



Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes

July 2, 2025

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
Nate Allison, Alternate Member

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Vanessa Price, Director of Planning and Building

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

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

2. Approval of Minutes

a. June 18, 2025

Mr. Zaremba made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from June 18, 2025. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

3. Ongoing Business:

- a. 41 Portsmouth Avenue LLC (Applicant) and 41 Portsmouth Avenue Realty LLC (Owner) request a Site Plan Review and Conditional Use Permit for a new 30,000 square foot auto dealership at 41 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 9, Lot 4 in the Gateway Commercial Business and Residential/Agricultural Districts.

Ms. Price updated the Board that the Stratham Zoning Board of Adjustment granted a variance from Section 3.6, the Table of Uses of the Zoning Ordinance, which prohibits vehicle storage in the Residential/Agricultural District. The ZBA included some conditions on the approval. One abutter requested adequate screening and an easement across the applicant's property. The ZBA had concerns with the number of parking spaces in the overflow area and with tractor-trailer turning for the site.

Mr. House asked for clarification on the easement request. Ms. Price replied that Bruce Scamman can provide more details, but that the abutter and the applicant came to an agreement to grant access for the abutter to the property. That is not shown on the plans before the Board this evening. Mr. Scamman clarified that there is a current easement to the neighboring farm. The abutter requested an easement across the 41 Portsmouth Ave property so they can access the agricultural fields. Mr. Scamman added that the abutter does not want tall trees in the 30-foot buffer because

45 that would stop the view from the home of the fields out back. They requested a low buffer if the
46 Planning Board is going to require a buffer.
47

48 Ms. Price stated that regarding the issue of vesting, she provided the Board with a memo regarding
49 the Town staff's position that vesting expired on December 15, 2019, and substantial completion
50 of improvements as shown on the site plan has not occurred to allow for further vesting. She
51 referenced Section 4.5 of the Site Plan Regulations, which speaks to substantial completion, and
52 read aloud her staff memo dated June 25, 2025. Mr. House asked if there were any questions from
53 the Board. There were no questions. Mr. House stated that the Board will give the Applicant time
54 to review the memo.
55

56 Ms. Price stated that two waivers from the site plan regulations were submitted, as well as
57 additional deviations from the Ordinance, which will be reviewed through the Conditional Use
58 Permit process. The architect for the project provided a materials sample board for the Board to
59 review. Ms. Price also noted the Board's previous concerns with road connectivity, sidewalks,
60 vehicle parking, storage areas, lighting plan, and vehicle delivery trucks. She noted that some
61 NHDES and NHDOT permits may need to be updated as they may have expired. The fire chief
62 had some comments in addition to the third-party engineering review, and those comments were
63 provided to the applicant. Ms. Price invited the applicant to make their presentation.
64

65 Brian Tanner of PRAXIS3 presented revised architectural drawings. They reduced the glazing by
66 one band and lowered the signage on the front façade that faces Portsmouth Avenue. They
67 integrated some gable forms, windows, downspouts, and other architectural forms to break up the
68 mass of the rear part of the building. Mr. House asked Mr. Tanner to present the proposed building
69 materials. Mr. Tanner asked the Board to review the materials board and described the proposed
70 materials and the locations in the building. He also presented an artist's rendering of the building.
71

72 Mr. House requested that Mr. Tanner present details on the exterior plaster material that they are
73 proposing. Mr. Tanner replied that it is a traditional three-coat plaster stucco that is not an EIFS
74 material. It is not synthetic and is a traditional plaster. Mr. House replied that it looks like EIFS to
75 him. Mr. Tanner replied that it is finished and that stucco, EIFS, and plaster all look similar. He
76 said they can use different levels of smoothness if that is the concern. Mr. House replied that he
77 does not like the material proposed, and he does not believe it meets the intent of the zoning. Mr.
78 Tanner replied that he was told they couldn't use EIFS and that they had to use plaster, so they
79 proposed stucco, which is cement plaster. Mr. House replied that, in his opinion, plaster is not
80 acceptable. Mr. House asked Mr. Tanner to discuss the metal material proposed. He replied that it
81 is not prefabricated in the sense that it is not corrugated metal; it is a sheet good that is
82 manufactured with a polymer inside aluminum, sandwiched between two pieces of metal that are
83 formed partly at the shop and partly on site to be placed on the building.
84

