



Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes
February 4, 2026
Stratham Municipal Center
Time: 7:00 pm

Members Present: Thomas House, Chair
David Canada, Vice Chair
Mike Houghton, Ex-Officio Select Board Member
Nate Allison, Alternate Member

Members Absent: Chris Zaremba, Regular Member
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 7:00 pm and took roll call.

2. Review and Approval of Minutes

A. January 21, 2026, Planning Board meeting minutes

Mr. Houghton made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from January 21, 2026. Mr. Canada seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.

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

3. Public Meeting

A. Eric Salovitch of Northam Survey, LLC (Applicant) for Towne Family Revocable Trust (Owner) requests a minor subdivision application with waivers for the creation of two condominium lots from the existing structure with no changes to the land area located at 6 Fifield Lane (Tax Map 6, Lot 127), in the Residential/Agricultural Zoning District. Request for a 30-Day extension.

Ms. Price explained that the Applicant could not attend tonight's meeting and sent a letter requesting an extension to allow additional time to receive State subdivision approval. The State has reviewed the submitted materials, but due to recent weather issues, the required site visit has been delayed. It is anticipated that the site visit will be completed in the next few days.

There were no questions from the Board.

Mr. Houghton made a motion to open the meeting for public comment. Mr. Canada seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed. No members of the public spoke.

45 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to close the meeting for public comment. Mr. Allison seconded**
46 **the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

47
48 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to approve the 30-day extension of the notice of decision of the**
49 **conditional approval subdivision application to obtain state subdivision approval for 6**
50 **Fifield Lane. Mr. Allison seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

- 51
52 B. 41 Portsmouth Avenue LLC (Applicant) and 41 Portsmouth Avenue Realty LLC (Owner) request
53 a Site Plan Review and Conditional Use Permit for a new 30,000 square foot auto dealership at 41
54 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 9, Lot 4 in the Gateway Commercial Business and
55 Residential/Agricultural Districts. Request for a six-month extension.

56
57 Ms. Price explained that the conditional approval was granted on August 20, 2025, and the
58 Applicant is seeking an extension to meet the precedent conditions of the 120-day approval. A six-
59 month extension is requested while they work on responses to NHDES on the AoT permit
60 application and to submit a septic application after the AoT permit is granted.

61
62 **Mr. Canada made a motion to open the meeting for public comment. Mr. Allison seconded**
63 **the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

64
65 Bruce Scamman of Emanuel Engineering and James Verra & Associates spoke on behalf of the
66 Applicant. He reiterated what Ms. Price previously stated and added that on the night of the
67 approval, he explained to the Board that the State approvals would be lengthy, and they asked for
68 a one-year approval at that time.

69
70 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to close the meeting for public comment. Mr. Allison seconded**
71 **the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

72
73 Mr. Canada asked if there is a site plan in the works for the Scamman property (57 Portsmouth
74 Ave). Mr. Scamman replied no. Mr. Canada noted that the property is being used for commercial
75 purposes and wondered if it needs a site plan approval. Mr. Scamman replied that he assumes it
76 has a commercial site plan with parking onsite. Mr. Canada questioned if the current parking lot,
77 as it is being used, is permitted. Mr. Scamman replied that there is a recorded site plan for a
78 business to operate there. Mr. Canada asked how many parking spots are on it. Mr. Scamman does
79 not know. Mr. Canada asked if there is a business operating there. Mr. Scamman replied that there
80 is not one open to the public to his knowledge. Mr. Canada asked Ms. Price her opinion if a site
81 plan is required and noted that just a parking lot is not allowed in the District. Ms. Price replied
82 there is a site plan on record, but not for the change of use. Mr. House stated that the property
83 which is the subject of this discussion, is not the property subject to the extension request.

84
85 Mr. Allison asked where the overflow vehicles are coming from. Chris Lane, the property owner,
86 replied that they are from the Volvo dealership and that they asked to park there in the winter while
87 they deal with snow removal. Mr. Lane stated he told them they could park there as long as they
88 were on the pavement, where there is parking, and it was clear to Volvo that they could not park
89 on the grass. Mr. Allison asked if it was temporary, and the vehicles will now be removed since
90 their parking should have been cleared of snow. Mr. Lane does not know if their area is clear of
91 snow. Mr. Allison asked what does Volvo do in a typical winter if that lot was not available.

