



Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes
May 6, 2026
Stratham Municipal Center
Time: 7:00 pm

Members Present: Thomas House, Chair
John Kunowski, Vice Chair
Jay Fraprie, Regular Member
Nate Allison, Alternate Member

Members Absent: Chris Zaremba, Regular Member
Tedd Tramaloni, Ex-Officio Select Board 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 7:01 pm and took roll call. Mr. House appointed Mr. Allison as a voting member for the meeting.

2. Review and Approval of Minutes

A. April 15, 2026, Planning Board meeting minutes

Mr. Kunowski made a motion to approve the April 15th minutes as drafted. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.

3. Public Hearing (Old Business)

A. Ben Collins (Applicant and Owner) request for a Conditional Use Permit for a proposed swimming pool, patio surround, and fence at 11 Treat Farm Road (Tax Map 14, Lot 167) in the Residential-Agricultural District and the Wetlands Conservation Overlay District. The project includes the construction of a 16-foot by 40-foot swimming pool, patio surround, and fence within the wetlands setback.

Ms. Price explained that the applicant is moving forward with getting a survey of the property and requested that the application be continued to the June 3rd meeting.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion to continue the application for 11 Treat Farm Road to June 3, 2026 at 7:00 pm for the application to provide the town with the requested site plan from the April 15, 2026 Planning Board meeting and to receive the recommendation by the Conservation Commission. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

B. Packer Brook Holdings LLC (Applicant and Owner) request for approval of a Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit for a Mixed-Use Development. This development is to include a Light Manufacturing Facility and proposed construction within the wetland setback. The project involves constructing a new ±6,110 square foot office/shop for a residential contracting business. This

45 facility will be located behind an existing single-family residence, which will continue to operate
46 in its current capacity. The location is at 170 Portsmouth Avenue (Tax Map 17, Lot 86) in Route
47 33 Legacy Highway Heritage Zoning District. The applications were submitted by Altus
48 Engineering, LLC, 133 Court Street, Portsmouth, NH 03801.
49

50 Ms. Price introduced the project, explaining that there are minimal comments from the Town
51 Engineer dated April 8, 2026, and applications for approval include the Route 33 Heritage District,
52 Conditional Use Permit for a mixed-use development, and Site Plan Review.
53

54 Eric Weinrieb of Altus Engineering introduced the project team of Chris Redmond and Jeff Stacy
55 from Mighty Roots and Packer Brook Holdings, and Kevin Baum, attorney for the project. Mr.
56 Weinrieb addressed comments from the town's consulting engineer (CMA) that requested signage
57 for public and staff parking. He stated this is a rural area and the owners would like to keep it
58 looking rural, and they do not see a benefit for the signs. He added that staff will know that they
59 are not to park in the paved areas, and visitors will not drive around the building to park. He
60 believes this is common sense and asked that it not be included as a condition of approval.
61

62 Mr. Weinrieb responded to CMA's second comment on handicap accessible parking for staff. He
63 stated that only one space is required by code, and that is what they provided. If there is an
64 employee with a disability, he believes it would be very unlikely that there would be a public
65 visitor with a need for the space as well. Mr. House suggested putting the hash marks in the middle,
66 identifying one space, and making sure that the other side of the space is sized properly in case it
67 does happen, because the hatching is currently on the end. Mr. Weinrieb agreed.
68

69 Regarding CMA's comment on the fire truck-turning templates, Mr. Weinrieb explained that they
70 can refine the plans.
71

72 Regarding comments from the Route 33 Heritage District Advisory Committee, Mr. Weinrieb
73 stated that he is uncomfortable with additional comments from one committee member being
74 presented to the project team after the meeting. The comments were related to invasive species
75 control and Mr. Weinrieb stated that he believes a landscaper is the most able-bodied person to
76 delineate that in the field as opposed to adding the species to the plan in advance. He added that
77 the Code Enforcement Officer can confirm the removal at the end of the project. He suggested a
78 change to the condition that includes 'delineated in the field' and confirmed before a certificate of
79 occupancy. The Board agreed to the change.
80