85 Mr. Zaremba commented that he does not believe the design meets the traditional New England
86 style.
87

88 Ms. Price described the two waiver requests. The first is from the Site Plan Regulations section
89 5.15.d. regarding exterior building materials. Mr. Canada does not like the metal as it is too
90 industrial looking. He prefers the fiber cement panel. Mr. Houghton is inclined to go with the
91 cement panel that is consistent with the regulations. Mr. Zaremba and Mr. Kunowski agree. Mr.
92 Kunowski added that the flatness of the MCM has a reflective quality.
93

94 Mr. House asked what kind of fading can be expected with the MCM or FCP materials. He

95 provided an example of another dealership in town where the roof has faded and looks terrible.
96 Mr. Tanner replied that both products are very weather resistant and are not like Hardy panel. The
97 fiber cement panel uses compressed heat in manufacturing which makes it color safe. He agrees
98 with Mr. Kunowski's comment that although the metal composite panel is a matte finish, it does
99 have a certain sheen to it that is different from fiber cement panel. He does not expect any fading
100 on either the MCM or FCP materials, but he would have to review the product specifications for
101 the material warranty. Mr. House expressed concern with the sides facing the sun and heating up
102 if it is metal and fading. Mr. Tanner replied MCM is used in South Florida, Arizona, and California.
103 The fiber cement panel is a through-body material so its color is through the body. Mr. House
104 replied that the sample of FCP is not the same color all the way through, and he believes the metal
105 is going to fade. Mr. House called for a motion.

106
107 **Mr. Canada made a motion to deny the waiver from Site Plan Regulations Section 5.15.d to**
108 **use the aluminum composite material. Mr. Zaremba seconded the motion. All voted in favor**
109 **of denial, and the motion passed.**

110
111 Ms. Price described the second waiver is from Ordinance Section 3.9.8.c.i and can be reviewed
112 through the CUP process and related to the use of the angle jamb at the front glazing. She stated
113 that the architect is here tonight to get direction from the Board and that the Board does not need
114 to vote on this tonight as the CUP will be discussed at a later meeting. Mr. Canada would like to
115 see a better side view of the rendition but does not see where the use is that significant. Mr.
116 Zaremba prefers the vertical option. Mr. Kunowski does not have a preference and is comfortable
117 letting the angle stay given the other changes made to the massing and variability of the façade.
118 Mr. Allison does not have a preference. Mr. Houghton and Mr. House prefer the vertical jamb.
119

120 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to defer the waiver request for vertical or angular jambs to**
121 **the Conditional Use Permit process. Mr. Zaremba seconded the motion. All voted in favor**
122 **and the motion passed.**

123
124 Mr. House clarified that the MCM material is denied, and fiber cement panel is allowed. Mr.
125 Tanner asked if that includes the front entrance, which has the other MCM product. Mr. House
126 replied no metal. Mr. House asked Mr. Tanner to go through the exterior plaster materials and
127 where they are proposed. Mr. Tanner presented the plans and the sample materials. Mr. House
128 stated that he believes both colors should be the smooth texture. Mr. Allison agreed. Mr. Kunowski
129 and Mr. Zaremba did not have an opinion on that. Mr. Canada asked if the smoother texture will
130 reflect the sun more. Mr. Tanner replied that the rougher material will be more consistent for a
131 longer period of time and that the smoother material will show age in a different way. Mr. Canada
132 stated that there will be harsh sun on that side in the morning, and he is concerned about potential
133 glare. Mr. House thinks it will be like a Hardy panel or planks and won't have a glare problem,
134 and thinks the smooth will look more traditional New England architecture. Mr. Canada agrees yet
135 maintains concern with glare. Mr. Houghton agrees with Mr. House. Mr. Zaremba and Mr.
136 Kunowski do not have opinions on the glare. The Board agreed with option 2 presented by the
137 architect.
138

139 Mr. Scamman presented some site plan changes, including changes to a retaining wall and showing
140 a water line connection to the abutter so a fire sprinkler system can be installed. Mr. Kunowski
141 asked if the two properties would share a well. Mr. Scamman replied that they are sharing the same
142 fire protection system and may share the same well in the future, but it has been designed with its
143 own well. In the rear of the existing Nissan dealership, there is a fire cistern below the service bays
144 with a fire protection pump. It is proposed that the fire protection system would be piped into the

145
146
147
148
149
150 new building so that a second system would not be required. Mr. House asked if the two properties
151 are the same owner. Mr. Scamman replied Yes. Mr. Scamman stated they have done some work
152 on the underground drainage system that has been changed to meet regulations, along with some
153 changes to accommodate a tow truck into the service bays.