92
93 Mr. Lane stated he does not know.

95 Mr. Canada commented that a change of use requires a site plan and that a parking lot is not
96 allowed. Ms. Price agreed. Mr. Canada told Mr. Lane that this needs to be addressed.

97
98 Mr. House requested a motion on the agenda item.

99
100 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to approve the six-month extension of the Notice of Decision**
101 **on conditional approval due to obtaining AoT approval for 41 Portsmouth Avenue. Mr.**
102 **Allison seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

- 103
104 C. Copley Properties LLC (Applicant) and Helen E. Gallant Revocable Trust of 1995 (Owner),
105 request for approval of a Residential Open Space Cluster Subdivision and Conditional Use Permit
106 for a proposed subdivision of 80 and 80R Winnicutt Road, Tax Map 14, Lots 56 and 57, Zoned
107 Residential/Agricultural. Request for a six-month extension.

108
109 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to open the meeting to the public.**

110
111 Ms. Price explained that the conditional approval is set to expire on March 2nd and the Applicant
112 requested an extension due to AoT resubmission requirements, wetlands permitting, and the need
113 to apply for septic approvals.

114
115 **Mr. Canada seconded the motion to open the meeting to the public. All voted in favor, and**
116 **the motion passed.**

117
118 Bruce Scamman of Emanuel Engineering and James Verra & Associates spoke on behalf of the
119 Applicant. He reiterated that they are continuing to work on state approvals and are hoping to have
120 approvals within six months, but he does not guarantee that. Mr. Houghton asked if that is typical.
121 Mr. Scamman replied yes and certain groups are worse than others. He stated that DOT is usually
122 a longer timeframe; he has been working on a DOT permit in Brentwood for two years trying to
123 get approval.

124
125 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to close the meeting to the public. Mr. Allison seconded the**
126 **motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

127
128 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to approve the six-month extension of the Notice of Decision**
129 **subject to a conditional approval of obtaining AoT approval for 80 and 80R Winnicutt Road.**
130 **Mr. Canada seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

131
132 **4. Public Hearing**

- 133 A. Bruce Bisbano (Applicant) and Roger Groux, Thirty-Eight Portsmouth Ave LLC (Owner) request
134 for approval of a Site Plan Amendment for the existing Citizens Bank at 36 Portsmouth Avenue
135 (Tax Map 9, Lot 117) in the Gateway Commercial Business District. Proposed changes include
136 expanding the existing bank building by closing in the drive-through while retaining a drive-up
137 ATM, updated landscaping, and the conversion of one parking space into an EV parking space.
138 Continued from January 21, 2026.

139
140 Ms. Price briefly described the project. The Applicant has addressed several staff comments and
141 submitted five waiver requests. She noted that three of the waiver requests (checklist item E HISS
142 mapping, checklist item F test pits, and checklist item G7 2-foot topographic contours) need to be
143 reviewed by the Board before making a determination on application completeness.

145 Bruce Bisbano presented the waiver justification. Regarding HISS mapping, he explained the
146 scope of the project is to infill under the existing drive-up canopy and there is no other work onsite.
147 They are not changing any of the existing asphalt grading with the exception of removing asphalt
148 at the existing drive-up area which is the extent of the excavation work. Regarding test pits, they
149 are not making any adjustments that require perc tests or test pits. Regarding 2-foot contours, there
150 are grade points on the drawings showing the scope and there are less than 2-foot contours in the
151 work area.

152
153 Mr. House asked for comments from the Board on the HISS mapping waiver. Mr. Allison stated
154 that it is a de minimis amount of disturbance on the site. Mr. Houghton and Mr. Canada agreed.

155
156 Mr. House asked for comments from the Board on the test pit waiver. Mr. Allison asked if they
157 are using the existing septic system and tank. Mr. Bisbano replied yes and the existing well. Mr.
158 House asked questions on the project design to confirm that there is no increase in water usage.
159 Mr. Bisbano described the changes as basically a reconfiguration of interior space to allow for
160 more accessible handicap restrooms and more space for customers queuing.

161
162 **Mr. Canada made a motion to open the hearing to the public. Mr. Allison seconded the**
163 **motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.** No members of the public spoke.