81 Mr. Weinrieb continued that he doesn't understand the comment about "reorganizing the building
82 on the plans that fit a traditional New England feel". His opinion is that the layout and site design
83 has been fully vetted and it is a late in the project to start reorganizing the buildings on the site.
84 Ms. Price explained that the project was presented as a conceptual plan to the Route 33 Heritage
85 District Advisory Committee in February and the project has been updated since that meeting.
86

87 Mr. Kunowski asked about the visibility of the shop building from Route 33. Mr. Weinrieb
88 explained that the property slopes up in that location and that coming from the north the building
89 will not be seen at all and there will be a slight glimpse traveling north.
90

91 Mr. Weinrieb asked for a waiver from the landscape plan certification block on the plan set as a
92 landscape architect did not prepare the plan, it was a landscaper. However, there was input from a
93 landscape architect on the plan. Mr. Allison commented that a number of species on the plan may
94 not be deer resistant, and he suggested that the project team have the landscape architect review

95 that. Mr. Stacy replied they did provide input, but he is not sure if they specifically were thinking
96 about deer. There were no further questions from the Board on the landscape stamp request.

97
98 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board accept the waiver of Section 5.2.N.2**
99 **requiring the landscape plan certification mark to be on the final set. Mr. Fraprie seconded**
100 **the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

101
102 Mr. House invited the public to speak. There were no comments.

103
104 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion to close the application to public comments. Mr. Fraprie**
105 **seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

106
107 The Board reviewed the Route 33 Heritage District Application and there was no discussion.

108
109 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board approve the Route 33 Heritage**
110 **District application for the proposed mixed-use project for the construction of a new**
111 **approximately 6,110 square foot office shop for a residential contracting business. Mr.**
112 **Fraprie seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

113
114 Mr. House invited the Applicant to present the CUP criteria for the mixed-use development.

115
116 Mr. Weinrieb stepped through the justification for each of the criteria as presented on the
117 application. Mr. Kunowski asked if the business operations include the use of any caustic materials
118 that require venting to the outside. Mr. Stacy replied, no they are just building cabinets and water-
119 based finishing is used when performed in house. Mr. Kunowski asked if there are any exhaust
120 vents proposed. Mr. Stacy replied no.

121
122 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board approve the Conditional Use Permit**
123 **from the Stratham Zoning Ordinance for Section 3.6 Table of Uses, for the request for a**
124 **mixed-use development to include light industry for the use of custom cabinet making with**
125 **the building size not to exceed the maximum of 6,700 total square feet allowable; as the**
126 **Planning Board determines that the proposal conforms to all of the following conditional use**
127 **permit criteria:**

- 128 **1. Spirit and Intent. The proposed development is located on a parcel with no existing**
129 **zoning violations and has been designed to be consistent with the spirit and intent of**
130 **the Stratham Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance. To ensure that commercial activity**
131 **does not detract from the District's residential and rural character, the Planning**
132 **Board finds that the proposed mixed-use development, consisting of an approximately**
133 **6,110 square foot light manufacturing/office space for a residential contracting**
134 **business alongside an existing residential use, is appropriate for the Heritage District.**
135 **The architectural design aligns with the rural and residential character of the District.**
136 **As the total building area exceeds 4,200 square feet, the Board may permit a**
137 **commercial component larger than 2,500 square feet, provided that the development**
138 **is mixed use and that residential or agricultural uses comprise at least 40% of the total**
139 **floor area.**
- 140 **2. Site suitability: The site is suitable for the proposed use, offering appropriate vehicular**
141 **access, adequate access for public services, and necessary utilities including water,**
142 **sewage disposal, stormwater management, and electricity. No environmental**
143 **constraints have been identified that would preclude the proposed use.**

