



Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes
June 3, 2026, 7:00 pm
Stratham Municipal Center

Members Present: Thomas House, Chair
John Kunowski, Vice Chair
Tedd Tramaloni, Ex-Officio Select Board Member
Chris Zaremba, Regular Member
Jay Fraprie, Regular Member
Nate Allison, Alternate Member

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Vanessa Price, Director of Building and Planning

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

May 20, 2026, Planning Board meeting minutes

Mr. Kunowski made a motion to approve the minutes as drafted for the May 20th meeting. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.

3. Public Hearing (Old Business)

A. Viewpoint Sign & Awning (Applicant) and Haralampos Sidiropoulos Revocable Trust (Owner) request for a Site Plan Amendment for Dunkin Donuts signage located at 46 Portsmouth Avenue (Tax Map 9, Lot 114) in the Gateway Commercial Business Zoning District. The application was submitted by Viewpoint Sign & Awning. Requested Continuance.

Ms. Price announced that the Applicant requested a continuance to June 17th to correct deficiencies with the application. Mr. Fraprie commented that June 17th is 14 days away and therefore the Applicant cannot meet the 15-day deadline for resubmittals. Ms. Price agreed and suggested a continuance to July 8.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the application for 46 Portsmouth Avenue be continued to the July 8th meeting. Mr. Tramaloni seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.

B. 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.

45 Ms. Price stated that the Applicant updated the survey, the application is complete, and the
46 Applicant is seeking a notice of decision this evening for the CUP. The plan shows the pool and
47 enclosure completely outside of the wetland setback. The Applicant presented a different plan to
48 the Conservation Commission that slightly encroached into the setback. The Conservation
49 Commission recommended approval of the project as long as none of the fencing, pool, or patio
50 are within the setback, and the revised plan shows that.

51
52 Mr. House requested a motion to accept the application as complete. **Mr. Zaremba made a**
53 **motion to accept the application as complete. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. All voted**
54 **in favor, and the motion passed.**

55
56 Ben Collins presented the changes to the plan. He described that the project meets the wetlands
57 setback, the 10-foot side property line setback, and the 50-foot rear setback. This location is the
58 only spot in the backyard that meets all of the requirements.

59
60 Erik Poulin of Jones and Beach Engineers added that Jones and Beach did the original design for
61 the subdivision along with the foundation certificate for this lot, so they have very good data in
62 house already. They took a couple of survey points for this current project and Gove Environmental
63 conducted wetland flagging. There will be some minor disturbance of earth in the setback that will
64 get quickly restabilized and seeded back to lawn.

65
66 Mr. House asked if the porch on the home that is existing as it is in the setback. Mr. Collins replied
67 yes. Mr. House asked how far is the well from the septic system. Mr. Poulin replied 75 feet.

68
69 Mr. Tramaloni noted that the fence is up to the 75-foot setback and construction will overlap but
70 he doesn't see anything in the application about restoration and asked if that is part of the plan.
71 Mr. Poulin replied that any disturbed ground will be regraded and seeded. He does not think a large
72 area will be opened and that it will be a little strip of disturbance for the patio.

73
74 Mr. Kunowski asked if the Applicant has spoken with the pool company about minimizing
75 disturbance and their experience doing that. Mr. Collins replied the contractor has worked in
76 multiple cities with variances and CUPs and they said that the majority of work will be outside 75
77 feet.

78
79 Mr. Zaremba asked if the pool equipment is going to go in the shed. Mr. Collins replied it was
80 potentially going either next to the shed or closer to the house. It will be outside of the 75-foot
81 setback, but the exact location has not yet been determined.

82
83 Mr. Zaremba asked Ms. Price if the CUP is for the disturbance for the construction since all
84 structures are outside of the setback. Ms. Price replied yes and the original submission showed
85 some structures within the setback. The ordinance limits construction and she anticipates that
86 includes site disturbance.