164
165 **Mr. Canada made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver from Site Plan**
166 **Checklist item F (test pits) as specific circumstances relative to the site plan indicate that the**
167 **waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations by the following**
168 **findings of fact:**

- 169 a. **The granting of the waiver will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, or welfare**
170 **or injurious to other property and will promote the public interest;**
- 171 b. **The waiver will not, in any manner, vary other provisions of the Stratham Zoning**
172 **Ordinance;**
- 173 c. **Such waiver will substantially secure the objectives, standards, and requirements of these**
174 **regulations;**
- 175 d. **A particular and identifiable hardship exists as neither a subdivision nor leach field are**
176 **being proposed as part of this project and therefore strict conformity to the requirement**
177 **would be unnecessary to the applicant and has no bearing on the expansion of the existing**
178 **building.**

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

180
181 **Mr. Houghton made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver from Site Plan**
182 **Checklist item E (HISS mapping) as specific circumstances relative to the site plan indicate**
183 **that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations by the following**
184 **findings of fact:**

- 185 1. **The granting of the waiver will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, or welfare**
186 **or injurious to other property and will promote the public interest;**
- 187 2. **The waiver will not, in any manner, vary other provisions of the Stratham Zoning**
188 **Ordinance;**
- 189 3. **Such waiver will substantially secure the objectives, standards, and requirements of these**
190 **regulations;**
- 191 4. **A particular and identifiable hardship exists as a leach field is not being proposed as part**
192 **of this project and the lot is served by existing sewer therefore performing test pits and**
193 **percolation tests to determine the area reserved for leach fields would be an unnecessary**

194 **hardship to the applicant and has no bearing on the expansion of the existing building.**
195 **Mr. Canada seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

196 **Mr. Allison made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver from Site Plan**
197 **Checklist item G7 (2-foot contours) as specific circumstances relative to the site plan indicate**
198 **that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations by the following**
199 **findings of fact:**

- 200 **1. The granting of the waiver will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, or welfare**
201 **or injurious to other property and will promote the public interest;**
- 202 **2. The waiver will not, in any manner, vary other provisions of the Stratham Zoning**
203 **Ordinance;**
- 204 **3. Such waiver will substantially secure the objectives, standards, and requirements of these**
205 **regulations;**
- 206 **4. A particular and identifiable hardship exists as the site proposes no changes to the**
207 **current topography of the area associated with the 578 square-foot addition and the**
208 **landscape upgrades.**

209 **Mr. Canada seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

210
211 Mr. House invited Mr. Bisbano to present the waivers for stormwater requirements and surveyor
212 requirements.

213
214 Mr. Bisbano presented the waiver request from Site Plan Regulations Addendum C, B.ii, waiver
215 option for small development projects. He explained that the proposed scope is removal of existing
216 asphalt and replacing the majority of it with an addition where the canopy was. Their civil engineer
217 performed calculations, and the impervious area was reduced thereby improving drainage. There
218 are no other adjustments to the grading of asphalt and all runoff will follow the same path that it
219 takes currently. He stated there are no problems with stormwater now and they will be improving
220 it.

221
222 There were no comments from the Board or the public.

223
224 **Mr. Houghton made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver from the Site Plan**
225 **as specific circumstances relative to the Site Plan Regulations Section B.ii of Addendum C**
226 **(Stormwater standards) indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent**
227 **of the regulations by the following findings of fact:**

- 228 **1. The granting of the waiver will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, or welfare**
229 **or injurious to other property and will promote the public interest;**
- 230 **2. The waiver will not, in any manner, vary other provisions of the Stratham Zoning**
231 **Ordinance;**
- 232 **3. Such waiver will substantially secure the objectives, standards, and requirements of these**
233 **regulations;**
- 234 **4. A particular and identifiable hardship exists as the site projects disturbs less than 43,560**
235 **square feet; creating less than 20,000 square feet of new impervious surface; and do not**
236 **disturb land within 100 feet of a surface water body or wetland comprised of less than**
237 **5,000 square feet based on wetland delineation.**

238 **Mr. Canada seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

239
240 Mr. Bisbano presented the waiver request from the Site Plan Regulations, Section 4.4.2, Surveyor
241 Requirement. He explained that the plans show existing conditions with property lines in blue and
242 zoning setbacks in red. The existing building and drive-up canopy are well within the setbacks,

243 and they are not extending any closer to adjacent properties. For those reasons, they request a
244 waiver to not have the property surveyed.
245 Mr. Canada asked if it has been previously surveyed. Mr. Bisbano replied that they don't have a
246 record of it and that the owner thinks he might have one. He added that the site plan matches up
247 well with the town's GIS maps and they would be willing to perform a survey prior to issuance of
248 a building permit, but they couldn't get it completed now and they are trying to get the project
249 completed before Labor Day. Mr. Canada stated that he doesn't see the need for a survey since the
250 footprint isn't really changing. Mr. Houghton and Mr. Allison agreed.

