



Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes

August 6, 2025

Stratham Municipal Center

Time: 7:00 pm

Members Present: Thomas House, Chair
Mike Houghton, Select Board's Representative
Chris Zaremba, Regular Member
Nate Allison, Alternate Member

Members Absent: David Canada, Vice Chair
John Kunowski, Regular Member

Staff Present: Vanessa Price, Director of Planning and Building

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Mr. House called the meeting to order at 6:58 pm and took roll call.

2. Approval of Minutes

a. July 16, 2025

Mr. Zaremba made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from July 16, 2025. Mr. Houghton seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. House appointed Mr. Allison as a voting member for this meeting.

3. Ongoing Business:

- a. Parks and Recreation Director (Applicant) for the Town of Stratham for a Preliminary Consultation for improvements to Stevens Park located at 68 Bunker Hill Avenue (Tax Map 9, Lot 84), in the Residential/Agricultural Zoning District.

Ms. Price explained that Tim Stevens (Stratham Director of Public Works) and Seth Hickey (Stratham Parks and Recreation Director) are here to present a Preliminary Consultation to hear comments from the Planning Board that can be brought to the Recreation Commission prior to presenting the project to the Select Board. The packet includes plans that were presented to Town Meeting and revised plans that are now proposed due to some site constraints which include pavilion changes, site and grading, as well as relocating the bathrooms and adjusting the courts.

Mr. Hickey presented the project. The parcel was acquired by town vote in 1998. It was opened for public use in 2005. The first intended uses were for soccer and lacrosse. In 2007 a playground committee was formed and soon after that the playground was constructed. There was a desire to construct a pavilion noted in the 2007 Town Report. In 2008 tennis courts were added with the intention of adding more when demand increased, which is the point we are at now. The Babe Ruth field was added in 2009, and the South ballfield was added in 2011. The departments worked with the Select Board leading up to this past Town Meeting to develop a warrant to make improvements

45 to Stevens Park including enhancements to parking and drainage and additional recreation
46 facilities. We realize that these improvements are most likely phased, and funding is not available
47 to complete all work at one time. They want to look at the whole project and make sure that all
48 factors are taken into consideration. Since town meeting, there has been some consultation with
49 Emanual Engineering and with Mr. Stevens and some adjustments were made. The project team
50 appreciates feedback from the Planning Board. He turned the presentation over to Mr. Stevens.
51

52 Mr. Stevens described the existing conditions. The proposed plan includes a new pavilion with
53 bathrooms and a septic system. The design of the pavilion will mimic the existing pavilion at
54 Stratham Hill Park. The pavilion will be located where the existing well house is and two existing
55 buildings will be removed and probably relocated in town. Part of the septic will be a pump system
56 which will pump back up to the field. All of the electrical infrastructure can stay in place with this
57 plan. Parking is proposed to be moved to high ground. As of now, the parking will be gravel. That
58 is probably phase one and a half, depending on the amount of money it's going to cost to
59 concentrate on the pavilion. They are now proposing that pickleball courts wrap around the existing
60 tennis courts, to save extra programmable space and to allow the parking lot to be located up top.
61 There will be a small addition to the pavement that will allow for a few additional parking spaces.
62 Mr. Stevens asked if there are any questions from the Board.
63

64 Mr. Houghton stated he doesn't have any questions about the design presented but noted that there
65 are historic concerns with drainage on the property and asked what steps are included for
66 mitigation. Bruce Scamman of Emanuel Engineering and James Verra & Associates replied that
67 the concerns have been about added drainage to the property to the south. The drainage design is
68 not finalized, but there is a proposed underdrain that will add an underground ponding area. That
69 stone area will allow for water to infiltrate into the ground. There will be additional stone
70 infiltration around the pavilion and along the parking lot. Under the parking lot there would be
71 essentially a pond, along with stone under the new pickleball courts.
72