- 144 3. **External impacts: The external impacts of the proposed use on abutting properties**
145 **and the neighborhood shall be no greater than the impacts of surrounding existing**
146 **uses or other uses permitted in the zone. Anticipated impacts related to traffic, noise,**
147 **odors, dust, fumes, vibration, hours of operation, and lighting are limited and will be**
148 **managed through defined business hours and the nature of the proposed use.**
149 4. **The layout, design, and proposed structures are compatible with the established**
150 **character of the area. The Route 33 Heritage District Advisory Committee has**
151 **reviewed the project and recommended approval based on the revisions presented.**
152 **The proposal supports mixed-use development while providing appropriate buffering**
153 **to adjacent residential areas and maintaining the historic character of the highway**
154 **corridor—its structures, landscapes, and overall visual integrity.**
155 5. **There will be no greater diminution of neighboring property values than would be**
156 **created under any other use or development permitted in the underlying zone;**
157 6. **The proposed use will not have a negative fiscal impact on the Town.**
158 7. **The proposed use serves the public interest by supporting local economic activity and**
159 **contributing to a balanced mix of uses within the District.**
160

161 Mr. House commented that the siding material is not listed on the architectural elevations for the
162 front building and asked what is proposed. Someone on the project team replied wood. There were
163 no additional comments or questions.
164

165 **Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**
166

167 Mr. House requested a motion on the site plan review application.
168

169 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board conditionally approve the site plan**
170 **for the proposed development of a Mixed-Use Development to include a Light**
171 **Manufacturing Facility, proposed construction within the wetland setback with the**
172 **construction of a new ±6,110 square foot office/shop for a residential contracting business**
173 **with the existing family residence remaining. The location is at 170 Portsmouth Avenue (Tax**
174 **Map 17, Lot 86) in Route 33 Legacy Highway Heritage Zoning District. This is subject to the**
175 **site plan titled “Mighty Roots World Headquarters Office/Shop” by Altus Engineering,**
176 **dated March 31, 2026, subject to all the conditions on the notice of decision. Prior to final**
177 **approval by the Board, a Compliance Public Hearing will be required to determine whether**
178 **the conditions have been satisfied, with proper Public Hearing notice to the applicant,**
179 **abutters, and others. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion**
180 **passed.**
181

182 **4. Public Meeting (New Business):**

- 183 A. Viewpoint Sign & Awning (Applicant) and Haralampos Sidiropoulos Revocable Trust (Owner)
184 request for a Preliminary Consultation for a site plan for Dunkin Donuts signage located at 46
185 Portsmouth Avenue (Tax Map 9, Lot 114) in the Gateway Commercial Business Zoning District.
186 The application was submitted by Viewpoint Sign & Awning.
187

188 Ms. Price provided a brief explanation of the project and stated that this is a Preliminary
189 Consultation.
190

191 Keith Dubois with Viewpoint Sign & Awning explained that the Dunkin brand remodels every
192 decade and this store is up for a remodel later this month. He explained proposed upgrades to the
193 menu, the speaker, and the entry gateway/clearance bar.

194 Mr. House stated that anything said today is non-binding as it is just a consultation. He asked the
195 Board for comments or questions.

196
197 Mr. Allison commented that the plans do not have a key map showing the location of this property.
198

199 Mr. Kunowski asked if the attachments on the sides of the existing menu sign were installed before
200 the revised sign ordinance, even though they appear to be going away in this project. Mr. Dubois
201 does not know what approval process was followed for the existing sign, but the end wings were
202 typical for all Dunkins.
203

204 Mr. House stated he likes the new look.
205

206 Mr. Kunowski asked if the other Dunkin Donuts in town are using the new scheme. Mr. Dubois
207 replied he does not know, but that the owner of this Dunkin owns others in Hampton, Portsmouth,
208 and Exeter and those all have the same exact products that were installed last year. This is the first
209 install in Stratham for Viewpoint.
210

211 There were no other questions from the Board.
212

213 Mr. Dubois asked if he will be on the next agenda. Ms. Price replied that they received the
214 application and if there are no other comments tonight then the abutters will be noticed tomorrow.
215