251
252 **Mr. Canada made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver from the Site Plan as**
253 **specific circumstances relative to the Site Plan Regulations Section 4.4.2(a) (Surveyor**
254 **requirement) indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the**
255 **regulations by the following findings of fact:**

- 256 **1. The granting of the waiver will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, or welfare**
257 **or injurious to other property and will promote the public interest;**
- 258 **2. The waiver will not, in any manner, vary other provisions of the Stratham Zoning**
259 **Ordinance;**
- 260 **3. Such waiver will substantially secure the objectives, standards, and requirements of these**
261 **regulations;**
- 262 **4. A particular and identifiable hardship exists as an architect can sign off on landscape**
263 **plans and the minimal site expansion.**

264 **Mr. Allison seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

265
266 **Mr. Houghton made a motion that the Planning Board accept the application as complete.**
267 **Mr. Canada seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

268
269 Mr. House invited Mr. Bisbano to present the application.

270
271 Mr. Bisbano described the architecture including the intent to blend new brick and wood trim to
272 match the existing and restoring some brick on the building. They will restore quite a bit of
273 woodwork due to rot and will replace roofing. The front of the building will stay the same. They
274 performed a lighting study and will install new lighting. Current conditions are dark in some areas,
275 and the bank tries to maintain two foot-candles within 50 feet of entrances and banking equipment.
276 Mr. Bisbano stepped through the details of the lighting.

277
278 Mr. Houghton asked if the lighting is dark sky compliant. Mr. Bisbano replied yes.

279
280 Mr. Bisbano described the internal changes and asked the board if there were any questions on
281 that. There were no questions.

282
283 Mr. Bisbano described the exterior changes and asked the board if there were any questions.

284
285 Mr. House asked for confirmation that they are basically matching all the existing materials. Mr.
286 Bisbano replied yes.

287
288 Mr. Bisbano briefly described the site plan overlay.

289
290 Mr. Houghton asked where the existing ATM is. Mr. Bisbano replied there is a remote ATM. There
291 are three lanes and it is in the third lane.

292

293 Mr. Houghton asked Ms. Price if a waiver is needed because at one point drive-throughs were not
294 permitted in the Gateway District and questioned where this is a remodel, is one required for the
295 ATM. Ms. Price replied that a Conditional Use Permit is required for drive up ATMs, but because
296 they already have one, she does not think an additional CUP is needed. Mr. House added that it is
297 an existing condition. Mr. Houghton stated that he just wanted to insure technical correctness. Ms.
298 Price added that a new ATM that is not pre-existing would need a conditional use permit for a
299 drive-through ATM. Mr. Allison stated that what they've done is remove two drive-up lanes and
300 move the ATM further out from the building, so it's really just a change in the location of the
301 ATM.

302
303 Mr. Bisbano continued presenting the site plan. They will install one EV charger. Mr. House stated
304 it looks like it is a good distance away from the building. Mr. Bisbano replied yes. Mr. House
305 stated that in the past the fire department was concerned with EV chargers close to buildings. Ms.
306 Price stated the fire chief had concerns initially and wanted it closer to the building, but there's
307 nothing in the fire code for them to be able to do that and he didn't have an issue overall for this
308 one.

309
310 Mr. Bisbano presented the parking, site circulation, and dumpster location. The bank was
311 concerned with the vendor accessing the dumpster. Mr. Bisbano presented an alternative location
312 and the travel directions and asked the Board for their thoughts on that. Mr. House stated that the
313 direction doesn't concern him and stated that there must be fencing around the dumpster.

314
315 Mr. Bisbano presented the landscaping plan, fire truck analysis, and some lighting changes. Mr.
316 House asked if there will be lighting at the trash. Mr. Bisbano showed the light pattern for the
317 nearest fixture. Mr. House asked if that is one fixture. Mr. Bisbano replied yes. Mr. House noted
318 that is a lot of light for one fixture.