73 Mr. House asked if there were any comments from the public.
74

75 Robert Law of 45 Frying Pan Lane spoke. He owns the land on the southern and eastern sides of
76 Stevens Park. He is concerned with the water drainage from Stevens Park onto his properties. It
77 has already impacted his property and remains unresolved. There is a large watershed area and
78 past mitigation has not been sufficient. He questions if the proposed mitigation will be enough in
79 the future especially with an expansion. Mr. Law stated concerns with noise impact. He said that
80 additional courts were there for residents and the noise impacts the abutters as there are no barriers
81 between the houses and the Stevens Park property. Mr. House asked what are the hours at the park.
82 Mr. Hickey replied dawn to dusk. Mr. Law stated that his final concern is with security and safety
83 with trespassing onto his property. Mr. House asked if he gets trespassers now. Mr. Law replied
84 some and that some are children which is fine, but there are other kinds of activities that go on. He
85 added that the expansion could require consideration for lighting which could be a potential issue.
86 He summarized that he would like the town to complete a comprehensive drainage study before
87 approval, require sound mitigation measures (e.g. barriers or court orientation), establish clear
88 operating hours, install proper fencing for boundary markers, and if there is going to be lighting to
89 minimize residential impact. He supports the recreational activity and just wants to make sure the
90 project is completed in a responsible way.
91

92 Mr. House stated that this is a non-binding consultation. Mr. Stevens and Mr. Hickey thanked the
93 Board for their time.
94

95
96
97
98
99

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

100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115

Ms. Price explained that the applicant is present to discuss progress on the plan set. There are several outstanding comments that she included in the staff report including questions with compliance and zoning. The CUP applications for wetlands impacts from roads and utilities and for a residential open space cluster subdivision are still pending. She highlighted Section 8.10.b of the zoning ordinance regarding minimum open space requirements. There are concerns with safe and convenient pedestrian access to open space and recreational facilities constructed by the developer or financial provision for construction in the future. Additionally, Section 8.10.c requires no less than 75% of the dedicated usable open space shall be contiguous and no more than 20% of the open space should be made up of wetlands. Ms. Price stated that those compliance issues do not fall under the CUP process, that a variance application or an administrative appeal to the ZBA would be required. There are four waivers for the Board to review for road length, soils based lot size determination/HISS mapping, road cross section to eliminate bike lanes, and to allow a fully paved cul-de-sac that is smaller than the detail in the regulations. There are three additional waiver requests that need to be submitted for the concrete fire cistern design, for a phasing plan, and from the open space criteria in the regulations.

116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127

Ms. Price provided an update from CMA Engineers that they received the July 23 response from the applicant, and the road design and updated stormwater design is under review and should take about two to three weeks. She stated there are comments from the fire chief in the packet with concerns on the current design and she is working on scheduling a meeting with the fire chief and the project team. The fire chief is not in agreement with the current cistern locations and the proposal for a concrete cistern. He does not support the waiver request for the smaller, paved cul-de-sac. Ms. Price stated that the DPW Director does not agree with the waivers submitted specific to the road. He has concerns with the adequate snow removal, staging area, sizing of the cul-de-sac, and future maintenance. She recommends continuing the application to September 3rd for the design changes to the plan set. Ms. Price noted there was a comment letter received from Elizabeth O'Toole that is in the packet.

128
129
130
131

Mr. House asked Mr. Scamman to describe the waiver for road cross sections. Mr. Scamman replied that they do not propose bike lanes and are requesting a waiver for that. They redesigned the road to a crowned road from a single pitch road.

132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141

Mr. Scamman addressed the road length waiver. He stated this project has been in the process for a year and to his knowledge, town staff have not complained about the road length. He stated with regards to the fire cistern locations, the fire department requested that they not meet the ordinance or site plan regulations and move the cisterns to locations that conflict with the regulations. They want the cistern at the end of the development to be moved to the front of the subdivision. Drew Goddard with Copley Properties stated that he will move the cistern to the front of the property if that is what the Board wants, recognizing that it does not meet the regulations. Mr. Scamman noted that it would also need to be located in the 50-foot no-disturbance buffer or within a wetlands setback.

142
143
144

Mr. House asked Mr. Scamman to describe the soils-based lot size waiver request. Mr. Scamman replied that per the NHDES regulations, there are different soils that you can base it on. They complete high intensity soils for Alteration of Terrain, so they completed two types of soil analysis.