216 Mr. Allison asked if the next application will be a full-blown site plan application with a standard
217 cover sheet, etc. Ms. Price replied she hasn't reviewed the application yet, but it should be and
218 there will be several waiver requests.
219

220 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board close the Preliminary Consultation**
221 **for 46 Portsmouth Avenue, and no design submittal is necessary for the site plan. Mr. Fraprie**
222 **seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**
223

224 4. Public Hearing (New Business)

225 A. ICL Autos (Applicant) and M & E Jespersen Realty LLC (Owner) request for a Site Plan
226 Amendment to construct a 2,390 SF addition to the rear of the Porsche Dealership to include
227 service bays, lunchroom, bathroom, mechanical, and tool storage space located at 60 Portsmouth
228 Avenue (Tax Map 9, Lot 14) in the Gateway Commercial Business Zoning District. The
229 application was submitted by Jones and Beach Engineers, Inc., 85 Portsmouth Ave, Stratham, NH
230 03885.
231

232 Ms. Price explained that a Preliminary Consultation has been completed for this project. There are
233 some waivers that must be reviewed and approved before the application can be accepted as
234 complete. Town department heads have reviewed the plans. Police, DPW, and the Fire Chief had
235 no comments. The Fire Inspector provided some comments regarding the construction, and the
236 Building Inspector had several comments including that there should be annual maintenance logs
237 and that the town engineer should be onsite during construction. There were additional comments
238 from the Building Inspector that would likely be addressed if the town's engineer reviews the plan
239 set.
240

241 Mr. House requested a presentation on the waiver from HISS mapping.
242

243 Eric Poulin from Jones & Beach Engineers spoke on behalf of the Applicant. He said that soil

244 mapping was not completed for the area where they are requesting the waiver and the septic and
245 drainage systems are already installed. He stated that the development team (contractor, architect,
246 engineer) for the addition are the same that worked on the original building and they have a very
247 good understanding of the soil characteristics from the previous excavation. There have been no
248 issues with the building.

249
250 Mr. Kunowski asked Ms. Price if there is any record in the Town of any inspections of the
251 stormwater system having taken place since the property was developed in 2019. Ms. Price replied
252 there should be maintenance logs, and she would need to research the file for inspections. Since
253 she has been with the Town, the building inspector has not performed any inspections.

254
255 Mr. Allison stated that, in his opinion, there is a rather de minimis amount of change in the surface
256 character therefore he does not think a HISS report is necessary.

257
258 Mr. Fraprie questioned the change in coverage as well but did not see that much change.

259
260 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver from Site Plan**
261 **Review Regulations checklist item E (HISS Mapping) as the waiver presented will properly**
262 **carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations by the following findings of fact:**

- 263 **1. The granting of the waiver will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, or welfare**
264 **or injurious to other property and will promote the public interest;**
- 265 **2. The waiver will not, in any manner, vary other provisions of the Stratham Zoning**
266 **Ordinance;**
- 267 **3. Such waiver will substantially secure the objectives, standards, and requirements of these**
268 **regulations; as the soils characteristics from the Porsche main building construction were**
269 **identified in 2019. The septic and stormwater systems are already installed from that**
270 **project and functioning properly.**

271
272 **Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

273
274 Mr. Poulin presented the waiver from Site Plan Regulations Section 4.4.2.f, storm drainage plan.
275 He submitted a drainage memo as part of the application. This is a very small development area
276 and the primary footprint for the addition is currently pavement. From a hydraulic standpoint it is
277 basically net zero. HydroCAD won't see any difference. The only change is re-routing a pipe. The
278 same stormwater treatment is going to occur and therefore they don't think that level of drainage
279 analysis is necessary for this sized project.

280
281 Mr. House and Mr. Allison agree with Mr. Poulin. Mr. Fraprie asked if they are moving a holding
282 tank. Mr. Poulin replied there are several holding tanks that collect drainage from the service areas.
283 They are completely independent, isolated systems so there is no interaction with the septic or
284 stormwater systems. One holding tank will be relocated to the north to make room for the addition,
285 there will be a new one to the east for the new bays, and one to the south will remain. Mr. Fraprie
286 asked if the one to the north will be set underneath the paved area. Mr. Pouline replied yes and
287 explained how the pipe would be rerouted.