319
320 Mr. Bisbano asked for questions from the Board. Mr. Allison is pleased that they prepared a
321 lighting plan as it shows a good idea of the impact. Mr. Bisbano replied that there is a banking
322 regulation that requires a certain light level within the entrances for security.

323
324 Mr. House asked how big the logo is on the building. Ms. Price did not ask the Applicant that. Mr.
325 Canada noted for the record that just because signage is on the plan doesn't mean it is correct with
326 respect to the Ordinance. Mr. Bisbano agreed.

327
328 There were no comments from the public or the Board.

329
330 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Canada seconded the motion.**
331 **All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

332
333 **Mr. Houghton made a motion that the Planning Board grant conditional approval for a Site**
334 **Plan Amendment for the existing Citizens Bank at 36 Portsmouth Avenue (Tax Map 9, Lot**
335 **117) in the Gateway Commercial Business District. The proposed changes include expanding**
336 **the existing bank building by closing in the drive-through while retaining a drive-up ATM,**
337 **updated landscaping, and the conversion of one parking space into an EV parking space. Mr.**
338 **Allison seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

339
340 B. Packer Brook Holdings LLC (Applicant and Owner) request for approval of a Site Plan and
341 Conditional Use Permits for a Mixed-Use Development. This development is to include a Light
342 Manufacturing Facility and proposed construction within the wetland setback. The project involves

343 constructing a new ±6,110 square foot office/shop for a residential contracting business. This
344 facility will be located behind an existing single-family residence, which will continue to operate
345 in its current capacity. The location is at 170 Portsmouth Avenue (Tax Map 17, Lot 86) in the
346 Route 33 Legacy Highway Heritage Zoning District.

347
348 Ms. Price explained that the Board's materials include a staff review memo and meeting minutes
349 from the staff working group. The Applicant completed a preliminary consultation on September
350 17, 2025, and the application includes two waiver requests from HISS mapping and from parking
351 limitations in the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Price does not believe a waiver from parking is the
352 appropriate process. She continued that NHDOT has jurisdiction for the road and regarding the
353 parking and access road around the building, she wants to make sure of the durability for fire and
354 delivery trucks. The Applicant will present the project to the Legacy Highway Heritage District
355 advisory committee next week. The Conservation Commission meeting was held last Thursday
356 and their comments are in the staff report. The Conservation Commission did not have issue with
357 granting the Conditional Use Permit but they did have some discussion about wetland mitigation
358 and they would like to see less impervious surface for parking areas. The project requires two
359 Conditional Use Permits, one for wetlands and one for the mixed-use development. Regarding
360 staff comments, the fire department requested that the plans be updated to include turning radii for
361 the Exeter and Portsmouth ladder trucks. The Heritage Commission chair has concerns with
362 impervious surface for parking. He had no problem with the architectural side views but there are
363 some architectural comments that will be brought up at the Heritage Commission in more detail.
364 Ms. Price stated the Board needs to review the waivers, determine application completeness, and
365 possibly refer the project to the ZBA for relief.

366
367 Mr. House requested a presentation on the waiver requests.

368
369 Eric Weinrieb of Altus Engineering introduced Chris Redmond and Jeff Stacy, owners of Packer
370 Brook Holding (property owner) and Mighty Roots (occupant). He presented the waiver request
371 from HISS mapping. The use is very small as far as septic system loading at 300 gallons per day.
372 They are not doing any work near or in the wetlands. They completed two test pits for the septic
373 system that were witnessed by Mike Cuomo and found exceptional soils and no seasonal high
374 water table. They also completed four more test pits for stormwater management and had similar
375 results where it is an excessively well drained soil, no water table, no evidence of water on the
376 entire site, so they believe it meets and exceeds the intent of the requirement for the waiver.

