meeting (not a public  
151 hearing or application process) to discuss the final architecture. Mr. Scamman stated that a  
152 traditional light fixture on the outside around doorways does not meet dark sky compliance and a  
153 light bulb that shines out does not meet some of those traditional things that lighting regulations  
154 say. The Heritage Commission is asking for more traditional lighting fixtures similar to Mr.  
155 Goddard's last project across the street. Mr. Scamman thinks those are the types of things the  
156 Board should be thinking about and they are showing some of those on the plan. He described the  
157 lighting around the front door and stated they were asked to make something more traditional. Mr.  
158 Goddard further described lighting on the project and his request is to remove the condition that  
159 he return to the Planning Board after working with the Heritage Commission on the final  
160 architectural design and that in the Professional/Residential District there is no architectural  
161 oversight mandated. Mr. Canada is a member of the Heritage Commission and he stated that the  
162 Commission members are happy to work with Mr. Goddard and Mr. Goddard as been receptive of  
163 the suggestions and he is comfortable with the informal process. Mr. Houghton is also a member  
164 of the Heritage Commission and stated that he is generally comfortable with that and as a point of  
165 clarification, he recalls there being a lot of discussion on other properties about lighting and he  
166 underscores that it is really important to have a collaborative approach towards it, which Mr.  
167 Goddard has demonstrated. Mr. Scamman stated that with residential code, lighting is required  
168 around doors and they would make sure the lighting is downward facing LEDs. Mr. House stated  
169 that he is okay with the applicant continuing to work with the Heritage Commission and noted that  
170 two of the Planning Board members are on the Commission. Mr. Connors asked if the changes are  
171 minor. Mr. Goddard replied that comments are related to coloring and shifting an entrance in the  
172 back and things of that nature. Mr. Kunowski asked if the condition could be worded that in lieu  
173 of returning to the Planning Board that it state "to the satisfaction of the Town Planner". Mr.  
174 Zaremba agrees that the project does not need to return to the Planning Board.  
175

176 Mr. Houghton asked if the lighting plan should be updated for the back. Mr. Scamman replied the  
177 lighting in the back will not change and the parking lot lighting is traditional dark sky.  
178

179 Mr. House asked where the sign is. Mr. Scamman described the location and the landscaping  
180 around it. Mr. House asked if there will be lighting on the sign. Mr. Goddard replied not internally,  
181 but he would like to have uplighting and he will submit a sign permit application for it. Mr. Canada  
182 clarified that just because there is a sign depicted on the barn does not mean the Planning Board  
183 has approved it. Mr. Goddard understands. Mr. Scamman provided an example style of sign from  
184 Millbrook Office Park.  
185

186 Mr. House asked if they have good sight distance. Mr. Scamman replied they are working with  
187 NHDOT on that.  
188

189 Mr. Scamman described the Butterfield Lane connection. They are providing a 50-foot right-of-  
190 way across the rear of the property and the Town's consultant did not like the version that went  
191 around the wetlands and prefers the one straight through the wetlands to get it further away from

192 Portsmouth Avenue onto Butterfield Lane.  
193  
194  
195  
196

197 Mr. House asked if the road will be public or private. Mr. Scamman replied private and Mr.  
198 Goddard will work with the Select Board on a name.  
199

200 Mr. Canada stated there is language in the proposed condition to the effect that if the Town can  
201 get right to Butterfield, there'd be a contribution from the applicant to help fund the road  
202 construction. He asked to what extent is the applicant developing the back road. Mr. Scamman  
203 replied they are developing about halfway down in the development. If it was made a requirement  
204 of the project, there is a wetlands impact and in the past the Town was involved in helping fund  
205 some connector roads in the Gateway District where it is required, so the applicant believes the  
206 donation of the easement itself is a good donation to the town. Mr. Canada asked Mr. Connors if  
207 he agrees with the Town's engineering opinion about constructing the road through the wetlands.  
208 Mr. Connors replied that the engineer's concern is that by going around the wetlands, the curb cut  
209 would be placed too close to Portsmouth Avenue. Mr. Canada asked what's the problem with that  
210 as Butterfield does not see too much traffic. Mr. Connors replied that he believes it is a default  
211 comment and that engineers don't like intersections close to each other. There was a discussion  
212 about the easement and the engineer's comment. Mr. Goddard agreed to show both easements on  
213 the plan for maximum flexibility.  
214

215 Mr. House asked what the water source for fire protection is. Mr. Goddard stated he will work with  
216 the fire department on the requirements.  
217