87
88 Mr. Allison commented that a grading plan should be included. Mr. Poulin replied describing the
89 location of a proposed small retaining wall and a description of the grading. Mr. Allison
90 appreciated the response and thinks that spot elevations and grading lines should be added to the
91 plan. Mr. Poulin replied they can provide additional detail to the grading.

92
93 Mr. House invited the Applicant to present the criteria justification.
94

95 Mr. Collins read from the application the justification for the CUP into the record.
96

97 1. Describe how the proposed construction is essential to the productive use of land not within the
98 Wetlands Conservation District and where the upland area considered for development is not
99 smaller (acreage) than the wetlands are and no-disturbance buffer (acreage) being impacted.
100

101 The proposed construction consists of a 16 by 40 in-ground fiber swimming pool with associated
102 equipment pad and hardscape to be installed on a residential lot at Winnicutt Road in Stratham.
103 The property contains a wetland area along its southerly boundary with a 25-foot no-disturbance
104 buffer and a 50-foot wetland setback extend northward into the useful upland area. The pool is
105 located entirely within the upland portion of the lot, and does not encroach into the wetlands
106 conservation district itself. The useful upland acreage of the lot significantly exceeds the acreage
107 of the wetlands and the no-disturbance buffer area being affected, given the size of the lot and the
108 location of existing residents. The 20-foot setback is essentially a 10-foot east property line
109 setback, and then northward extends to the wetlands buffer. The 50-foot setback zone constitutes
110 a substantial portion of the available rear yard. Sign the pool outside of the 50-foot setback entirely.
111 It's not feasible. We figured out how to make it feasible while maintaining a functional and safe,
112 safely accessible swimming pool area in relation to the rest of the residence, and the area conflicts
113 with a now 10-foot setback from the neighbor; the proposed location represents the minimum
114 cushion necessary to make productive personal use of the upland portion of the property.
115

116 2. Describe how design and construction methods will be utilized to minimize detrimental impact
117 upon the wetland.
118

119 The pool is a prefabricated fiberglass unit, which significantly reduces excavation time and site
120 disturbance compared to a poured concrete pool. Installation will be completed in a single
121 continuous excavation event, minimizing ground disruption, erosion, and sedimentation controls,
122 including a silt fence and construction barriers to be installed along the southern perimeter of the
123 work zone prior to construction, maintained throughout. No construction activity, equipment s,
124 material, or material storage will occur within the 25-foot no disturbance buffer. All disturbed
125 upland areas outside of the pool permit will be stored with low and seed or sod immediately
126 following construction. The pool will be equipped with a closed-loop filtration system. No pool
127 discharge will be directed towards the wetland. The equipment pad is sited to the east of the pool,
128 away from wetlands, to further concentrate mechanical activity at the greatest practical distance
129 from the wetland boundary.
130

131 3. Describe how the proposed construction design includes provisions for restoration of the site as
132 nearly as possible to its original grade and condition.
133

134 Excavated material will be managed on-site or removed as needed to achieve final grades
135 consistent with the existing landscape. The pool deck and surrounding hardscape will be designed
136 to direct surface drainage away from the wetlands. Any areas of ground disturbance outside the
137 footprint of the pool deck and coming that will be regraded to match existing grades and stabilized
138 with topsoil and vegetation. Site will be left in a condition that preserves the natural drainage
139 patterns of the upland area and does not redirect stormwater toward the wetlands. No permanent
140 alteration of grades within the no disturbance buffer is proposed.
141

142 4. Describe how no feasible alternative exists.
143

144 The buildable area of this lot is constrained on multiple sites. Existing residents and associated
145 structures occupy the northern and eastern portion of the lot. It's a 10-foot east property line
146 setback. When these constraints are mapped together, the areas for pool siting outside the 50-foot
147 well and setback are insufficient to accommodate a standard residential pool while maintaining
148 safe access and adequate circulation space for residents. The proposed location minimizes buffer
149 equipment to the extent feasible, given these overlapping constraints. No alternative siting
150 arrangement had been identified in the 50-foot setback, while remaining functional and compliant
151 with all other applicable requirements. The update to that was that we thought was 20 foot, it was
152 actually 10, so we could get it outside of the further closer to that 10 foot setback.

