



Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes
November 06, 2019
Municipal Center, Selectmen's Meeting Room
10 Bunker Hill Avenue
Time: 7:00 PM

Members Present: David Canada, Member
Tom House, Member
Robert Roseen, Member
Colin Lavery, Member
Mike Houghton, Selectmen's Representative
Pamela Hollasch, Alternate Member
Robert Baskerville, Alternate Member

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Tavis Austin, Town Planner

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Mr. House took roll call.

2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. October 16, 2019

Mr. Canada made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of October 16, 2019 as presented. Mr. Lavery seconded the motion, which passed with a unanimous vote.

3. Public Meeting:

- a. Preliminary Consultation.** Begeron Ground Mount Solar Array Install at 7 Sweetland Place. Solar PV installation of 9.24 kW ground mounted solar tracker consisting of 24 QCell 385W panels. Submitted by Neil Begeron, 7 Sweetland Place, Stratham NH 03885 Tax Map 06 Lot 179.

Mr. Austin explained the application to the Board. Mr. House asked Neil Begeron if he had any comments. Mr. Begeron stated that he is in compliance with section 5.14 and is

asking for a height wavier for an additional 6 inches. Mr. House suggested that he speak to his neighbors about his plan. Mr. Begeron said he had already discussed his plans with his neighbors. Board took no action, thanked applicant for submission and recognized upcoming hearing on the project 11/20/19.

4. Public Hearing(s):

- a. Subdivision and Conditional Use Permit.** Robie Farms, represented by Wayne Morrill, Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc., requests a Subdivision and Site Plan Review & Conditional Use Permits for an Open Space Cluster Subdivision at 90R Winnicutt Rd., Stratham, NH 03885, Tax Map 14 Lots 53&54

Mr. Austin reviewed the third party review comments Jones and Beach received from Horsley Witten. Horsley Witten stated they are in compliance with the Towns regulations with two minor exceptions. One of the comments from Horsley Witten is related to the fill slope on an infiltration basin. They recommended having an impermeable liner installed around the perimeter and Jones and Beach added a note with the plan that states they will install the liner to the satisfaction of Horsley Witten. The other comment from Horsley Witten is that one of the infiltration ponds that allows the driveway configuration to work encroaches on the 25 foot no disturb area of a wetland. Wayne Morill will explain, staff recommends moving forward with the discussion on the 25 foot no disturb encroachment because the alternative is a less desirable plan.

Wayne Morill from Jones and Beach Engineers reviewed the plans and materials submitted to the Board. Neighbors were concerned about the flow of water draining to the front of the property because they felt the wetlands along Winnicutt Road were sensitive. In the current plan there is one section that drains to the front that cannot be forced to the back, the rest of the development runs in swales along the roadway then along the back of each one of the lots on the east side of the property into a gravel wetland that they worked with Horsley Witten to ensure it was acceptable to them. The fire cistern will be located in the center of the cul-de-sac. The other open space on the east side of the roadway will be 4 parking spaces for people to access the trail network. Mr. Morill explained the driveway that is in the 25 foot buffer of the gravel wetland is placed in an area that is not a wetland impact, it is a gravel wetland next to a wetland. There are notes on the plan that state that is the only impact to the buffer and any other impacts will go through the Board. There are 40 feet of trees around the property that will not be touched and there is a restriction on each lot that states they cannot build within 50 feet of the property line.

Mr. Austin explained to the Board that all the storm water infrastructure will be built first not last.

Mr. Morill explained why some of the permit applications from DOT are still pending.

79 Mr. Baskerville addressed some questions he had about the plan for Mr. Morill. He
80 confirmed that the name of the two-way road will be Treat Farm Road and there will
81 be a 60 foot right-of-way to the abutting line. Mr. Baskerville wanted know if the
82 cul-de-sac would be replaced by a two lane road if the right-of-way was built on.

83 Mr. Morill answered that yes and the fire cistern would be relocated outside of the
84 right-of-way.

85 Mr. Baskerville expressed concerns about the fire cistern not having enough space if
86 it had to be relocated.

87 Mr. Morill said they would look into that concern.

88 Another question regarding the 60 foot wide right-of-way Mr. Baskerville had was if
89 there is a slope easement for the right-of-way.

