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

Members Present: Tom House, Chair
John Kunowski, Vice Chair
Jay Fraprie, Regular Member
Jameson Paine, Regular Member

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

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Vanessa Price, Director of Planning and Building

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 called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and took roll call. Ms. Price stated that all votes must be cast via roll call.

Review and Approval of Minutes:

Planning Board Minutes from September 16, 2026.

Ms. Price stated that grammatical corrections were made since the draft minutes were sent to the Board, and she recommends moving them to the next meeting for approval to give adequate time for the Board to review them. **Mr. Kunowski made a motion to defer the review and approval of September 16, 2026 minutes to the October 21, 2026 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – Aye; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye. Motion passed.**

Public Meeting:

A. Recommendation to the Select Board: Bond Amount & Developer Agreement, Porsche Addition located at 60 Portsmouth Avenue.

Ms. Price explained that tonight is more of a formality, but the applicant is, as part of the Notice of Decision, to establish a performance guarantee and execute a developer agreement. She provided the Board with a copy of the drafted developer agreement. This applicant has not set their type of bond yet; letter of credit or cash. However, they have acknowledged the requirement, and they will have that prior to the pre-construction meeting. The total bond amount is $122,007.00, which is based on estimated costs to install erosion and sediment control, site grading, earthwork, drainage, stormwater treatment, curbing, loam and seed, as prescribed in the site plan signed by the Planning Board chair on August 25, 2026, including a 15% contingency to stabilize the site and return to its pre-development condition, in the event that the construction is abandoned at any point during the construction. The owner and the applicant have coordinated the agreement and the fee structure. The Town's engineer has reviewed for compliance, and

staff recommends that the Planning Board set the bond amount and recommend the amount and the developer agreement to the Select Board for signature.
There were no questions from the Board.

Mr. Fraprie made a motion that the Planning Board approve and set the required bond amount at $122,007.00 and recommend that the Select Board approve the bond amount and the associated developer agreement and authorize its execution. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – abstained; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye. Motion passed.

B. Recommendation to the Select Board: Bond Amount & Developer Agreement, Lindt Fire Access Road, located at One Fine Chocolate Place.

Ms. Price explained this is another developer agreement between the Town and Lindt regarding the obligation to complete the fire access lane improvements and perform work in accordance with their approved site plan. Staff recommends that the Board establish a scope and amount of the guarantee in the total amount of $182,850.00, which includes cost estimate and a 15% contingency amount based on estimated costs to perform all work, supply materials, and provide necessary labor to construct the facility in strict compliance to New Hampshire State Fire Code, pursuant to New Hampshire RSA 153:1 and NFPA 1 Chapter 18 Section 18.2.3.11. All site work shall be completed as required for the infrastructure emergency access route. This scope includes erosion and sediment control, strip loam, earthwork, gravels, and fine grade subgrade preparation. Surface construction includes paving, curbing, sidewalk installation, and protective bollards. Final site completion includes loam and seed restoration, traffic signs, pavement markings, all executed under continuous mobilization, supervision, layout, and traffic control protocols. This is as prescribed in the site plan signed by the Chair on August 25, 2026, to stabilize the site and return it to pre-development condition in the event that construction is abandoned at any point after major construction activity is initiated. As noted, the owner and applicant have coordinated the agreement and fee structure, and the Town's engineer has reviewed for compliance. Staff recommends the Planning Board set the bond amount and recommend amount and the developer agreement to the Select Board for signature.

There were no questions from the Board.

Mr. Fraprie made a motion that the Planning Board approve and set the required bond amount at $182,850 which includes the Lindt & Sprungli (USA) Inc. cost estimate and a 15% contingency amount based on estimated costs to perform all work, supply all materials, and provide all necessary labor to construct the facility infrastructure in strict compliance with the New Hampshire State Fire Code pursuant to NH RSA 153:1 and NFPA 1, Chapter 18, Section 18.2.3.1.1, and recommend that the Select Board approve the bond amount and the associated Developer Agreement and authorize its execution. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – abstained; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye. Motion passed.