145 They did not do the HISS mapping because it would be a third type of soil.
146

147 Mr. House asked Mr. Scamman to describe the cul-de-sac waiver request. Mr. Scamman replied it
148 is a request to allow a smaller cul-de-sac that is fully paved.
149

150 Mr. House asked Mr. Scamman to continue his presentation. Mr. Scamman described changes to
151 the plans that are described in the July 28th letter to the Town. They changed to a crown roadway,
152 added individual driveways on the design plans and on the drainage design, added spot grades for
153 the retaining walls on sheets C5 and C7, updated road profiles for the new pipe layout, updated
154 road sections to show the crowned road and the typical road section. They added turnarounds for
155 fire protection in the arrays, updated the fire truck turning plans, increased the size of the cul-de-
156 sac, added a note that fire sprinklers will be added to lots 26 and 27 because of the length of the
157 driveway, add BMP worksheets for stormwater, added a stone berm pre-treatment to the bioswales,
158 added a 40 mil PVC liner to the bioswales, added stone drip edges around the homes and
159 driveways, updated the HydroCAD modeling calculations to include the houses, driveways, and
160 the subcatchment, revised the stormwater plan for the individual houses on the plan, revised the
161 stormwater narrative, revised the riprap pipe protection, revised bioswales surface sections,
162 removed references to street sweepers in the stormwater maintenance plan, added a sheet to show
163 400-foot sight distances at the entrance, added a 100-foot setback from Mill Brook, added a note
164 to commit to planting two shade trees per lot, added a note specifying wetland signs to be installed
165 every 75 feet on metal posts, updated the trail layout, revised proposed tree lines, updated the area
166 of disturbance, added waiver requests for the updated road design – the crowned road and no bike
167 lanes, added a note requiring sleeve utility crossing under the road, updated the drain and structure
168 chart and pipe listings, updated easements to match revised septic layout, moved septic access
169 from Lots 26, 27 and 29 and updated the easement, shifted house 30A (in the arrays) slightly to
170 accommodate the proposed turnaround, and revised septic specifications. Mr. Scamman believes
171 the submitted changes satisfy the comments from CMA Engineers. He stated the only request not
172 yet addressed is the request for a fire cistern at the entrance and he is seeking guidance from the
173 Planning Board. Mr. Goddard added that the fire cistern is below grade and is not a visible
174 structure. Ms. Price noted that a variance from the ZBA is required for construction in the no-
175 disturb cluster subdivision buffer. Mr. House stated that the project team should meet with the fire
176 chief to discuss options before moving forward. Mr. Zaremba asked if the fire chief wants the
177 cistern at the intersection with Winnicutt Road or just before the start of the development. Ms.
178 Price replied that she believes he wants it close to Winnicutt Road. Mr. Allison asked if the fire
179 chief could come to a Planning Board meeting to discuss this as it seems to him that the chief is
180 asking for a location in order to serve an area of more than just this development. Mr. Goddard
181 agreed and stated that the regulations are to protect these homes and not the general community.
182

183 Mr. Scamman initiated a discussion on Section 8.10 Minimum Open Space Requirements. He
184 summarized that they are providing a percentage of upland area in the open space land that meets
185 the ordinance and is exceeding the percentage of wetlands allowed in the open space so that there
186 are less wetlands on individual lots. Mr. Zaremba stated that he remembers the past discussions,
187 and he does not think there was a unanimous decision from the Board. He was supportive of the
188 applicant's proposal for the reasons stated, but it is clear that the Board cannot grant the relief. Mr.
189 Goddard instructed Mr. Scamman to make the changes.
190

191 Mr. Scamman stated that they prepared a plan for the Conservation Commission showing multiple
192 setbacks and submitted response letters to CMA Engineers, the fire department, and Planning staff.
193 Mr. Scamman addressed the DPW's request for snow storage. Mr. Goddard stated that DPW
194 commented that they want more storage, and it would be beneficial if the DPW would articulate