153
154 5. Describe how economic advantage alone is not reason for proposed construction.

155
156 The proposed pool is not motivated by, not motivated by economic advantage. It's a private
157 residential amenity intended for the personal use and enjoyment of the property owners in our
158 family. The placement within the wetland setback is not a cost-saving measure. Alternative
159 configurations were evaluated, but not feasible in the face of physical and regulatory constraints,
160 not cost.

161
162 Mr. Collins stated on a personal note, this is really important to my wife and two young kids; we
163 want to stay in Stratham long term. She wants approval. It's really important, so that's kind of part
164 of why we want to get it done.

165
166 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion to open the hearing to public comment. Mr. Kunowski**
167 **seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

168
169 David Wardrop asked if the Aquifer Protection District applies to this project. Ms. Price replied it
170 is not in the Aquifer Protection District.

171
172 **Mr. Tramaloni made a motion to close the hearing to public comment. Mr. Kunowski**
173 **seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

174
175 Mr. House called for a motion on the application. Ms. Price asked if the request by Mr. Allison to
176 add spot elevations and grade should be added as a condition. The Board agreed.

177
178 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion that the Planning Board approve with conditions the**
179 **Conditional Use Permit from the Stratham Zoning Ordinance for Section 11.6.1 for site**
180 **disturbance within the 50-foot wetland setback. The conditions include:**

- 181
182 **1. The final plan set shall be stamped by a New Hampshire licensed wetland scientist and**
183 **Jones and Beach Surveyor prior to issuance of a building permit.**
184 **2. Pool perimeter fencing shall not exceed six feet in height, and no fencing shall be located**
185 **in the wetland setback.**
186 **3. The proposed construction design will include provisions for restoration of the site as near**
187 **as nearly as possible to the original grade and condition.**
188 **4. The final plan shall include a spot elevation and grading plan.**

189
190 **The findings of fact for granting the CUP are:**

- 191 **1. The proposed construction is essential to the productive use of land not within the**
192 **Wetlands Conservation District and where the upland area considered for development is**
193 **not smaller than the wetlands area and non-disturbance buffer being impacted.**

- 194 **2. Design construction methods will be utilized to minimize detrimental impact upon the**
195 **wetland, as no patio, fencing, or vegetation in the setback will be located in the wetland**
196 **buffer, with minimal site disturbance during construction.**
197 **3. The proposed construction design will include provisions for restoration of the site as**
198 **nearly as possible to the original grade and condition.**
199 **4. No feasible alternative exists.**
200 **5. Economic advantage alone is not for the not the reason for the proposed construction.**

201 **Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

- 202
203
204 C. ICL Autos (Applicant) and M & E Jespersen Realty LLC (Owner) request for a Site Plan
205 Amendment to construct a 2,390 SF addition to the rear of the Porsche Dealership to include
206 service bays, lunchroom, bathroom, mechanical, and tool storage space located at 60 Portsmouth
207 Avenue (Tax Map 9, Lot 14) in the Gateway Commercial Business Zoning District. The
208 application was submitted by Jones and Beach Engineers, Inc., 85 Portsmouth Ave, Stratham, NH
209 03885.

210
211 Ms. Price updated the Board on the town engineering review of the project, including parking
212 calculations, the waiver request for stormwater treatment, traffic impact analysis, and snow
213 storage. The town engineer does not have staff to review the septic plan and recommended that the
214 Town use the Rockingham County Conservation District.