C. Recommendation to the Select Board: Bond Amount & Developer Agreement, located at 89/91 Portsmouth Ave.

Ms. Price explained that the August 21st, 2024 Notice of Decision specified that the development agreement be executed between the Town of Stratham and C.A.N. Reality Trust and GGF Limited Liability Company, (the property has since changed ownership to JOEWES LLC) prior to the issuance of a building permit; and a performance guarantee in the form of a bond, letter of credit, or check should be provided to the Town, along with a signed development agreement consistent with the site plan regulations, to guarantee site stabilization, erosion control, stormwater, and landscaping. Staff recommends that the Board establish a scope and the amount of the guarantee as a total amount of

$405,027.00 based on cost estimates to install site stabilization, erosion control, stormwater, and landscaping as prescribed in the site plan. The owner and the applicant coordinated the agreement and fee structure and the Town's Engineer reviewed compliance. Staff recommends that the Planning Board set the bond amount and recommend the amount and the development agreement to the Select Board for signature. Ms. Price updated the Board that the Town has not received the cistern plan and noted for the record that the owner said they could not be here tonight but supports this application moving forward.

There were no questions from the Board.

Mr. Fraprie made a motion that the Planning Board approve $405,027.00 based on the estimated cost to install site stabilization, erosion controls, stormwater, and landscaping as prescribed in the site plan, and recommend that the Select Board approve the bond amount and the associated developer agreement and authorize execution. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – abstained; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye. Motion passed.

D. Discussion on Zoning Change for Banner Signs.

Ms. Price introduced the topic. She stated that a resident, Lucy Cushman requested an opportunity to address the Planning Board regarding the Town's sign regulations, specifically the limitations applicable to banners, and the Zoning Ordinance citations. She came in to apply for a temporary banner, and per the prohibited signs section of the Ordinance, any banners are prohibited. Additionally, there are size limitations for temporary signs as well. Ms. Cushman is here tonight to request the Planning Board support in these changes.

Mr. House invited Ms. Cushman to speak.

Lucy Cushman of Winnicutt Road explained that she came to the Building Department this summer because the church wanted to put up a banner for a week for Welcome Back Sunday. They have done the same sort of thing for their church supper or the Holly Fair. The banners are up for a week, and they have done it for years. This year they were denied because banners aren't allowed since March of 2025. She believes they were the first ones to be denied because in August, there were two banners in front of the former Jones and Beach, one of which is still there. They've been giving out permits until August 1st when somebody read the regulation and said you're not doing it anymore. Ms. Cushman stated that she knows these things are on the ballot, and she tries to read the Planning Board questions, she has been on the Planning Board and she knows how important it is for citizens to read and understand; but somehow, she missed the total ban on banners, which apparently was March 2025; that all banners, pennants, or feather flags were disallowed. As a representative of a nonprofit, like the Boy Scouts or the church, Summerfest, food truck festival, all those things always have banners, and I know they had them right up until August, and now it's suddenly being enforced, and you can't do it anymore. She thinks the reason her church went to a banner instead of a wooden sign, was it takes a lot of manpower to put up a wooden sign that will stay up; a banner is easy to put up. It can then be rolled up and stored in a tiny space. Ms. Cushman stated that it seems to her, for nonprofits at least, to have a banner for one week is not going to ruin the town. She understands not wanting those crazy things like that they have at dealerships and stuff. She wonders if the Board at the time was thinking about the little things that come up that are only up for a week. They are not up for a long period of time. She asked if there is any way this could be amended so that you could have a banner for a week. Ms. Cushman spoke with Ms. Price in the office and asked staff to craft a zoning amendment for non-profits, but Ms. Price explained that she cannot limit a zoning amendment to only non-profits as it would be discrimination. Ms. Cushman concluded that she wanted to bring this to the Board's attention and ask the Board to consider an amendment.

Mr. House stated that he thought churches are exempt.

Mr. Fraprie stated that he wished he knew the history and Ms. Cushman's request seems reasonable. He can imagine that having a wooden sign or something permanent would be a lot harder to deal with on a regular basis for just a short period. He thinks there should be a limitation on having them up for certain period of time and does not see why they couldn't be used.

Mr. Kunowski stated he is sympathetic to Lucy's argument. He sees where in the Zoning Ordinance the specific language was added in March of 2025. He was on the Board at the time and recalls the discussion being more related to pennants and feather flags, but he can be swayed to support a temporary banner.

Mr. Paine stated he is of similar opinion, and he recalls there being a permit process where they could be allowed maybe four times per year. He thinks it could be considered in a well-planned manner.

Mr. House stated the Board can review it as a Zoning Amendment, but being a zoning regulation, they can't do anything now. Ms. Cushman understands that and stated that if the Board wasn't interested in the change, she would go through the petition process and try to write something, but since the Board seems to support the change, she thinks that is better.