195 exactly what they want.
196

197 Mr. House asked Mr. Scamman to present the waiver request from bike lanes. Mr. Scamman stated
198 that this is a subdivision road that is not high traffic. It is not a through-road and to his knowledge
199 there are no bike lanes in town in individual subdivisions. A bike lane seems more typical for a
200 connector road with faster traffic. There are curves in the proposed road to slow traffic down but
201 will be open enough for visibility. Mr. House asked for comments from the Board. Mr. Allison
202 asked how wide the road is. Ms. Price replied that sheet D4 shows the road cross section at 22 feet.
203 Mr. Allison stated that he assumes they are calling this a local road without bicycle lanes and they
204 are deferring to the cross sections in the regulations as an option. He stated that Mr. Scamman said
205 that they will maintain a 19-foot distance from the edge of the pavement to the right-of-way and
206 the cul-de-sac detail for the town has an incorrect 88-foot number. Mr. Scamman replied that they
207 widened it to 20 feet. Mr. Allison described what he believes is the error in the regulation detail
208 and mentioned the location of utilities in the right-of-way. Mr. Scamman replied that they moved
209 the utilities out of the right-of-way at the request of the DPW and created an easement for utilities.
210 Mr. Allison summarized his comments on the cul-de-sac design in the regulations and stated that
211 he believes where it says 88 feet, it should be 94 feet. Mr. Scamman replied that he understands
212 Mr. Allison's comments, but they would need a waiver for that and he summarized that the road
213 goes from 19 feet between the edge of pavement to the edge of the right-of-way down to 13 feet
214 in the cul-de-sac. Mr. Goddard added that pavement is not always centered in the right-of-way for
215 multiple reasons. Mr. Allison agreed and added that although they are following the regulations,
216 his comments are something that he wished they would accept. Mr. House commented that he
217 thinks there will be more traffic in this subdivision than in other examples in town. Mr. Houghton
218 stated that he can't recall any bike lanes in subdivisions and he thinks it is okay. Mr. Allison stated
219 that he thinks the 22-foot wide road is good. There is one in his development. Mr. House added
220 that there are no sidewalks in Mr. Allison's neighborhood. Mr. Allison replied they do not and
221 there are curbs that make it impossible to walk along with car traffic. In this development, he agrees
222 with the waiver. **Mr. Allison made a motion to grant the waiver request from Subdivision
223 Regulations Addendum A, Figure A, Road Cross Section to waive the requirement for bike
224 lanes. Mr. Houghton seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**
225

226 Mr. House requested that Mr. Scamman describe the waiver request for road length. Mr. Scamman
227 described they added two cul-de-sacs and two fire cisterns. They worked with emergency response
228 and the DPW and no concerns with the road length were expressed. Mr. Houghton commented
229 that he has not heard consistent, vehement objections to it. His only concern is not with the road
230 length but with a resolution on the fire cistern locations. Mr. House replied that this waiver is just
231 about the length and questions why the cistern locations matter. Mr. Zaremba replied because the
232 cisterns need to be within 1,000 feet and the Board is creating an issue by allowing the road to be
233 this long. Mr. House asked how long is the road. Mr. Scamman replied 2,138 feet from Winnicutt
234 Road to the center of the cul-de-sac. The shorter road is only 321 feet. Mr. Allison commented that
235 he has brought up several times and provided to Mr. Scamman a sketch that would connect the
236 array, even if it was a breakaway type gate to the long driveway that extends from the cul-de-sac
237 to lots 27 and 26. It does not look to Mr. Allison to be a large wetlands crossing, particularly when
238 compared to the yield plan that was prepared with many, large crossings. That would create a loop
239 system, so if there was an obstruction between the road going to the array and the cul-de-sac, there
240 would be an additional access point. It doesn't correct the fact that there is still a total length of
241 roadway that is more than 2,000 feet, but the distance has been cut in half that is unobstructed. He
242 does not think that it is a costly solution and it would be very nominal revisions. Mr. Allison asked
243 how wide is the shared driveway. Mr. Goddard replied it is a 12-foot driveway and he is trying to
244 provide as little environmental impact as possible and reduce the amount of wetland crossings and

tree cutting and provide for varied home types. He looked at a looped road but it ultimately created more environmental impact. Mr. Allison replied that his suggestion would include a crossing that is de minimis. Mr. Houghton agreed that it would be far less impact than putting a cistern in the front of the subdivision. Mr. Allison stated with regards to the long driveway he provided a real life example of an issue with a moving truck not being able to deliver directly to his home because of the size of the driveway which resulted in the need for a second smaller truck to offload the moving truck. He thinks that driveway should have better accessibility from the cul-de-sac and suggested that the entrance be wide enough so that a straight unit could access it and he would like to see that shared driveway connected to the arrays so that a fire truck could conveniently get down that. Mr. Goddard replied the road design has not changed in 14 months and if they designed a loop road they would change the project to a conventional housing types without the array homes. Mr. Houghton replied that he does not think Mr. Allison is talking about that. He is suggesting a fire access road. Mr. Goddard replied that if he is going to build a fire access road, then he would make it a road and he thinks his design is better environmentally and for the community with regards to housing types. Mr. Allison replied that he does not see what he proposed as a roadway and how it would negatively impact the development. He stated this is the first time it has been discussed. Mr. Goddard replied that he appreciates the suggestion. Mr. Zaremba agrees that Mr. Allison's proposal is reasonable. With regards to the waiver, he thinks the loop access road addresses the concern with the spirit and intent of emergency response capabilities. Mr. Goddard replied that he met with the fire department in May 2024 and they had no concerns with fire access. Mr. Allison asked if they presented it as an option. Mr. Goddard replied what they presented was what he thought is the best project to bring forward. Mr. Allison said so there was never an option that showed this. Mr. Goddard replied that as an applicant they design a project, not necessarily options. Mr. Houghton replied that to Mr. Allison's point, staff were presented with a project, and they weren't engaged in discussion about options. Mr. Scamman replied that there are other professionals that the town has review the project and that the shared driveway would need to be widened to 20 feet causing a greater wetlands impact. Mr. House stated that the Board will table voting on the road length waiver until the project team meets with the fire chief.