377
378 Regarding the parking waiver, Mr. Weinrieb believes there is a conflict in the regulations. He
379 described the parking as two unstriped stalls for the single-family residence and for the commercial
380 building there are three paved spaces for clients and handicap accessibility. They propose a lower
381 impact site design using gravel around the property. There are ten parallel areas for parking around
382 the building and seven head in for staff. The parallel parking are not striped but are called out on
383 the plans as parking. They are not designated parking spaces and being a gravel surface, people
384 don't usually park efficiently. Because of that, they are showing more parking than what is
385 technically allowed. The spaces would be used only periodically when they have functions like
386 staff meetings. Mr. Redmond added that they have monthly meetings with all employees that is
387 about an hour long. Mr. Houghton asked how many people. Mr. Redmond replied right now they
388 have 17. Mr. Weinrieb stated if they narrow the lane around the building, there will be issues with
389 emergency vehicle access. He suggested that they could label that area as overflow and stated that
390 they don't think they need a variance; that they are complaint, are providing a good use of the land
391 and are being respective of the environment.

393 Mr. House asked Ms. Price to explain the requirements. Ms. Price stated the Site Plan Regulations
394 require spaces for single-family dwellings and sets a number of spaces needed per 1,000 square
395 feet of gross floor area for commercial uses. This project is approximately 6,000 square feet. Mr.
396 Weinrieb stated they used 6,107 in the calculation on Sheet C2. He suggested changing the label
397 designation to overflow area. The alternative is to narrow the gravel area around the building but
398 with snow piles, that will hinder emergency access. In warm weather they could park on the grass.
399

400 Ms. Price explained that per the Site Plan Regulations, two spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross
401 floor area is required for industrial use and for single-family use the requirement is two spaces per
402 dwelling unit. The discrepancy is that they are not providing adequate parking for the paved areas
403 and in Section 3.10.6 of the Zoning Ordinance, parking areas must be limited and sufficiently
404 screened and cannot exceed the minimum number required in the Site Plan Regulations by a factor
405 of more than 15% unless the Planning Board waives the requirement by determining that the
406 additional parking is provided in the form of overflow parking that is used only for Special Events
407 and/or unusual circumstances and includes a pervious surface treatment. She stated that the Board
408 needs to determine if the lack of striping and plan labeling allows the Board to waive the
409 requirements. Ms. Price and the Code Enforcement Officer advised the Applicant that they need
410 to seek relief from the ZBA because of the increase in the size of parking.
411

412 Mr. House asked if the residence is a single dwelling. Mr. Weinrieb replied yes, it is a single
413 dwelling. Mr. House asked if the parking for the commercial building must be paved. Mr. Weinrieb
414 replied that the Ordinance is vague and says there can be gravel surfaces and that is supported by
415 the Conservation Commission. Ms. Price added that there are minimum sizing and dimensional
416 requirements in the parking requirements. Construction requirements mention striping, grading,
417 loam materials, etc. It also states that the Planning Board may allow for gravel parking in certain
418 cases when considering the unique characteristics of the land, the proposed use, drainage, dust
419 control and if gravel parking surfaces promote and preserve the rural character of Stratham. Mr.
420 House asked if the tenant spaces can be gravel. Ms. Price replied it is not clear, but yes. Mr. House
421 summarized that they show three paved spaces in the front and seven on the north side of the
422 building and the rest could be lay down area. Mr. Weinrieb replied it is more like a driveway than
423 a lay down area as they don't intend to store materials there.
424

425 Mr. Houghton stated that he agrees with the three plus seven spots and removing the lines around
426 the building.
427

428 Mr. Canada stated that he doesn't have a problem with gravel parking spots if that's the question.
429 Mr. House replied they have too many parking spaces per code. Mr. Allison clarified that the seven
430 gravel spaces will not be demarcated, it is just demonstrated on the plan how many vehicles they
431 could have assuming standard size, which they marked on the plan. Mr. Canada and Mr. Allison
432 agree with not showing the additional parking on the plan.
433

434 Mr. Weinrieb addressed screening of the parking from the street. He presented photos of the site
435 showing that they more than meet screening with existing conditions. Even with leaves removed
436 for the season, one can barely see the top of the hill where the building will be. Therefore, they do
437 not believe a waiver is required. Additionally, the location of the existing septic system makes
438 adding some landscaping difficult.
439

440 Mr. Canada commented that the existing vegetation needs to be added to the site plan if the intent
441 is to use it for screening.
442

443 Mr. Allison commented and asked for confirmation that the new building is roughly 250 feet back
444 from the edge of the road. Mr. Weinrieb replied his notes have it at 240 feet from the street.
445 Mr. Houghton commented that traveling along Route 33 at 45 miles per hour, it won't be seen in
446 his opinion. He is interested to hear an opinion from the Heritage Commission.
447