154
155 Mr. Scamman requested feedback from the Board on the vegetated buffer. It was discussed that
156 the ZBA's approval includes conditions on the buffer. The Board decided to wait to discuss the
157 buffer until after the ZBA meeting minutes are complete. Mr. Scamman requested a continuance
158 to the next meeting.

159
160 Mr. Zaremba asked where the vehicles are washed. Mr. Scamman replied in the bays. Mr. Zaremba
161 asked if the water goes into the septic system. Mr. Scamman replied No, that is not permissible
162 from NHDES, so the water is directed to a holding tank.

163
164 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to continue the application to July 16, 2025. Mr. Zaremba
165 seconded the motion. Mr. House appointed Mr. Allison as a voting member for this motion
166 in place of Mr. Canada who stepped out. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

167 Ms. Price and Mr. House clarified for the record that the reason for the continuance is to allow
168 further discussion between the Town and the applicant on the question of vesting.

169
170 **b. Land Bank Properties, LLC (Applicant and Owner) request for approval of a Condominium
171 Subdivision, Conditional Use Permit, and Route 33 Heritage District Application at 217
172 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 21, Lot 88 in the Route 33 Legacy Highway Heritage District. –
173 *Amendment to the Notice of Decision.***

174 Ms. Price explained that at the April 2nd and May 7th Planning Board meetings it was discussed
175 that conditions of approval for this project were to include an assessment of the architectural
176 integrity of the home by Heritage Commission members; a preservation easement to be held by
177 the Town on the existing historic home; an inventory of the property to determine its eligibility for
178 listing on the New Hampshire Register or National Register of Historic Properties; and installation
179 of a Stratham Historic House sign.

180 Tim Phoenix of Hoefle, Phoenix, Gormely & Roberts spoke on behalf of Shamus Quirk with Land
181 Bank Properties. Mr. Phoenix acknowledged that his client agreed to a historic preservation
182 easement on the exterior of the building, but there was no discussion about the other conditions.
183 He stated that they have significant problems with the other conditions, including the interior
184 assessment. Mr. Phoenix stated that Mr. Quirk may not object to an assessment of the interior as
185 long as it is understood that any easement will be only for the exterior of the home, and future
186 owners can remodel the interior without limitation. Regarding the proposed condition that the
187 owner will work with the Heritage Commission to come to a mutual agreement on the terms of a
188 Preservation Easement, Mr. Phoenix agrees that they can be involved, but is concerned about what
189 happens if there is no mutual agreement. He was led to believe that it would be Mr. Phoenix and
190 Town Counsel who would make the final agreement. Mr. Phoenix questioned the condition for
191 annual inspection reports – by whom and what authority will they have. Finally, they did not agree
192 to hiring a preservation consultant. Mr. House asked Ms. Price who drafted the conditions. Ms.
193 Price replied that the conditions are from the Heritage Commission.

194 Mr. Canada addressed Mr. Phoenix and stated that there is no intention of asking for an interior
195 easement. The assessment is solely for the Heritage Commission to view the interior and take

195 pictures. Mr. Phoenix said that would be agreeable. Mr. Canada addressed the concern with annual
196 inspections and explained that the Heritage Commission does the inspections, and they do not have
197 the authority to police it, but they report to the Town, who will hold the easement if there are
198 violations. Mr. Canada addressed the cost of the consultant and explained that although it is to the
199 benefit of the Town, the entire project is to the benefit of Mr. Quirk. Mr. Canada stated the Town
200 made a lot of concessions in approving the project, and he does not believe the cost is too much,
201 and if negotiations need to be reopened, then perhaps the entire Notice of Decision should be
202 rescinded. Mr. Phoenix thinks that wouldn't be prudent for the Town and requested that the Board
203 consider only what was discussed during the hearing. He added that he did not have much time to
204 talk to his client prior to this meeting, as they just received the information yesterday.
205

