



**Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes
September 2, 2026, 7:00 pm
Stratham Municipal Center**

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

Member Virtual: Tedd Tramaloni, Ex-Officio Select Board Member

Staff Present: Vanessa Price, Director of Building and Planning

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Mr. Tramaloni is attending the meeting remotely and stated that he is not in the Town of Stratham due to attending to urgent family matters.”) Mr. House stated that all votes must be cast via roll call. Mr. House called the meeting to order at 6:59 pm and took roll call.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Planning Board Minutes from August 19, 2026.

Mr. Fraprie made a motion to accept the Planning Board minutes from the Planning Board meeting of August 19, 2026, as written. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. Mr. House – Aye; Mr. Fraprie - Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; Mr. Tramaloni – Aye. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARING (NEW BUSINESS):

170 Portsmouth Ave. Compliance Hearing

Packer Brook Holdings LLC (Applicant and Owner) requests final approval of a Site Plan for a Mixed-Use Development of 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 facility will be located behind an existing single-family residence, which will continue to operate in its current capacity. The location is at 170 Portsmouth Avenue (Tax Map 17, Lot 86) in the Route 33 Legacy Highway Heritage Zoning District.

Mr. House read the project into the record and asked Ms. Price to give an update. She explained that the applicant is before the Board for a compliance hearing to determine if all of the precedent conditions of the Planning Board’s May 6, 2026, Notice of Decision have been met. Ms. Price explained that staff recommends that the Planning Board deliberate with the Applicant to address the outstanding items identified in the review, including the soil scientist signature and identification of soil types; required Town signature blocks; final E-911 addressing; and completion and execution of the required stormwater Operations & Maintenance documentation and Stormwater Agreement. Mr. House asked the applicant if they would like to present their case. Eric Weinrieb, Altus Engineering, addressed the board that they wanted to discuss the outstanding items from the Town Planner letter dated August 27, 2026. Mr. Weinrieb was not in agreement with the Notice of Decision requirement of soil scientist’s signature shall be included on the cover sheet and on all applicable topographic plan sheets. He explained that all the relevant information is found in the USDA NRCS soils

45 report. The Board determined that the applicant's report shows sufficient information for this project. The
46 second item Mr. Weinrieb was not in agreement with was the Notice of Decision requirement of the USEPA
47 Construction General Permit (CGP) to be on the final plan set. He explained, that the permit has not yet been
48 submitted, as the owner's don't know which contractor they will use. MS. Price stated that the applicant stated
49 that the Notice of Intent (NOI) will be submitted at a later date, and it's based upon the anticipated construction
50 schedule and that the Town does not dictate when construction will commence. It is also noted on the cover
51 sheet of the plan set that the NOI is to be filed 14 days prior to the start of construction. The Board had a
52 lengthy discussion on the requirement and decided it could be a condition to be met prior to construction. Mr.
53 Weinrieb was not in agreement with the Notice of Decision requirement of having all of the plan set have
54 Town Signature Blocks. Mr. House asked which were missing. Ms. Price stated that the signature blocks are
55 currently missing from Sheets D-1 through D-5 and A-1 through A-5. Mr. Weinrieb stated they have not been
56 asked of this in other municipalities, and he doesn't see the reason to. Mr. House stated that he has seen this
57 in other requirements, and asked Ms. Price if this was in the regulations. Ms. Price said it was a requirement
58 on the Notice of Decision and other applicants didn't have an issue, and stated that, for record-keeping, all the
59 sheets have been signed. Mr. House stated he had no issue with signing all the plan sheets, whether or not
60 there is a signature block. Mr. Weinrieb was not in agreement with the Notice of Decision requirement that
61 the invasive species removal be noted on the landscape plan, and in his opinion, he had satisfied the invasive
62 species questions with the HDAC. Ms. Price stated that the applicant did update notes #6, #16, and #21 per the
63 request from HDAC. The Board had a brief discussion on the landscape plan and determined that the
64 identification of the specific invasive species may instead be conducted by the landscaper at the time of
65 construction. Mr. Weinrieb didn't agree with the comments made by E-911 for addressing and doesn't want
66 to have E-911 addressing road name shown on the final plans. He described he was frustrated that they should
67 have to comply with a road name. Mr. House inquired why this couldn't be addressed. Mr. Weinrieb said that
68 when they inquired with the Town what addressing was required for the property, the Town required a road
69 name. Ms. Price stated that the owner wanted to be ready to pull building permits and asked the Planning &
70 Building Department how to get their address. She explained that when the conditionally approved site plan
71 was submitted to the New Hampshire Division of Emergency Services and Communications (E-911), they
72 advised the Town that sequential street numbers may be interpreted by emergency responders as properties
73 located along the main road rather than along a driveway extending perpendicular to it. Mr. Weinrieb did not
74 agree. Ms. Price explained that the recommendation of state E911 was passed along to the applicant, and they
75 didn't agree with requiring a road name change, and stated fire had no issue. Ms. Price explained to the board
76 that the plan is sent to the state E911 office, and they determine addressing for safety. The Select Board policy
77 is to have the applicant choose four road names; the applicant was not in agreement but complied by proposing
78 four names for the Select Board approval. She went on to explain the process that E911 vets the proposed
79 names, and these recommendations are passed to the Town's Police and Fire Departments, then sent to the
80 Select Board for approval of road names. Mr. Tramaloni stated the Select Board was provided four road names
81 and the information from the state E911 and Town staff. He explained that his understanding is that in the
82 event of an emergency at the rear building, this could create confusion regarding how far responders must
83 travel from Portsmouth Avenue, particularly when mutual-aid responders are responding from neighboring
84 communities. Assigning a separate road name to the driveway will provide clearer addressing for emergency
85 response purposes. At its August 17, 2026, meeting, the Select Board voted to authorize the use of Greenwood
86 Lane. Mr. Weinrieb did not agree with the road name, but said they would comply. Mr. Weinrieb did not agree
87 and didn't want to have the street name on the plan set. The Board had a lengthy discussion on adding the
88 street name to the plan. The Board decided the street name didn't have to be on the final plan, as the plan set
89 would be organized by Map and Lot. The remaining item for discussion on the letter was the Stormwater
90 Operations and Maintenance to be updated, and an agreement will need to be in place for the stormwater. Mr.
91 Weinrieb stated he didn't receive the agreement document and requested a copy. Ms. Price stated they were
92 sent to Mr. Redmond as they were legal documents, but Mr. Weinrieb did not agree and requested a copy. Ms.
93 Price said she would send the agreement over, as well as the developer agreement. The developer agreement
94 was the next agreement discussed from the staff memo. Ms. Price explained to the board that the May 6, 2026,
95 Notice of Decision did not establish a specific performance guarantee amount. Staff recommends that the