448 Mr. House asked that they bring a photo of the vegetation on one side of the driveway by the
449 neighbors.
450

451 Mr. Allison commented that Sheet C2 shows existing and proposed tree lines and there is quite a
452 bit of vegetation proposed to be removed, maybe 60 to 70 feet wide. Mr. Weinrieb replied that
453 when coming from the north towards the site, there is an abutting home and the angle to see into
454 the site is very acute. Mr. Allison stated that he was describing what he thinks will be seen from
455 the roadway and will be a clear shot after construction; that right now vegetation blocks off about
456 halfway in front of the proposed buildings. Mr. Weinrieb replied that he believes the tree shown
457 in the rendering is much more substantial, it's a 20-inch maple with a much more substantial
458 canopy. Mr. Allison asked if they will install fencing to protect the tree during construction to
459 protect the root system. Mr. Weinrieb replied yes. Mr. Allison added that it should be installed out
460 to the drip line of the tree. The discussion on existing and proposed landscaping continued and Mr.
461 Weinrieb corrected himself that it is a 50-inch, not 20-inch maple tree and added that they have
462 proposed landscaping around the building.
463

464 Mr. House suggested that they add screening in one area near the residential parking and regarding
465 the building in the back, it seems sufficient. Chris Redmond stated that residential homes aren't
466 required to screen their parking and questioned the requirement. Mr. House replied because it is a
467 mixed-use site now. Mr. Weinrieb asked if a 4-foot high fence would meet the intent. Mr. House
468 prefers landscaping and not a fence because it is more rural. He asked for input from the other
469 board members; they agreed. Ms. Price asked if that will affect snow storage. Mr. Weinrieb
470 believed for the most part the existing snow storage should be sufficient.
471

472 Mr. Weinrieb asked if they add the suggested landscaping for the residential parking, is a waiver
473 needed. Mr. House replied if they meet the zoning regulations then they don't need the waiver.
474

475 Mr. House stated that the project will need to come back before the Planning Board after other
476 meetings. Ms. Price confirmed that the Heritage District Advisory Committee meeting is next
477 week, and she recommends that the project be reviewed by the Town's engineering consultant.
478

479 Mr. House asked for Board comments on the HISS mapping waiver request. Mr. Allison stated
480 they completed soil logs and perc tests and found sandy material with fast perc rates. He agrees
481 with a waiver. Mr. Canada agrees that the soil tests are pretty good at the site and agrees with the
482 waiver but noted that he has a problem waiving the same requirement for every application. Mr.
483 Houghton agrees with the waiver due to there being an existing septic system and soil testing was
484 performed, but a brand new site plan with new construction would need it.
485

486 Mr. House invited members of the public to speak.
487

488 Mario Izzo of 172 Portsmouth Avenue spoke against the project. He is worried about the valuation
489 of his property going down. He saw this happen to his dad who lost \$200,000 from the sale of his
490 property in Massachusetts. He is also concerned about his water table because his well is in the
491 back area.
492

493 Mr. Houghton noted that the public comment is general in nature and public comment is being
494 accepted for the waiver request only at this time. Mr. House agreed and asked Mr. Izzo if he has
495 any comments specific to HISS mapping. Mr. Izzo replied he is against the whole project. Mr.
496 House explained they will leave the public hearing open and that the Applicant will come back to
497 the next meeting. Mr. Allison asked if Mr. Izzo could find someone who is knowledgeable in real
498 estate and come back to talk about property valuation. Mr. Izzo replied okay.

499
500 Mr. House requested a motion on the waiver for HISS mapping.

501
502 **Mr. Houghton made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver from Site Plan**
503 **Checklist Item E (HISS mapping) as specific circumstances relative to the site plan indicate**
504 **that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations based on the**
505 **following findings of fact:**

- 506 **a. The granting of the waiver will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, or welfare**
507 **or injurious to other property and will promote the public interest;**
508 **b. The waiver will not, in any manner, vary other provisions of the Stratham Zoning**
509 **Ordinance;**
510 **c. Such waiver will substantially secure the objectives, standards, and requirements of these**
511 **regulations;**
512 **d. A particular and identifiable hardship exists as the soil report from the USDA NRCS**
513 **shows the identifications that only two types of soil on the site exist, Windsor loamy sand**
514 **and Deerfield fine sand, and both have the properties of an “A” hydrologic soil group.**

515 **Mr. Allison seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

516
517 Ms. Price asked Mr. House how the Board would like to handle the parking waiver request that
518 was submitted. It was discussed and the Applicant requested to withdraw the waiver request from
519 Section 3.10.6.d.i of the Zoning Ordinance as it pertains to surface parking areas.