206 Mr. House asked if the primary concern is over the \$2,500 to \$5,000 cost for a consultant. Mr.
207 Phoenix replied yes and asked for confirmation that an interior inspection and potential listing on
208 the National Historic Register would not result in restrictions on the interior. Mr. Canada replied
209 it puts no restrictions on the house. Mr. Houghton stated that it was an oversight, but in the past, it
210 has been typical for an applicant to pay similar costs. He asked if there is an opportunity for the
211 Board to speak directly with Mr. Quirk in the coming weeks to resolve the issue. Mr. Phoenix
212 replied that if the Board feels strongly about including the requirement, then vote on it tonight, and
213 if Mr. Quirk objects, then Mr. Phoenix would like the opportunity to object to it at the next meeting.
214

215 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion to continue 217 Portsmouth Avenue to the meeting on July 16,
216 2025. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**
217

218 Mr. House polled the audience to see what projects they were in attendance for. Two people had
219 public comments on 41 Portsmouth Avenue. It was determined that the Board had neglected to
220 accept public comments earlier. The applicant's representative was in attendance and agreed to
221 hear the comments. Mr. House opened the application for 41 Portsmouth Avenue.
222

223 **c. Reopening of 41 Portsmouth Avenue LLC (Applicant) and 41 Portsmouth Avenue Realty LLC
224 (Owner) request a Site Plan Review and Conditional Use Permit for a new 30,000 square foot auto
225 dealership at 41 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 9, Lot 4 in the Gateway Commercial Business and
226 Residential/Agricultural Districts.**

227 Kaitlin Frederick and John Dailey of 58 River Road commented. Mr. Dailey voiced concerns with
228 the initial plan to use River Road for exiting traffic to turn left onto Portsmouth Avenue. It is
229 already a tough turn, and this project will add more traffic. They submitted an email to Ms. Price
230 with some options. One suggestion is a redesign of the entrance and exit to the driveway between
231 Nissan and Kia, which would allow a left exit back onto Route 108 as well as a right exit. Currently,
232 other dealerships, including BMW, Audi, Porsche, and Subaru, all have left and right turn exits
233 onto Route 108. The general concept is to keep commercial business traffic on Route 108, and not
234 on our residential roads. Mr. Scamman replied that he believes his client would prefer a left exit
235 directly onto Route 108 as well, but NHDOT is requiring the no left-out. Mr. Houghton added that
236 NHDOT has been engaged on Route 108 studies for many years, and they have more recently been
237 engaged in generating options. NHDOT will be before the Select Board on Monday for a public
238 hearing, and he welcomed Ms. Frederick and Mr. Dailey to attend. Ms. Frederick stated that there
239 are existing safety issues with the Nissan and Subaru service techs driving very fast up and down
240 River Road. It is a dead-end road with no outlet and a family neighborhood. Mr. House suggested
241 they call the police department. Ms. Frederick agreed and stated that this is another dealership that
242 will add volume, especially when turning left onto Route 108. She described other safety concerns
243 with drivers coming out of the Nissan Dealership using the shoulder at a high rate of speed while
244

245 she is trying to turn right onto River Road. Ms. Frederick stated the area is not well maintained at
246 all, for example, the guardrail is damaged and sticking out partially into the road, and there is a lot
247 of overgrowth. She requested that a road safety study be conducted at the corner. Mr. House replied
248 that putting aside the service techs, the new dealership shouldn't add much traffic. Mr. Canada
249 asked if people are test-driving down River Road. Mr. Dailey replied that he doesn't notice as
250 many test drives as he does drives from the service departments. Ms. Frederick provided some cost
251 estimates she found from NHDOT for a traffic signal project in Jaffrey that was one-quarter the
252 cost of a roundabout, and asked what the timeline is for some sort of change in traffic pattern. Mr.
253 House replied that she should ask that question on Monday to NHDOT because the Planning Board
254 can't answer that. Mr. Dailey asked how they could get a 'no outlet' sign on River Road. Mr.
255 Houghton replied that they could request it from the Select Board. Ms. Frederick asked if a market
256 study could be completed for home values in the immediate area of the dealership. Mr. Canada
257 replied that it is an allowed use in the commercial zone. Ms. Frederick understands and asked if
258 there is a study being done for that, regardless. Mr. House replied no. Mr. Dailey provided a final
259 comment regarding architecture that it doesn't seem like the Gateway Business District zoning
260 doesn't seem to make sense anymore. He asked how does it affect where we are today vs. 2008.
261 Mr. Houghton replied that the Planning Board reviews ordinances annually and the public is
262 welcome to come to the meetings to discuss changes.
263