Mr. House asked Mr. Scamman to describe the paved cul-de-sac waiver. Mr. Scamman described that they proposed that the smaller cul-de-sac be fully paved so kids could play street hockey, basketball, etc. It also allows fire trucks to turn into any of the three driveways without following an outside radius. They added turnarounds on each driveway for the fire trucks. They feel the design meets the safety requirements and to make it larger would make more snow concern for the DPW and more area for plowing. Mr. Goddard added that comments from the fire department in May 2024 were that they preferred a fully paved cul-de-sac for staging fire apparatus. Mr. Scamman explained the request is for a right-of-way radius of 60.5 feet versus 88 feet. The outer road edge is 47.5 feet versus 75 feet and the center island is fully paved. Mr. House tabled the discussion until the project team meets with the fire chief and DPW Director.

Mr. House moved on to the waiver request from soils-based lot size determination. Mr. Houghton asked Mr. Scamman what are the advantages over using one data set versus the others. Mr. Scamman replied that the calculations are the same basic calculation. One of them calls it one soil and the other calls it a different soil. They use what NHDES uses because they need to get a subdivision approval from NHDES. Mr. Allison stated that apparently conventional septic placement with a tank and leach field adjacent to it has been determined to not be possible on this site resulting in six different fields. He added that using the standards of lot size according to septic suitability does not apply because it is not being used in this case. If each lot had an individual system with a tank and a leach field, he can see the point of having it. He asked Mr. Scamman if there is something about the site that made it unfeasible to have a conventional septic system on

295 each lot. Mr. Goddard replied it is due to the minimum lot sizes adopted by the Planning Board for
296 cluster subdivisions that created the need for this. Mr. Scamman added that with smaller lots in
297 cluster subdivisions, leach fields can be very close to wells. This proposal is better for groundwater.
298 Mr. Allison asked if there are backup locations for a failure of the leach field. Mr. Scamman replied
299 that typically with traditional systems like this they would put the system back in the same location.
300 There are other test pits that passed. Additionally, there are nitrate setbacks to abutters. Mr. Allison
301 asked Mr. Scamman to describe how their soils information was prepared and noted that he does
302 not see stamp from a certified soil scientist that is required by the state. Mr. Scamman replied that
303 Luke Hurley is their wetlands scientist and soil scientist and he did the soils work on this site. Mr.
304 Allison asked if he signed the plans to say that is what they represent. Mr. Scamman replied they
305 typically do not stamp the plans until the end because the plans change multiple times. Mr. Allison
306 stated that the soils information on the plan has been transposed from another source and is not the
307 result of field work specifically with regard to the boundaries. In some cases the upland soils are
308 running through the lowlands or wetlands and vice versa. He believes that is not because the
309 information is inaccurate on the information source, it is just not as specific as contouring. Mr.
310 Allison suggested that in order to be a high intensity soil survey, these types of things should match
311 up in the field and the maps should reflect wetland soils and plant soils accurately. Mr. Scamman
312 replied that the wetlands are delineated accurately. Mr. Allison agreed. Mr. Scamman added that
313 they delineated very poorly drained soils and performed a vernal pool review and surveyed the
314 wetlands. Mr. Allison explained that they have a map which identifies the specific designation of
315 soils that does not match up with the contours. He agrees they located the wetlands accurately, but
316 the high intensity soil survey does not line up properly. He asked that the soil scientist sign the
317 plans to show that he was involved in the preparation. Mr. Scamman replied they will have him
318 sign the plans. Mr. House stated they will table the waiver from the high intensity soil survey. Mr.
319 Goddard asked why it is being tabled. Mr. House replied because Mr. Allison is looking for more
320 information. Mr. Goddard asked that it be a condition of approval that the final plan set have a
321 signature. Mr. House asked Mr. Allison to expand on his request. Mr. Allison replied that the high
322 intensity soil survey does not align with the contours on this plan. He believes the information is
323 accurate, but it is not shown accurately over the map because it was taken from another source. He
324 does not have a problem granting a waiver from the soil-based determination and making it a
325 condition of approval because this is not the way they designed their septic. **Mr. Allison made a**
326 **motion to grant the waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section 4.3 soil-based lot size**
327 **determination. Mr. Houghton seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**
328