215
216 Erik Poulin of Jones and Beach Engineers spoke on behalf of the Applicant. He described how
217 they addressed the engineering comments. Regarding parking requirements, 71 are required, and
218 76 are proposed to remain. They submitted a driveway permit application and traffic memo to
219 NHDOT. Snow storage areas are provided in the front grass area and in the rear and a note was
220 added to the plan that snow should be trucked offsite if the onsite areas hit capacity. The septic
221 plan was submitted to the Rockingham County Conservation District. Regarding fire sprinklers,
222 the building is currently does not have a sprinkler system. The building complies with proper fire
223 separation and ratings. He spoke with the architect who confirmed that the fire separations and
224 ratings will continue with the new build. To have sprinklers retrofitted after the fact would be
225 massively cost prohibitive for the project, so they ask that not be a requirement of the addition.

226
227 Mr. House asked if the comment on sprinklers came from the fire department. Ms. Price replied it
228 was a question from the town engineer and the fire inspector who both said that the new service
229 bays need to be sprinklered. Mr. Poulin stated there is no sprinkler capacity. Ms. Price stated that
230 from life safety, they want to make sure it is fire code compliant. Mr. Pouline replied they would
231 be comfortable with a condition that the building is to comply with fire code. He believes the
232 architect's position is that it does. Mr. House believes the concern with fire code is under the
233 purview of the Building Inspector but that it can be a condition of approval.

234
235 Mr. Allison asked why can't a sprinkler system be added just for the new bays as the Board has
236 since this in single family homes. Mr. Poulin replied the challenge is with retrofitting the existing
237 well lines and adding a storage tank or cistern for pressure and that a sprinkler system for
238 commercial use is a much more complex system than for residential use. Ms. Price suggested a
239 third-party review for fire code could be commissioned. Mr. House agreed.

240
241 There were no additional comments from the Board or the public.
242

243 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion to close the application to public comment. Mr. Zaremba**
244 **seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**
245

246 **Mr. Fraprie made a motion that the Planning Board conditionally approved a minor site**
247 **plan to construct a 2,390 square foot addition to the rear of the Porsche dealership to include**
248 **service bays, lunch room, bathroom, mechanical, and tool storage space located at 60**
249 **Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 9 Lot 14 in the Gateway Commercial Business Zoning**
250 **District, with the conditions stated in the drafted notice of decision, and the conditions**
251 **precedent to include the following:**
252

- 253 **1. List of all waivers granted on the cover page.**
- 254 **2. If additional loading is needed, a new septic design will need to be approved and installed**
255 **for commercial use. The two holding tanks will also require NHDES approval.**
- 256 **3. NHDES septic plan approval number.**
- 257 **4. Correspondence through NHDOT will be required, and the NHDOT permit number on**
258 **the plan set.**
- 259 **5. Owner's signature on the cover sheet.**
- 260 **6. All sheets shall be stamped by the New Hampshire licensed professional engineer.**
- 261 **7. Town of Stratham Planning Board signature block shall be included on all pages .**
- 262 **8. The parking lot calculation table to be updated for the proposed condition for the increase**
263 **in the number of service bays. Sheet C2 updating note 5, parking calculations.**
- 264 **9. Snow storage to be shown on the plan.**
- 265 **10. The relief valve, filling connection, and max liquid valve gage vent connection at the**
266 **container must be at least 10 feet from any exterior source of ignition, openings into direct-**
267 **vent appliances, or mechanical ventilation air intakes. (2020 NFPA 58 Chapter 6.4.4.4)**
- 268 **11. The plan will meet State fire code.**
269

270 **Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**
271

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

273 **A. Preliminary Conceptual Consultation for Subdivision**

274 Rick and Lynn Cates (Owner) request a Preliminary Consultation for a two-lot subdivision located
275 at 130 Winnicutt Road (Tax Map 14, Lot 8) in the Residential-Agricultural Zoning District.
276

277 Ms. Price stated that she met with the Applicant and their attorney and noted that a variance is
278 needed for the frontage. There is also a question about the validity of the square presented on the
279 plan as required in Section 4.3(h). The existing lot is non-conforming in that it doesn't meet
280 frontage requirements. A shared driveway is proposed and they have to meet fire code and town
281 standards for emergency access. NHDOT review will be needed for a change of use for an
282 additional home.
283