264 Mr. Scamman replied to the comments that the applicant hired a consultant to complete a traffic
265 study of this entire area of Portsmouth Avenue. NHDOT held a scoping meeting which is the first
266 step in their process.
267

268 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to continue 41 Portsmouth Avenue LLC to July 16, 2025. Mr.**
269 **Zaremba seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**
270

271 d. Copley Properties LLC (Applicant) and Helen E. Gallant Revocable Trust of 1995 (Owner),
272 request for approval of a Residential Open Space Cluster Subdivision and Conditional Use Permit
273 for a proposed subdivision of 80 and 80R Winnicutt Road, Tax Map 14, Lots 56 and 57, Zoned
274 Residential/Agricultural.
275

276 Ms. Price stated that the Board needs to make a decision tonight on the application or continue the
277 application. The application currently does not meet the regulations and waivers have not been
278 granted. There are several issues with zoning compliance and there are two CUP applications
279 before the Board that have not been voted on yet. Sections of the ordinance that the application
280 does not comply with include Sections 12.5.c, 8.10.d, and 8.10.c. Those sections do not fall under
281 the purview of the CUP. There are additional waiver requests that were submitted as a result of the
282 CMA Engineering review. There continue to be outstanding comments from the fire chief and
283 DPW. The Parks and Rec Director and the Conservation Commission have concerns about the
284 design of the project. Ms. Price stated the applicant's representatives are here tonight to discuss
285 the waiver requests.
286

287 Tim Phoenix of Hoefle, Phoenix, Gormely & Roberts spoke on behalf of Drew Goddard of Copley
288 Properties. He stated the project team has a number of questions on staff comments, but he turned
289 the waiver discussion over to Bruce Scamman. Mr. Scamman stated that it appears the Board does
290 not want a single pitch road and if that is the case, then they need to know so they can finalize the
291 design. Mr. House polled the Board and the majority prefer the crowned road. Mr. Scamman
292 replied that they will withdraw that waiver and design a crowned road (Addendum A, Figure A,
293 Road Cross Section).
294

295 Mr. Scamman discussed the road length waiver request from Section 4.4.3.a.ii. They are requesting
296 a 2,138-foot road where a maximum of 1,000 feet is allowed. They added fire cisterns and two cul-
297 de-sacs for turning around. He stated that the fire department requested that the cistern in the rear
298 of the property be moved to the front of the property at Winnicutt Road. Mr. Scamman is concerned
299 the new location is within the wetlands setback or in the open space buffer. Mr. Scamman
300 requested input from the Board on the location of the client. He stated they selected the original
301 locations so the cisterns are within 1,000 feet of every home and the change requested by the fire
302 department results in a deviation from that requirement and will either affect the wetlands setback
303 on one side of the road or the open space buffer on the other side of the road. He understands the
304 logic of moving a cistern to the front of the property so the truck can load up water, drive to the
305 fire, and not possibly pass a fire to get to the water system. However, when trying to redesign that,
306 it puts the project in direct conflict with the Zoning Ordinance of a 50-foot no-disturb buffer. Mr.
307 House asked Ms. Price if there is concern with the road length from DPW. Ms. Price replied that
308 DPW has an issue with maintenance particularly with the cul-de-sacs not being designed to town
309 regulations but did not voice an issue with road length. Mr. Houghton asked if there is an area
310 available near the pond. Mr. Scamman replied there is a second cistern near there. He added that
311 the paved apron for a cistern at the front of the property will necessitate a widening of the road and
312 that will cause encroachment into either the 50-foot buffer or the wetlands setback depending on
313 which side of the road it is on. Ms. Price reiterated the fire chief's concern with passing a fire to
314 get to a cistern and also with fire truck access up a couple of long driveways. Mr. Scamman pointed
315 at two lots in question in the rear and stated that his client said he would install fire sprinkler
316 systems in those homes. Mr. Allison asked why there is hesitation to create a P loop between the
317 two cul-de-sacs. It would only require a small wetlands crossing which is de minimis when
318 compared to the crossings on the yield plan, but there has been pushback from the applicant on
319 this suggestion. He suggested the driveway to the two homes could be widened to accommodate a
320 fire truck and then add a connection to the other cul-de-sac with a breakaway lock and a gate. Mr.
321 Scamman replied that would require another wetlands crossing and they are trying to minimize
322 that. It would also go through the open space land which is of concern. Mr. Allison replied that the
323 crossing is very small and it would not go through the back of the open space. He clarified for Mr.
324 Scamman the suggested location. Mr. Allison described an issue he had in the past with a moving
325 van not being able to fit down a driveway and he had to rent a second truck to shuttle the materials.
326 He added that it would be valuable for emergency services to have the driveway be more like a
327 small roadway like 18 feet wide for larger vehicles. Mr. House agrees with Mr. Allison. Mr.
328 Zaremba asked if the 1,000-foot requirement is for safety. Mr. Houghton replied yes, and Mr.
329 House replied he believes that is part of it. Mr. Scamman replied that 1,000 feet is the length of
330 hose on a fire truck.