288
289 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver from Site Plan**
290 **Review Regulations Section 4.4.2.f, storm drainage plan performed and stamped by a**
291 **Registered Professional Engineer, including a plan for the retention and slow release of storm**
292 **water where necessary, together with supporting calculations in accordance with Addendum**
293 **C; as specific circumstances relative to the site plan indicate that the waiver will properly**

294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343

carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations by the following findings of facts:

1. The granting of the waiver will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, or welfare or injurious to other property and will promote the public interest;
2. The waiver will not, in any manner, vary other provisions of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance;
3. Such waiver will substantially secure the objectives, standards, and requirements of these regulations; as the proposed addition will replace an equivalent area of existing impervious pavement, and the overall impervious pavement will not increase that would affect runoff characteristics or the existing stormwater management approach.

Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Poulin presented the waiver related to wetland items on the Site Plan Review checklist. He stated that wetlands were delineated in 2019 and a wetland impact permit was issued by the State. He described the location of the wetland and that there is a large retaining wall between the project and the wetland.

Mr. Allison commented that he would like the Applicant to make sure during construction that there is a fence against the wall so it is obvious.

Mr. Kunowski asked how high the retaining wall is in relation to the pavement. Mr. Poulin replied four to six feet tall. Mr. Kunowski added that he sees a guardrail and a fence already there so the likelihood of a construction accident is minimized. Mr. Poulin agreed and they have already discussed the sensitivity of the area with contractors at a preliminary meeting.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver from Site Plan Review Regulations checklist item for Wetlands specifically. H11, K.,1,3 4, 6 ,7 ; as specific circumstances relative to the site plan indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations: by the following findings of fact:

1. The granting of the waiver will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, or welfare or injurious to other property and will promote the public interest;
2. The waiver will not, in any manner, vary other provisions of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance;
3. Such waiver will substantially secure the objectives, standards, and requirements of these regulations; as the wetland delineation from the Porsche main building construction were identified in 2019, and all disturbance associated with the project is confined to the building side of the wall, and there are no proposed impacts on the wetland side.

Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Poulin presented the waiver for a landscape plan. The addition is in the rear of the building, and there is currently not much landscaping back there, and it is not very visible from the main roadway.

There were no comments or questions from the Board.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver from Site Plan Review checklist item L (Landscape Plan); as specific circumstances relative to the site plan indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations by the following findings of fact:

1. The granting of the waiver will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, or welfare

- 344 or injurious to other property and will promote the public interest;
345 2. The waiver will not, in any manner, vary other provisions of the Stratham Zoning
346 Ordinance;
347 3. Such waiver will substantially secure the objectives, standards, and requirements of these
348 regulations; A landscape plan was prepared to support the main building construction
349 and was implemented at the time of construction in 2019. The addition is located at the
350 back of the building and is not visible from the highway.

351
352 **Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

353
354 Mr. House requested a motion on application completeness.

355
356 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board accept the application as complete.**
357 **Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

358
359 Mr. House invited Mr. Poulin to present the project.

360
361 Mr. Poulin stated the project is driven by a need for additional service space and is broken into two
362 sections. He described the proposed vehicle access, drainage, propane tank relocation, septic
363 system design amendment, wall mounted lighting, and architecture. Mr. Poulin addressed previous
364 Board comments on the structural integrity of the existing retaining wall. The Applicant had the
365 wall reviewed by Civil Connection LLC who designed the wall. They determined it is adequate
366 and there will be no adverse impacts to the wall with the proposed construction. Mr. House asked
367 if Civil Connection inspected the wall. Mr. Poulin replied no, they did an analysis on the wall
368 design based on the plans looking at bearing pressure and how deep the footings are.