284 Mr. House announced this is a preliminary consultation, so all discussion is non-binding. He
285 invited the Applicant to speak.
286

287 Kevin Baum, attorney with Hoefle Phoenix Gormley & Roberts, spoke on behalf of the Applicant.
288 The goal of the owners is to subdivide which would allow them to downsize into a smaller home
289 to be built on a new lot that will allow them to stay in Stratham. It is a large lot but with already
290 undersized frontage and they intend to seek a variance in July. They may ask for some waivers
291 when they return to the Planning Board and he is seeking a feel from the Board on those; one being

292 from the high intensity soils map. He is also seeking an opinion on the shared driveway. There
293 would be an easement and a driveway agreement for the shared driveway.

294
295 Mr. House asked if there are any wetlands. Mr. Baum replied no and that was confirmed by a
296 wetland scientist.

297
298 Mr. Kunowski commented that the new lot will need to meet all the requirements for a new septic.
299

300 Mr. Zaremba commented that turning radius for fire trucks has been an issue in the past and that
301 other projects have considered sprinkler systems for homes that are far away from the main road.
302 He added that showing the abutting house locations would be helpful along with some screening.
303

304 Mr. Allison commented that the existing lot is a porkchop lot that will be subdivided into two
305 porkchop lots and that was removed from the ordinance. Mr. Rick Cates replied that an alternative
306 is to create a three-lot subdivision, but that required a cul-de-sac to meet the frontage requirement
307 and would result in deforestation, and the driveway would be cost-prohibitive. Mr. Baum added
308 that it is a porkchop lot, but the addition of another house does not change that in terms of the area.
309 Mr. Allison replied that the second lot needs an easement to use the existing driveway. Mr. Baum
310 replied that the driveway may shift, but the intent is to have a shared driveway because it does not
311 make sense to have two driveways next to each other. Mr. Cates added that there is room to add a
312 turnaround. Mr. Allison noted that another option is to develop a cul-de-sac. Mr. Baum replied that
313 a private road to town standards is hard to justify financially. He added that adding additional lots
314 might need relief from the square (required in 4.3(h)).
315

316 Mr. House asked what the condition of the existing driveway is. Mr. Cates replied it is 13 years
317 old. Mr. House commented that an additional home will mean there is more driving over it. Mr.
318 Cates said that redoing the driveway will be part of the plan.
319

320 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion that the Planning Board close the preliminary consultation at**
321 **131 Winnicutt Road, and no design submittal is necessary for this subdivision plan. Mr.**
322 **Fraprie seconded the motion. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**
323

324 B. Review of NHDES Major Wetland Dredge & Fill Application for a proposed subdivision at 80 &
325 80R Winnicutt Road. NHDES File Number: 2026-01170 for 80 & 80R Winnicutt Road.
326

327 Ms. Price gave an update and stated that the Town received the NH DES major wetlands dredge
328 and fill permit. It is considered administratively complete by DES. The Conservation Commission
329 requested to intervene, which extended the comment period. The Planning Board and the Select
330 Board can also comment. The Conservation Commission plans to provide a comment letter to DES
331 with their concerns, primarily with lots 27 and 26. There was discussion about species on the
332 property and concerns from abutters, including concerns about Blandings turtles. The DOT permit
333 was issued with a lot of conditions, and the AoT permit was issued in May.
334

335 There was a Board discussion about whether to open the meeting to hear from the audience; it was
336 decided to hear comments, but that the Board would not respond.
337

338 Brandon Michaud of Winnicutt Road spoke. He encouraged the Planning Board to make comments
339 on the wetlands permit application before the NHDES, specifically mentioning endangered species
340 involved, tree cutting, wetland fill impact, and how that will affect the aquifer and runoff into the
341 wetland.