329 Mr. House stated that the applicant will meet with the fire department and DPW and asked Ms.
330 Price what else is needed. Ms. Price replied that the applicant needs direction from the Board after
331 they meet with the fire department and DPW. The Town is also waiting for comments from CMA
332 Engineers on the last submission. Mr. Scamman stated that they would like to come back on
333 August 20th for guidance from the Board on the cistern location as it could result in a ZBA
334 application. Mr. Zaremba stated that he remains concerned with the open space and connectivity
335 aspects of the project and he does not believe the proposal satisfies the zoning. Mr. Goddard replied
336 that he believes the requirements for open space are clear in the regulations and he did not receive
337 a density bonus for recreation. Mr. Zaremba disagrees and stated that the entire open space
338 subdivision is discretionary on the Board, and the applicant needs to satisfy that regardless of
339 density bonuses. Mr. Goddard stated that he will not be changing the proposed recreation on this
340 application. He believes he is offering an extensive trail network within the open space that
341 connects to an adjacent trail network. There is a gazebo and a pond that's preserved in open space
342 for fishing, reading a book, ice skating, and fishing benches throughout the open space. He believes
343 he has the right to restrict the open space to only this new community. He is willing to provide
344 easements to the Town for future use.

345 Ms. Price noted for the record that a public comment letter was submitted to the Board. Mr. House
346 asked if any members of the public wanted to speak.
347

348 Elizabeth O'Toole of 7 Taylor Court asked for confirmation that the project has a permit from
349 NHDES for wetlands construction. Mr. Scamman replied that the process has not started yet. He
350 added there will be septic approvals and an Alteration of Terrain approval from NHDES. Ms.
351 O'Toole asked if they will be filling in wetlands. Mr. Scamman replied yes, about 3,000 to 4,000
352 square feet. Ms. O'Toole asked how drainage and flooding will be affected in the area with the
353 wetlands filling and digging of wells and installation of septic systems. Mr. Scamman described
354 the proposed wetlands impacts and explained that in addition to the Town's consulting engineer,
355 NHDES will review stormwater management for the project. He described the proposed septic
356 systems locations.
357

358 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion to continue the application to August 20, 2025. Mr. Allison**
359 **seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**
360

361 7. Miscellaneous

362 a. Wetland Sign requirements

364 Ms. Price stated that the Board had agreed on the standard that Mr. Allison presented previously.
365 She presented some samples of signs loaned by town staff for the Board's review on sizing. She
366 asked for comments on the size, material, and text. Mr. Zaremba prefers to have a more detailed
367 list of things not to do and understands that someone might try to do something that is not on the
368 list. He added that people are currently doing stuff in wetlands that is not allowed and recognized
369 that the Board won't be able to cover everything on the sign. The Board finalized the language and
370 size of approximately 12" by 16".
371

372 b. Subdivision Regulation Review

374 Ms. Price introduced subdivision regulations that mimic recent changes in the Site Plan
375 Regulations. She spoke with the DPW Director on potential changes to the driveway regulations
376 and road standards.
377

378 c. Site Plan Addendum A Cistern Specifications Review

380 Ms. Price described that Addendum A currently references a 2004 cistern plan and the fire
381 department recently had an engineering firm update the cistern detail in 2024. She would like to
382 schedule a public hearing to update this reference. The Board agreed.
383

384 8. Adjournment

386 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion to adjourn at 9:42 pm. Mr. Houghton seconded the motion. All**
387 **voted in favor and the motion passed.**