369
370 Mr. Kunowski asked if the new location for propane tanks is underground. Mr. Poulin replied yes.

371
372 Mr. Allison noted an error in the name of Frying Pan Lane on the plans.

373
374 Mr. Poulin replied that he will correct that on the final plan.

375
376 Mr. Fraprie asked if there is adequate turning radius for vehicles to enter the new service bays.

377
378 Mr. Poulin replied yes, that even though there are parking stalls nearby, customers do not use that
379 area, and the business controls the parking in that area. Mr. Fraprie asked if the parking lot would
380 be relined. Mr. Poulin replied yes and there will be a reconfiguration of that area and he presumes
381 that the closest spots won't be used on a regular basis and the business can move cars if necessary.

382
383 Mr. House asked if the garage doors will be glass. Mr. Poulin replied yes, the same style as before.

384
385 Mr. Fraprie asked if the rear parking is for employees and customers. Mr. Poulin is not sure where
386 the employees park, he assumes they park in the rear along with inventory. Mr. Fraprie commented
387 that there is more parking in the rear of the Audi dealership next door and it looks like some of the
388 employees park there. Mr. Poulin replied they are both owned by the same entity, so that might be
389 the case.

390
391 Mr. Poulin consulted with NHDOT if approval would be needed and NHDOT replied yes.

392
393 Ms. Price consulted with the Building Inspector and recommended a third-party engineering

394 review for things like confirming the existing drainage can handle the additional building area,
395 annual reports for record keeping, special inspections, letter of certification that framing was
396 constructed per the approved plan, and a requirement that annual maintenance logs be sent to the
397 town regarding stormwater maintenance. She asked if the Planning Board would like a town
398 engineering review. Mr. House polled the Board who agreed.
399

400 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion to open the hearing to the public. Mr. Fraprie seconded the**
401 **motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**
402

403 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board Town engineer should review the**
404 **storm water and drainage plans, existing septic is adequate for the change, and site plan**
405 **regulation review; and continue the application to the June 3, 2026, Planning Board meeting.**
406 **Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**
407

408 **5. Public Meeting (New Business):**

409 A. Technical Corrections of the 2026 Stratham Zoning Ordinance 410

411 Ms. Price provided the Board with some technical corrections for the Board’s review to be
412 incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance as authorized in Section 21.2 of the Ordinance. If the
413 Board agrees, Ms. Price will post a notice for public hearing to accept the corrections. The Board
414 agreed with moving to public hearing.
415

416 **Mr. Fraprie made a motion that the Planning Board approve the proposed changes allowed**
417 **per Section 21.2 Technical Corrections of the 2026 Stratham Zoning Ordinance and post for**
418 **a Public Hearing for the Planning Board Meeting on May 20, 2026. Mr. Kunowski seconded**
419 **the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**
420

421 **6. Miscellaneous**

422 A. Planning Board Training Opportunities

423 Ms. Price announced some training opportunities

- 424 • Office of Planning Development (OPD) – “You’re a Planning Board member, now what”.
- 425 • RSA 91-A
- 426 • OPD Annual Conference May 9th
427

428 B. Master Plan Working Meeting

429 Ms. Price discussed scheduling a working meeting for the Planning Board to review the Master
430 Plan and update as needed.
431

432 C. Rockingham Planning Commissioners

433 Ms. Price announced that Lucy Cushman’s term as Stratham’s Commissioner on the RPC ended
434 last year, and she is seeking support for Lucy’s renewal. The second commissioner moved out of
435 Stratham, and Ms. Price asked the Board to think about possible candidates. The Board agreed to
436 recommend Lucy for renewal.
437

438 D. Stratham Hill Park charrette meeting

439 Ms. Price announced a preliminary meeting for Stratham Hill Park for Board and Commission
440 members.
441
442

443 7. Adjourn

444 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion to adjourn at 9:07 pm. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. All voted**
445 **in favor, and the motion passed.**

446

447 *Respectfully submitted by Susan Connors*