342 Myra Citrin, abutter to the project, spoke. She focused comments on the direct wetland impact
343 from one shared driveway that will service only two homes, which is 62% of the total wetland
344 disruption. She believes that is inexcusable and those homes should be eliminated. Ms. Citrin
345 commented that when the oversight of the endangered species program transferred from NH Fish
346 and Game to NHDES, the presence of Blandings turtles at the site was not flagged. She has seen
347 Blandings turtles at her property and documented one only 1.02 miles away. This site is a perfect
348 environment for them, but there has been no survey conducted. She asked DES who can submit
349 comments on the project, and they said mostly abutters and the Conservation Commission, and
350 that they would be happy to hear from the Planning Board. Ms. Citrin would be grateful if the
351 Board joined to decrease the impact on wetlands. She noted the increase of lawn product use that
352 can affect groundwater quality.

353
354 Heidi Hanson commented that although the Conditional Use Permit has been approved, one of the
355 conditions is that the Applicant obtain all other permits.

356
357 Cindy Conlin stated that she reviewed the Master Plan and it mentions land of ecological value
358 and wetlands specifically along with vernal pools. There are four vernal pools on the property that
359 may be impacted. She asked that the Board submit comments to DES on the importance of vernal
360 pools and wetlands to the Town.

361
362 David Wardrop implored the Board to make comment to DES about the project. He is concerned
363 about how the project will affect aquifer protection, wetlands, vernal pools, and endangered plant
364 species. He questioned if the project meets the 20% lot coverage requirement.

365
366 Susan Connors, Stratham resident, commented that she does not recall mitigation of wetlands being
367 a condition of the CUP. Normally if there is direct impact to a wetland it should be mitigated
368 somewhere and asked the Board that if it was an oversight, that they request that DES require it.

369
370 David Wardrop spoke again that replacement of the wetlands that will be filled should be
371 considered for this project.

372
373 Cindy Conlin commented that she loves to hear the sound of the peepers when driving down
374 Winnicutt Road and she is afraid that might get destroyed with disruption of wetlands. She doesn't
375 want to see it happen here or anywhere in town.

376
377 Bob Millstein, abutter, commented that only 20% of applicants for wetland permits in the past
378 decade have been major like this one, and for this project 62% of the impact relates to only two
379 homes. He asked that the Board write a comment letter to DES stating that the Board objects to
380 issuing the wetlands permit for these two homes.

381
382 Mr. Fraprie noted that comments are due June 16, but the Board does not meet again until June 17.

383
384 Ms. Price replied the Board could schedule an additional meeting to discuss this.

385
386 Mr. House thanked the public for their comments.

387
388 The Board discussed this was an update to the project.

- 389
390 **5. Miscellaneous**
391 A. MS4 Permit Updates for Stormwater Regulations

392 Ms. Price announced that Susan Connors from the Planning Office is here to seek the Board's
393 opinion on some optional updates to the stormwater regulations. The Board determined for now
394 that the regulations will continue to apply town-wide as opposed to just in the MS4 area and will
395 apply to all sizes of projects, not just those that are greater than 1 acre, which is the minimum
396 required in the MS4 permit. Projects that disturb less than 1 acre can request a waiver.
397

398 B. 2026 Stratham Open Space & Connectivity Plan – Schedule Public Hearing
399

400 Ms. Price announced that the Town needs to schedule a public hearing for the 2026 Open Space
401 and Connectivity Plan. A target date of July 8th was suggested; the Board decided to have it when
402 they don't have too many applications.
403

404 C. Stratham Hill Park Charette Public Engagement: Thursday, June 11, 2026 - 5:30 to 7:30 at the
405 Stratham Municipal Center, 10 Bunker Hill Ave, Stratham, NH.
406

407 Ms. Price announced this meeting will take place in the Sewall Room.
408

409 **6. Adjourn**

410 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion to adjourn at 9:43 pm. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. All**
411 **voted in favor, and the motion passed.**
412

413 *Respectfully submitted by Susan Connors*