218 Mr. House requested a presentation on the waivers. Mr. Scamman requested a waiver on the  
219 landscaping and certification of a landscape architect. Mr. House asked if the plan includes species.  
220 Mr. Goddard replied yes and he used the same designer that he used across the street. Mr. Scamman  
221 described the landscaping plan.  
222

223 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion to open public hearing. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion.  
224 All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

225 No members of the public were present.  
226  
227

228 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to approve the waiver from section 2.2.G of the subdivision  
229 [sic] checklist to waive the requirement that a landscape plan be stamped and certified by a  
230 certified landscape architect. Mr. Zaremba seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the  
231 motion passed.**

232 Mr. House asked for a presentation on the conditional use permits. Mr. Scamman stated that one  
233 application is for mixed-use development in the PRE District and the second application is for  
234 development in the wetlands buffer. He stated that the Stratham Conservation Commission  
235 endorsed the conditional use permit for the wetlands buffer because the area is currently pavement  
236 and the project will result in less buffer impacts. Regarding the mixed-use development conditional  
237 use permit, Mr. Scamman stated that duplexes are allowed in the District so he is not sure why the  
238 permit is required. Mr. Connors clarified because the use category is mixed-use development, it  
239 requires a conditional use permit.  
240

241 Mr. Scamman presented the conditional use permit criteria for the wetlands application.  
242

## *Criteria 1. Spirit and Intent of the Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan*

Mr. Scamman stated that mixed-use development is promoted within the town. He stated with having the commercial in the front and the residential in the rear, it helps with buffering of the neighbors. With regards to the wetlands buffer, he stated the project is making the buffer better than it was previously.

## *Criteria 2. Site Suitability*

Mr. Scamman stated that adequate vehicle and pedestrian access has been designed for this project. Emergency services traffic has been designed and they have included additional paving for some areas. He added there is an absence of environmental constraints such as flood plains and that the project includes a robust drainage system with porous pavement and green infrastructure with the bioretention ponds.

### *Criteria 3. External Impacts*

Mr. Scamman stated there is approximately 12,000 square feet of existing office space and the proposed project will be the same size but include residential duplexes as an alternative to large homes in town.

#### *Criteria 4. Character of development and impact on natural, cultural, historic, and scenic resources*

Mr. Scamman stated the applicant is working with the Heritage Commission on the architecture and the proposed drainage structures will improve stormwater treatment.

### *Criteria 5. Impact on Property Values*

Mr. Scamman stated the new structures will raise property values along Portsmouth Avenue.

### *Criteria 6. Fiscal Impacts*

Mr. Scamman stated they are donating to the Town possible roadways in two locations and the front sidewalk which saves the Town future dollars on having to come in and take that public interest.

### *Criteria 7. Public Interest*

Mr. Scamman stated they are making the roads and sidewalks available.

### *Wetlands Criteria 1 Proposed construction is essential to the productive use of land*

Mr. Scamman stated that the project includes underground power that is better during storm events and is more appealing than overhead power lines.

## Wetlands Criteria 2 Design and construction methods to minimize impact to the wetland

Mr. Scamman stated that the project includes porous pavement and silt socks and will have erosion control that will make the wetlands safer and cleaner.

### *Wetlands Criteria 3 Construction of utilities provides for restoration of the site*

Previously discussed.

#### *Wetlands Criteria 4 Alternative considerations*

Mr. Scamman stated the property could have been left in its current state which is already impacted and this project reduces the paving that abuts the wetlands.

### *Wetlands Criteria 5 Economic advantage*

Mr. Scamman stated that the applicant is giving easements to the town for roads and sidewalks.

## *Wetlands Criteria 6 BMP design to mitigate wetland and buffer impacts*

Mr. Scamman stated that the property currently has no best management practices for stormwater and that the existing treatment swale on the property has not been maintained and is all silted in. He stated that by creating the porous pavement, there will be treatment before it gets in along with secondary treatment with the bio filters.

Mr. Scamman presented the conditional use permit criteria for the mixed-use application. *[Note: the CUP criteria in the Zoning Ordinance changed in March 2024, but the application form was not updated prior to this application being submitted.]*

## *Criteria 1. Spirit and Intent of the Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan*

Mr. Scamman stated that mixed-use developments are allowed with approval of a Conditional Use Permit in the Professional/Residential District if over 25% of the gross interior habitable area is non-residential. This project has 12,624 square feet of non-residential vs. 10,320 square feet of residential.