Mr. Tramaloni commented that the Ordinance can't be limited to nonprofits, and he expressed concerns with the potential for banners for everything imaginable. He appreciates the Boy Scouts and the church needing an easily managed sign for their events, but he has concerns about opening that door. Ms. Cushman replied that it could be written very tightly, and she understands it can't be limited to nonprofits. She stated that with wood signs, someone needs to dig a hole and put it in and paint it and change the dates; it's a lot of maintenance and a lot of storage. She knows the Town doesn't have to follow its own rules, but you want to lead by example, so you wouldn't want Parks and Rec to have a banner if no one else could.

Mr. Tramaloni asked Ms. Cushman if she got a citizens' petition, what would be the next steps involved? Ms. Cushman replied that she would work up some sort of wording and then it would go to the Planning Board, and they would either say that they recommended it or not. But if it comes from the Planning Board, she thinks the town will have more of a feeling that some planning was involved.

Ms. Price further explained that whoever is petitioning must get 25 verified signatures by the Town Clerk, something like 90 or 120 days before town meeting. The petition is delivered to the Select Board's office, and the Town Clerk verifies that the signatures are from registered voters. It is written and presented to the Planning Board by a citizen. Whether the Board supports it or not, it would still go on the ballot, and the Board cannot change any of that wording once that petition has been submitted. Mr. Fraprie is concerned with the public petition process; that there would not be input from the Board or from staff, and one can get any kind of language one wants, which can be a problem. He understands the issue and Mr. Tramaloni's point about banners, but he thinks if there was a limitation for time, that would be better. Ms. Price replied that there is a provision for temporary signs in the ordinance, but it prohibits banners.

Mr. Fraprie stated he can see a prohibition against feather flags, as it would be a nightmare to have those all over town and with pennants, but with banners, he understands Ms. Cushman's request.

Mr. Tramaloni stated that if he was a business or a nonprofit and put two four-by-fours in the ground, four feet apart, and a piece of wood across them, and then on that piece of wood, stapled banners that were printed up each time, that wouldn't violate the ordinance; it wouldn't violate anything, and yet it would be just as simple as hanging a banner. The difference would be the work is done once, and then one only needs to staple a different banner up there. He is not sure that this would prevent any entity from displaying a sign for their event; it's just the manner in which it is displayed. He thinks there are ways that this can be accomplished that don't violate the spirit, the letter of ordinance, and at the same time provide an option for organizations that wish to do so.

Ms. Cushman replied to Mr. Tramaloni's comments about putting up a permanent wooden thing and then changing; she said the church gets a permit with the permission of another landowner because the church is set back from the road. The people who own the property in front of the church allow the church to put the banner on the corner toward Ginger Fox. She does not know that they would want permanent installation where we change the banner; and the same thing for the Boy Scouts. She sincerely doubts that Stratham Hill Park Association is going to be thrilled with a structure put up that Summer Fest or Food Festival or Boy Scouts use either. Mr. Fraprie agreed that makes sense. Ms. Cushman added that the idea is it is only there for a week.

Mr. Kunowski suggested that the Board consider this question because currently the Zoning Ordinance in Section 7.2, definitions, defines a temporary sign as a ground-mounted sign or a banner affixed to the facade of a structure; so that is inconsistent within the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Cushman replied, the issue with the church is their façade is not on the road and there is no façade at Stratham Hill Park. Ms. Price stated they are freestanding. Mr. Kunowski continued reading: ground-mounted sign or a banner affixed to the facade of a structure, without a permanent foundation established for any period of less than 120 days. A temporary sign shall not include contractors, development signs, signs located on parcels that are for sale or lease, or political signage. He thinks the Board needs to revisit that definition.

Mr. House agrees with Mr. Kunowski and added that perhaps the Board did not consider all the different options. He recalls the feather flags being more of an issue. He is not a fan of, for example, putting a for sale sign under the open hood of a car.

The Board agreed to revisit the ordinance regarding banners.

Public Hearing:

A. The New Hampshire Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (Owner) request for a Minor Site Plan Review to add 16 additional parking spaces at 104 Portsmouth Avenue, Stratham, NH (Map 13, Lots 84 & 85) in the Professional/Residential District.