Board establish the scope of the guarantee, as she anticipated that the Board didn't intend to establish a bond for the entire project. Ms. Price recommended that the guarantee be limited to site grading, loam and seed, stormwater treatment facilities, and any other improvements necessary to stabilize and restore the site, rather than bonding the cost of the entire project. The Applicant should provide a detailed cost estimate for these items for review by the Town's engineer before the Planning Board establishes the final guarantee amount.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion to open to public comment. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. Mr. House – Aye; Mr. Fraprie -Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; Mr. Tramaloni – Aye. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.

Mr. House asked if anyone was there to speak for or against the case file. No public stated they wanted to comment.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion to close public comment. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. Mr. House – Aye; Mr. Fraprie -Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; Mr. Tramaloni – Aye. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.

Mr. Fraprie made a motion that the Planning Board certify the final plans as all conditions precedent have been met. The Planning Board shall set the performance guarantee to be limited to site grading, loam and seed, stormwater treatment facilities, and any other improvements necessary to stabilize and restore the site, rather than bonding the cost of the entire project; the USEPA Construction General Permit and Notice of Intent (NOI) must be obtained 14 days prior to the start of construction; O&M to be dated, and the stormwater agreement to be executed. The Applicant should provide a detailed cost estimate for these items for review by the Town's engineer before the Planning Board establishes the final guarantee amount.

Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. Mr. House – Aye; Mr. Fraprie -Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; Mr. Tramaloni – Aye. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.

Ms. Price stated that a formal notice of the decision will be sent to the applicant.

PUBLIC MEETING (NEW BUSINESS):

A. 102R/104 Portsmouth Ave. Preliminary Consultation: NHSPCA Expansion of Parking

Ms. Price stated that she discussed with the Applicant a request to expand their parking lot at NHSPCA. They would need to appear before the Board with a preliminary concept to discuss the project before filing a formal application, as they are adding more impervious surface to the site and need to ensure that the stormwater is adequately addressed. She explained the applicant is here tonight to receive preliminary feedback before filing for a formal application.

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

Jeremy Wellman, NHSPCA Director of Facilities and Grounds, explained his project about expanding their parking lot for 16 spaces for their growing staff and volunteers; this would help alleviate the parking shortage for visitors. He explained that they have been in talks with their engineering firm, Jones and Beach, and explained that no additional stormwater allocation would be needed.

The Board had a lengthy discussion on the improvements to the parking, and overall didn't see an issue with the proposed improvements to the site and thanked the NHSPCA for presenting.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion to close the Preliminary Consultation for the NHSPCA 104 Portsmouth

143 **Ave., and no design submittal is necessary. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. Mr. House – Aye; Mr.**
144 **Fraprie -Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; Mr. Tramaloni – Aye. All voted in favor, and the motion passed.**

145
146 **MISCELLANEOUS**

147
148 The Board had a brief discussion of Mr. Tramaloni’s ongoing participation, which will be virtual.

149
150 **ADJOURN**

151 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion to adjourn at 8:13 p.m. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. Mr. House –**
152 **Aye; Mr. Fraprie -Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; Mr. Tramaloni – Aye. All voted in favor, and the motion**
153 **passed. *Minutes respectfully submitted by Vanessa Price***