520
521 Mr. Weinrieb asked if the third-party review automatically happens at this point. Ms. Price replied
522 that the Board will make a motion for that and Ms. Price will request a task order from the
523 consultant that she will forward to Mr. Weinrieb.

524
525 Mr. Weinrieb asked for a discussion on the wetlands conditional use permit and the location of
526 wetland buffer plaques. They propose them 50 feet from the wetland as portions of the existing
527 home and septic system are within 75 feet and therefore placement at 75 feet does not seem
528 appropriate. He added this was presented to the Conservation Commission and they did not have
529 an issue with it. The Commission asked that some additional areas be allowed to naturalize.

530
531 Mr. House stopped the discussion so that the Board can make a determination of application
532 completeness.

533
534 **Mr. Canada made a motion to accept the application as complete. Mr. House seconded the**
535 **motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

536
537 Mr. House requested a motion for third-party engineering review.

538
539 **Mr. Allison made a motion for third-party engineering review. Mr. Houghton seconded the**
540 **motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

541
542 Mr. House returned to the wetland signage discussion. Mr. Allison commented that a bioretention

543 area is proposed within the 75-foot wetland setback and that area will require maintenance. Mr.
544 Weinrieb added that the disturbance is between 50 and 75 feet of the wetland and is an area that is
545 maintained today. He described the disturbance in detail. Mr. House asked if the existing septic is
546 within 75 feet. Mr. Weinrieb replied yes and that needs to be maintained to prevent woody
547 vegetation.

548
549 Mr. House asked the Applicant to locate Mr. Izzo's well on the drawings. Mr. Izzo agreed to allow
550 access to his property to locate the well.

551
552 Mr. Canada asked if the Applicant would be willing to give the Town a historic easement on the
553 exterior of the existing home. Mr. Redmond replied it is a historic home with vinyl, so it has been
554 compromised already. If they do anything, they want to improve it. Mr. Canada suggested that he
555 will put the Heritage Commission chair in touch with the Applicant. Mr. Canada asked if they
556 would be willing to install a historic sign on the home. Mr. Redmond replied there is plaque on the
557 front door with the original owner's name. Mr. Canada explained that the Heritage Commission is
558 installing new signs on historic homes with the date of the original build and would like to see one
559 of those on the home, and asked if they are amenable to that. The Applicants replied yes.

560
561 Mr. Canada commented that the design and materials for the proposed building does not conform
562 with the zoning. Mr. Redmond replied that they received some feedback on that and the shop
563 building will not be metal as originally proposed; they will use vertical wood siding. The office
564 building will be clapboards. Mr. House asked that they update the drawings to reflect that.

565
566 There were no further questions from the Board.

567
568 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to approve a Conditional Use Permit for Section 11.6.1 for the**
569 **construction within the 50-foot wetlands setback for a disturbance area not to exceed 2,350**
570 **square feet. Mr. Allison seconded the motion.**

571
572 The Board briefly discussed the Conditional Use Permit for the mixed-use development and
573 decided to wait for review by the Route 33 Heritage District Advisory Committee before taking
574 action on the application.

575
576 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to continue the application for Tax Map 17 Lot 86, Mighty**
577 **Roots to March 4, 2026. Mr. Canada seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion**
578 **passed.**

579
580 Mr. House asked that the Applicant ensure that Mr. Izzo is made aware of the date and time for
581 the Advisory Committee and Heritage Commission meetings.

582
583 **5. Miscellaneous**

584 A. Subdivision Regulations
585 Ms. Price explained that Mr. Allison provided some draft language for Board review regarding lot line
586 layouts. Mr. Allison presented his draft language and rationale.

587
588 **6. Adjourn**

589
590 **Mr. Canada made a motion to adjourn at 9:29 pm. Mr. Allison seconded the motion. All voted**
591 **in favor, and the motion passed. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

592