Ms. Price introduced the project. She stated the applicant completed a Preliminary Conceptual Consultation on September 2nd. Her review of the application noted a few deficiencies including no high-intensity soils information and that a cover letter from a soil scientist was not submitted. The second is a requirement for test pit and percolation tests. The applicant agreed to submit waiver requests for those. She summarized that there are five waiver requests for this project; two are in relation to the two she just described, and the Board should review those before making a determination on application completeness. The other waivers are for a landscape plan, an illumination plan, and the stormwater standards. A revised plan was also submitted on October 2nd that Ms. Price has not had a chance to review, as it did not meet the 15-day submittal period.

Joe Coronati, with Jones and Beach, spoke on behalf of the applicant. He explained they didn't know they needed to submit all the waivers. He considers this project to be one of the more minor site plans that the Board will ever see on a property of this size, and the regulations don't really specify any difference. There is a minor site plan application, but no difference in submission requirements. Because the checklist is the same for minor and major site plans, they would have had to submit, probably $20,000 worth of information on the property just to pave 16 parking spaces, which seems like an awful lot of information; most of which, or almost all of it, is not needed. Mr. Coronati has seen in many towns where for a minor site plan, there is a threshold as to an impervious amount or a building change, and in many towns like Exeter, those are handled administratively, without even the Planning Board's purview on something this minor. Mr. Coronati explained that the location of the parking is an area that had a former building approved therefore there is almost no additional impervious area and NHSPCA has had to use the area for

parking already. They would like to pave the area this year before the winter so as not to have to deal with mud and plowing and the parking problem. He believes the regulations in the waiver are not relevant to the application. They are not changing the leach fields or the septic demand for the site, there is no change to the building, lighting, or landscaping. The impervious coverage is almost identical when looking at the former building that was approved in 2019 or 2018. The reason there was a little grassed island located here, and the sidewalk, is that there was an additional building of about 3,200 square feet located there. The NHSCPA bumped this area out and built a sidewalk around it. When you go out there today, you wonder why is there a random area of grass and a sidewalk following it, and it was all relative to the plan at the time for the building. He stated they are obviously eliminating the need for that building and the approval of and just paving in those spaces. Mr. Coronati added some notes on the plans at the request of Ms. Price related to parking calculations, handicap parking requirements, and snow storage areas.

Mr. House stated that the Board needs to discuss the waivers before accepting the application as complete and asked Mr. Coronati to present the waiver requests.

Mr. Coronati presented the waiver from Section 4.3.2.f. for test pits and perc tests. The waiver was because the parking areas do not affect the septic system, the loading on the field, or the subsoils. Mr. House asked where the leach fields are. Mr. Coronati pointed them out on a plan. He added that they could submit the test pit data from 2018 if the Board would like it. Mr. House asked the Board for comments.

Mr. Tramaloni does not see the project as a major change that will impact anything and he believes this waiver and other waivers are probably appropriate. Mr. Paine, Mr. Fraprie, and Mr. Kunowski are fine with the first waiver.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver to the site plan regulation section 4.3.2.f., Exhibits Required at Submission, for the requirement of data on test pits and percolation tests, including: location of test pits, percolation test data and rate, certification of test witness, and outline of area reserved for leach fields; as there are specific circumstances relating to the site plan that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations because the proposed parking areas do not affect the septic system, the loading on the field or subsoils. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – Aye; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye. Motion passed.

Mr. Coronati presented the waiver from Section 4.3.2.e. for high-intensity soil information for lot size calculations and a cover letter from a soil scientist. He stated that these areas are either existing gravel or lawn areas adjacent to pavement and that we don't do a lot of high-intensity soils anymore. He thinks they stopped doing those in about 2008 when the state changed site-specific soil for all the stormwater information. It has probably been 15 years since they have done HISS mapping. Regarding this site, the area proposed to add asphalt, are already disturbed areas that have been filled, built on, and they are basically looking at fill sites with loam in the area where the old building was. The area near the barns had stone added to give them a secure area to drive vehicles on. He added that HISS mapping would not be accurate because it would not tell you the existing soils because the areas have been all disturbed. He understands HISS mapping is more important when looking at a native site, trying to get an idea of the existing soils on a property that could be wooded or farmland or something that's never been disturbed or hasn't been disturbed in a long time, but that is not the case here.

Mr. Fraprie asked where the additional runoff will be directed. Mr. Coronati replied that because there was a building there previously, it was accounted for in the sizing of the stormwater system. He described the locations of catch basins, slopes, and pond. The paved area will not overload the system and Mr. Coronati thinks there is maybe 150 square feet of additional impervious surface over what that former building was sized at.