### *Criteria 2. Existing violations of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance*

Mr. Scamman stated that the existing buildings do not meet the 30-foot front setback on Lot 23 and existing pavement is located within the 50-foot no disturbance buffer from poorly drained soils. It is the intent of this project to remove the building and the pavement in these areas.

### *Criteria 3. Site Suitability*

Mr. Scamman stated driveway, parking and pedestrian paths have been designed per the Zoning Ordinance, Site Plan Regs, and the Subdivision Regs. Parking is located close to the office building with pedestrian access included. The site is located on Portsmouth Avenue, therefore it is easy access for emergency services, pedestrian facilities, schools and municipal services. The proposed buildings are located outside of any wetlands buffer, and the site has been regraded as required to accommodate the proposed development. No other environmental factors are present on site. A septic system from a licensed designer is currently awaiting state approval for all the proposed buildings. Emmanuel Engineering is working with the state to obtain the public water supply and the NHDOT permit. The applicant will work with the electric company provide the necessary electricity for the proposed buildings,

#### *Criteria 4. External Impacts*

Mr. Scamman stated that building heights and scales will meet all zoning requirements and site design, traffic, noise, odor, and light will be typical for mixed use development.

#### *Criteria 5. Layout and design of the site in the character of the neighborhood*

Mr. Scamman stated the applicant will mitigate any extreme impacts of the use of the neighborhood as a mixed-use design the professional and residential zone, the proposed use fits the character of the neighborhood. The proposed layout will be consistent with office space along Portsmouth Avenue, similar to the neighboring lots in the Professional/Residential District. Residential units will be located behind the office space and be screened from Portsmouth Avenue.

#### *Criteria 6. Building design in the character of the neighborhood*

Mr. Scamman stated the applicant is working with the Heritage Commission to design the proposed

339 office buildings and duplexes.  
340

341 *Criteria 7. Natural, cultural, historic, and scenic resources*

342 Mr. Scamman stated the applicant is working with the Heritage Commission to preserve the  
343 historic character of the lot. The proposed structures are more historic looking than the existing  
344 structures. By combining the lots which were previously subdivided, makes the final lot more  
345 traditional.

346  
347 *Criteria 8. Diminution of neighboring property values*

348 Mr. Scamman stated the proposed development is not expected to have a negative impact on  
349 neighboring property values as they will be similar to other existing office buildings in the district  
350 and the proposed parking and residential units will be located behind the office buildings without  
351 much visibility from the road.

352  
353 *Criteria 9. Adequate sewage disposal, solid waste disposal, water supply, utilities and drainage*  
354 Mr. Scamman stated the project will be served by an onsite septic system, a dumpster area, and the  
355 well will be registered as a public water supply.

356  
357 *Criteria 10. Fiscal Impact on the Town*

358 Mr. Scamman stated the proposed commercial space will offset any negative fiscal impacts of the  
359 proposed residential use.

360  
361 *Criteria 11. Compliance with the ordinance and in the public interest*

362 Mr. Scamman stated the proposed mixed-use development is allowed in the  
363 Professional/Residential Zoning District with a Conditional Use Permit.

364  
365 Mr. House called for a Board discussion on the CUP for the mixed-use development. Mr. Zaremba  
366 stated that he believes the applicant demonstrated that they have met the requirements of a  
367 conditional use permit for the mixed-use development. The Board members agreed.

368  
369 Mr. Houghton stated that with the Conservation Commission's endorsement, he is supportive of  
370 approving the Conditional Use Permit for the wetlands buffer disturbance. The Board members  
371 agreed.

372  
373 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion that the Planning Board approve the Conditional Use Permit  
374 requested under Section 11.4.1, of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a disturbance within the  
375 Wetland Conservation District buffer area associated with grading activity to support a  
376 proposed driveway for a mixed-use development consistent with the site plan by Emanual  
377 Engineering, last revised August 21, 2024 as per the Board's deliberations, the Board has  
378 determined the applicant meets all of the conditional use permit criteria. Mr. Kunowski  
379 seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

380  
381 There was a board and staff discussion regarding editing the proposed conditions of the CUP for  
382 the mixed-use development based on the application discussion this evening.