331
332 Mr. House called for a motion on the waiver. Mr. Houghton stated that it is frustrating to be at this
333 point, but he is not inclined to agree to the waiver. He believes there are open issues that are going
334 to require working together in a responsible manner before he would agree to the waiver. Mr.
335 House asked Mr. Scamman if he would like to hold off on the waiver as it seems it would not get
336 approved tonight. Mr. Scamman agreed to continue it to a future meeting because there are other
337 road questions, but he would like Board input on which side of the road to design the fire cistern
338 at the front of the property. The waiver was tabled.

339
340 Mr. House does not have a problem with the cisterns. Ms. Price mentioned that the fire engineer
341 and the fire chief agreed that one cistern should be at the entrance. Mr. Scamman clarified that he
342 is asking if it should be on the north side of the road in the wetlands buffer or on the south side of
343 the road in the 50-foot open space buffer. Mr. House prefers the 50-foot buffer location. The board
344 members agreed.

345
346 Mr. House invited members of the public to speak.
347

348 Elizabeth O'Toole of 7 Taylor Court spoke. Her land buffers the wetlands that run through the
349 property, and her biggest concern is that they are constructing so many units. She asked how it
350 would affect the water table, the wetlands, runoff into the wetlands, and her property. She has
351 concerns with the development affecting the wetland's ability to accept runoff from very heavy
352 rains. Mr. Scamman described how he believes her property won't be affected by demonstrating
353 the extent of the watershed and the flow direction of the water down Mill Brook towards the traffic
354 circle, which is the opposite direction from her home. They are proposing to infiltrate all
355 stormwater into the ground. They will obtain an Alteration of Terrain permit from the NHDES.
356

357 Mr. House stated there are two more waiver requests and only four minutes left for this project
358 tonight, and asked if Mr. Scamman would like to hold off on them. Mr. Scamman replied that one
359 is only requesting a smaller diameter cul-de-sac. Mr. House stated there is an issue with that. Mr.
360 Scamman replied that he would like to put that request on hold. The other waiver request is for
361 soils-based lot sizing determination. He stated that he has the same waiver request on another
362 project recently, and the Board agreed to allow the use of NHDES lot sizing with USDA soils. He
363 asked if the Board would like a more detailed presentation on that. He described that they don't
364 have individual lots with individual septic systems. The Board decided to table this waiver
365 discussion.
366

367 Mr. House discussed with the project team a continuance date and Mr. Phoenix suggested August
368 6, 2025. **Mr. Zaremba made a motion to continue the 80/80R Winnicutt Road application to**
369 **August 6, 2025. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion**
370 **passed.**

371 e. Copley Properties, LLC (Applicant) and CAT Trust (Owner) request for approval of a Site Plan,
372 Conditional Use Permit, and Route 33 Heritage District Application for an approximate 4,535 SF,
373 three-unit, multi-family structure consisting of 3-bedroom units. The location is 301 Portsmouth
374 Avenue (Tax Map 22, Lot 24), in the Route 33 Legacy Highway Heritage Zoning District.
375

377 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to continue the Copley Properties, LLC and CAT Trust Site**
378 **Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and Route 33 Heritage District Application to July 16, 2025.**
379 **Mr. Zaremba seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

380 4. MISCELLANEOUS

382 a. Discussion of Planning Board Goals for 2025.

383 Ms. Price asked the Board to consider any ideas for additional planning goals or zoning
384 amendments. Mr. Houghton suggested reviewing the Route 33 Heritage District zoning. Mr. House
385 suggested reviewing the Master Plan and the Gateway District.

386 5. Adjournment

387 **Mr. Canada made a motion to adjourn at 10:09 pm. Mr. Houghton seconded the motion. All**
388 **voted in favor and the motion passed.**