Mr. Kunowski clarified that the revised site plan with these additional parking spaces implies that the

NHSPCA completely abandoned the training building and that in the future, if NHSPCA wanted to build that, they would have to come back with a major site plan project. Mr. Coronati understands that.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver to the Site Plan Regulations Section 4.3.2.e Exhibits Required at Submission, for the requirement of high-intensity soils information with lot size calculations and cover letter from a soil scientist; as there are specific circumstances relating to the site plan that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations because the parking areas are either existing gravel or lawn areas adjacent to pavement. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – Aye; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye. Motion passed.

Mr. Coronati presented the waiver request to Addendum C Stormwater Regulations. He stated this proposal is a small increase in impervious material. The former site plan approval had a proposed building located in some of the spots and the others by the barn are proposed over a gravel section in use for years. All the stormwater goes into the existing detention pond, and he believes this is for the submission of a drainage report.

Mr. House asked if it was the six parking spaces in the lower left corner by the barn that is all gravel. Mr. Coronato replied yes and over the years the NHSPCA has brought in trailers for hay or other materials and they laid stone for the trailers to park on. He added that lately they have used it for overflow parking for staff and volunteers. He described the location of the parking in relation to the abutter and that the grade of the spaces is towards the barn so there is no stormwater running off towards the property line. Mr. House stated that a lot of the discussion is about up top where the old building was approved and the waiver says that the proposal is a small increase in impervious materials; pavement is different from gravel. Mr. House asked if Mr. Coronati is considering that small as well. Mr. Coronati replied he is considering all of it small. The building that was proposed was 3,163 square feet. All the pavement that is proposed, including those spaces down by the barn and the ones in the lawn area, are 3,345 square feet, so the difference is about 180 square feet of additional impervious.

Mr. Kunowski asked if there can be a signage at the parking near the horse barns that references no idling. He is thinking in terms of health of the animals. A representative of the NHSPCA replied yes, of course.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver to the Site Plan Regulations, Section B.ii of Addendum C as there are specific circumstances relating to the site plan that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations because this proposal is a small increase in the impervious material. The former Site Plan Approval had a proposed building located in some of the spots. The others by the barn are proposed over a gravel section in use for years. All the stormwater goes into the existing retention pond. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – Aye; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye. Motion passed.

Mr. Coronati presented the waiver request to Section V.5.2 for landscape design. They are not altering, adding or removing any landscaping. There were no questions from the Board.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver to the site plan regulations, section 5.2, landscape design standards, as there are specific circumstances relating to the site plan that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations because of the scale of the project. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – Aye; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye. Motion passed.

Mr. Coronati presented the waiver request to Section V.5.8, illumination. He stated this is relative to acquiring lighting design standards for parking lots. The waiver is requested because this area already has

light poles and adequate lighting. The area is intended for staff parking and he presumes the SPCA doesn't stay open super late at night, and it is already well lit. A representative of the NHSPCA added that the events they are open for are minimal classes or programs where they would have a majority of staff there.

Mr. Fraprie asked if there a light plan is already on file. Mr. Coronati replied yes. Mr. Fraprie asked for confirmation that it is not going to change. Mr. Coronati replied it is not going to change and there are lights in this area and it is not the main parking lot. Mr. House asked if it is lit up all the time whether there are classes or not. A representative of the NHSPCA replied that certain lights are on for safety; they are on timers.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver to the site plan regulations, Section 5.8.1 illumination, as there are specific circumstances relating to the site plan, that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations, because there is already lighting in the area. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – Aye; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye. Motion passed.

Mr. House called for a motion on application completeness.

Mr. Fraprie made a motion that the application is complete as for the Planning Board submission for a minor site plan review to add 16 additional parking spaces at NHSPCA. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – Aye; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye. Motion passed.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion to open the application to the public for comment. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – Aye; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – aye. Motion passed.

There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion to close the public comments on this application. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – Aye; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye. Motion passed.

There were no further comments from the applicant or the Board.

Ms. Price reviewed the proposed conditions on the draft Notice of Decision with the Board and the applicant.