383  
384 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion that the Planning Board approve the Site Plan and Conditional  
385 Use Permit as provided under Section 3.6 of the Zoning Ordinance Table of Uses to permit  
386 a mixed-use development at 89 and 91 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 13, Lots 22 and 23,  
387 Zoned Professional/Residential and subject to the site plan prepared by Emanual**

388 Engineering, last revised and the architectural plans by Art Form Architecture and subject  
389 to the following conditions:

- 390 1. The applicant shall obtain all necessary state and federal permits and note the permit  
391 numbers and Public Water System ID on the plans, including EPA Construction  
392 General Permit, NHDOT driveway permit, NHDES Public Water System final  
393 approval and registration, and NHDES septic approval.
- 394 2. Any outstanding technical comments provided by the town's consulting engineer or  
395 by the Town Planner shall be addressed to satisfaction the Planning Department.
- 396 3. The Town Planner shall confirm that no proposed landscaping is an invasive species  
397 as designated by NHDES.
- 398 4. The plan shall be revised to show a 50-foot right of way for an alternative road layout  
399 that avoids most wetland impacts consistent with the June 19, 2024 plans. The legal  
400 conveyance of the right of ways on the rear of the property shall be to the final  
401 satisfaction of Town's legal counsel.
- 402 5. A stormwater management agreement shall be signed by the Town and property  
403 owner and recorded with the site plan. During and after construction phases the  
404 owner shall be responsible for maintaining stormwater facilities. An Operation and  
405 Maintenance (O&M) plan for all storm water management facilities shall be recorded  
406 with the stormwater management agreement after completion of construction. The  
407 agreement will require the owner to submit annual reports to the Town completed by  
408 certified professional certifying that stormwater management facilities are  
409 functioning in accordance with their design intent.
- 410 6. The applicant shall submit a site plan and associated documents for recording. The  
411 applicant shall be responsible for all recording fees to the Rockingham County  
412 Register of Deeds as well as the \$25 recording fee of the Town of Stratham.
- 413 7. A private street name serving the development shall be approved by the Stratham  
414 Select Board and proposed addressing and Map and Lot numbers shall be approved  
415 by the Stratham Assessing Department and noted on the plan.
- 416 8. The applicant shall provide a 10-foot easement to the benefit of the Town of Stratham  
417 along Portsmouth Avenue frontage. The easement language shall be the final  
418 approval of town's legal counsel with providing that five feet shall be for the sidewalk  
419 and five feet for grading and maintenance of the sidewalk.
- 420 9. The applicant shall work with the Heritage Commission to make revisions to the  
421 architectural plan consistent with comments previously provided by Commission  
422 Chair Nate Merrill. The architectural plan shall be to the final satisfaction of the  
423 Town Planner.
- 424 10. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a performance guarantee in the form of a  
425 bond, letter of credit, or check shall be provided to Town, along with a signed site  
426 development agreement consistent with the site plan regulations to guarantee site  
427 stabilization, erosion control, stormwater, and landscaping.
- 428 11. Prior to starting construction, details for the pervious pavement material shall be  
429 provided to the Planning Department review and approval.
- 430 12. Prior to start of construction, the Planning Department shall inspect the site to  
431 confirm that erosion and sediment control measures are in place according to plan  
432 and best management practices. The applicant shall afford reasonable access to the  
433 site for periodic planning inspections during the construction phases.
- 434 13. Prior to the start of construction, a pre-construction meeting shall be scheduled with  
435 the Planning Department all relevant Town Departments.
- 436 14. Prior to issuance of a building permit for any building in the development, details for

437 fire protection to include either individual fire suppression sprinkler systems or a fire  
438 assisting cistern supply shall be submitted to the fire department and shall be subject  
439 to the final approval of the fire chief.

440 **15. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any building in the development, details**  
441 **for building mounted exterior lighting shall be submitted to Planning Department for**  
442 **review and approval. If any additional freestanding exterior lighting is proposed, the**  
443 **applicant shall return to the Planning Board for approval of the revised lighting plan**  
444 **in a public meeting without abutter or newspaper notification and a public hearing**  
445 **required.**

446 **16. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for any building in the development,**  
447 **a street sign meeting details of the Stratham Department of Public Works shall be**  
448 **installed along the Portsmouth Avenue frontage.**

449 **17. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for any building in the**  
450 **development, all landscaping for that building shall be installed. The building**  
451 **inspector may issue a temporary Certificate of Occupancy under winter conditions at**  
452 **his discretion.**

453 The Board discussed the optional conditions in the staff memo for this project and determined they  
454 would not be included.

455 **Mr. Houghton seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

456  
457 **Mr. Canada made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion.**  
458 **All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

459  
460 **5. Other Business:**

461  
462 **a. Miscellaneous Community Planning Issues**

463  
464 There was no discussion on this topic.

465  
466 **6. Adjournment**

467  
468 **Mr. Canada made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:13 pm. Mr. Zaremba seconded the**  
469 **motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**