Mr. Coronati questioned the need for a bond on this small project. He asked if they didn't complete the work, the Town would pull the bond and pave it for them, as typically that is what a bond is for, and he doesn't think that is necessary in this case. Ms. Price replied that it is a regulation requirement per Section 7.1, and a waiver was not submitted. She deferred to the Board.

Mr. Paine asked if the least way to get around this concern for a bond is something that doesn't require the whole bond process or something that may be easier for them to address the need without going through additional waivers and understanding their concerns.

Mr. Coronati explained the process of the applicant submitting a bond amount that is reviewed by an engineer, and that will take time. He presumes the only bonding needed would be if NHSPCA started the paving and didn't finish. There are times when towns only require the amount of money required to go back in and stabilize the site. He provided the example of somebody starting a construction project on Portsmouth Ave, getting halfway through it, running out of money, going bankrupt, leaving town, and

leaving a half-empty site. The town would want at least to have the money to stabilize the site, which is understandable on a bigger project. In this case, they could probably have the amount of loam and seed right in their manure pile. If they didn't complete it, you could just go over and take a bucket load from their tractor, and they could reloam and seed all these areas very quickly. Mr. Coronati thinks that, to save time and energy, if that didn't have to be a condition, it would be simpler. Mr. House replied the Board needs things for the record. Mr. Coronati replied that is his waiver pitch. Mr. Fraprie suggested a condition of approval that a letter of credit be obtained before starting the project. Mr. Coronati suggested that Board require a letter of credit for a certain amount and forgo the engineering review. Ms. Price replied that the applicant would have to come back to the next Planning Board meeting and a developer agreement would have to be executed before they could start work. Mr. Fraprie believes the process seems to be a bit excessive for this project, and he would like to make it simple. Mr. Tramaloni commented that a letter of credit is not an onerous requirement, but a waiver would also make do. However, he is not crazy about the reasoning that this is a small-scale project, so why do we have to follow all the regulations. He stated we see homeowners that come in for a fence and have to follow the regulations and that is also a small, if not smaller, project.

The Board took a recess at 8:17 pm and resumed at 8:22 pm.

Mr. Coronati submitted a waiver request. Mr. House read aloud the waiver request from Section 7, Agreements and Bonding of the Site Plan regulations prepared by Mr. Coronati. The justification for granting the waiver is that the size and scope of this development is so small that a bond or financial guarantee or site review agreement is not necessary. The site could easily be stabilized by the owner, if needed. There were no comments from the Board.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board grant the waiver to the site plan regulations, Section 7, Agreements and Bonding, as there are specific circumstances related to the site plan that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations, because of the scale of the project. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – Nay; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye. Motion passed.

Ms. Price reviewed with the Board and the applicant the draft Notice of Decision. All were in agreement.

Mr. Kunowski made a motion that the Planning Board conditionally approve the application for the New Hampshire Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (Owner) request for a minor site plan review to add 16 additional parking spaces at 104 Portsmouth Avenue, Stratham, New Hampshire. All precedent conditions, as outlined in the draft Notice of Decision, as revised, must be met by the applicant at the expense of the applicant prior to the plans being certified by the Planning Board. Certification of the plans is required prior to commencement of any site work or recording of any plans. Once these precedent conditions are met and the plans are certified, the approval is considered final. Mr. Fraprie seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – Aye; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye. Motion passed.

B. Amended Site Plan Regulations Continued from August 19, 2026, with corrections. [Attached to the meeting minutes.]

Ms. Price described changes made from the previous iteration reviewed by the Board. The Board provided additional comments. There was a lot of discussion regarding defining what projects would qualify as a minor site plan or amendment. The Board decided to remove the definition for minor site plan.

Mr. Fraprie made a motion to continue the site plan regulation review to October 21, 2026. Mr. Paine seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – Aye; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye. Motion passed.

MISCELLANEOUS

A. Stratham Open Space & Connectivity Plan – Schedule Public Hearing

Ms. Price discussed with the Board a public hearing date for the Stratham Open Space & Connectivity Plan. The Board is flexible with whatever meeting date Ms. Price chooses.

B. Zoning Amendments Workshop – Schedule Work Session

Ms. Price discussed with the Board a date for a zoning amendments workshop. The Board is flexible with whatever meeting date Ms. Price chooses.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Fraprie made a motion to adjourn at 9:52 p.m. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Mr. Tramaloni – Aye; Mr. Paine – Aye; Mr. Fraprie – Aye; Mr. Kunowski – Aye; and Mr. House – Aye.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Susan Connors