90 Mr. Morill answered that if it were ever developed into a town road, they would have
91 easements on both sides.

92 Mr. Baskerville recommended that the wells be drilled before filling.

93 Mr. Morill agreed to add that into the construction sequence.

94 Ms. Hollasch asked about the right-of-way being a potential through road for the east
95 property. She asked what is on the east property.

96 Mr. Morill answered that it is an 80 acre lot with one single residential home on it
97 and if they were to develop that lot, they would be able to connect the roadways.

98 Mr. Baskerville questioned the proximity of the well for lot J to the wetland.

99 Mr. Morill stated that he will relocate the well for lot J closer to the open space.

100 Ms. Hollasch asked about the location of the trail.

101 Mr. Morill explained the trail is part of the 60 foot right-of-way and the open space is
102 where it begins.

103 Mr. Roseen had questions about a missing note on the infiltration basin section.

104 Mr. Morill said he would add that missing note in.

105 Another comment Mr. Roseen had on the gravel wetland was to add 40% voids to the
106 crush stone and he recommended the inlets on the gravel wetland have pre-filtered
107 screens that can be put on each cell to extend the life of the gravel wetland.

108 Mr. Morill said he would add those into the plans.

109 Mr. Lavery agreed with Mr. Baskerville about the cistern being a tight fit if the 60
110 foot right-of-way was built on. He would also like to add he appreciated the note
111 about the 4 additional parking spaces for trail access.

112 Mr. House asked the public if they have any comments.

113 Mary Mielke, a resident from 91 Winnicutt, had some comments she would like to
114 address. She appreciated the driveway entrance being moved so the light will not

115 shine into her house. She asked what will happen to the existing driveway
116 Mr. Morill answered they are removing the existing driveway and putting seed down
117 to turn it into a grass area.

118 Ms. Mielke asked if there was a traffic study done for the project to show the effect it
119 would have on Winnicutt Rd.

120 Mr. Morill explained that they did do a traffic analysis and on a peak day, there will
121 be 18 additional cars. The analysis says that with this small of a development there
122 won't be any impact to surrounding roadways. They are still waiting for a DOT
123 driveway permit and they may have some comments regarding traffic concern.

124 Ms. Mielke wanted to know if the wetlands will go toward the back of the
125 development.

126 Mr. Morill said that the wetland on the east part of the lot next to Winnicutt Road
127 was a wetland that sometimes swells up and rises a lot and it was a request that all
128 drainage goes to the rear of the project. They tried to make sure all water drained to
129 the back, which caused an application for an Alteration of Terrain permit because all
130 the lots needed to be graded. The only area that will not drain to the rear is right at
131 the front of the property. Part of a DOT permit requirement is that you have to go
132 down the first 50 feet of a roadway before it goes up to make sure the roadway does
133 not drain into Winnicutt. That will be the only area the water will not drain to the
134 back.

135 Ms. Mielke asked if the water will affect their private wells.

136 Mr. Morill answered that the development will be all individual wells which will not
137 affect their wells.

138 Ms. Mielke asked if the wells have been tested for PFA's.

139 Mike Pladd from Continuum of Stratham said the wells were tested and nothing
140 came back.

141 Ms. Mielke asked if there would be landscaping along Winnicutt.

142 Mr. Morill answered that they aren't planning to add any landscaping, there are trees
143 that they will not be touching around the perimeter and they are replacing the
144 existing driveway with grass.

145 Ms. Mielke asked about lighting and signing.

146 Mr. Morill answered that there will be a street sign and maybe a postal box out front.
147 There may be signage for the development, but that would have to come before the
148 Board. There will be no street lighting in the development.

149 Ms. Mielke asked how close the first house will be to Winnicutt.

150 Mr. Morill answered 200 feet off Winnicutt.

151 Beth Adams, a resident from 86 Winnicutt Rd., had questions regarding a fence on

the property line, whether it would be inside the tree line or outside of it. She also wanted to know if the existing path at the bottom of her field would be changed.

Mr. Morill explained that there is nothing that will change in the area of the path. A fence will be placed outside of the tree line so that there will be no visual impact from the existing houses to the house attics. There will be no additional development, the fence will be placed on their property against the tree line.

Mr. Austin asked if the Board has questions on the possible connection to other developments and there being different entrance signs.

The Board did not express any concerns with multiple signs on the same road.

Mr. Austin stated that if the board was ready they could close the public hearing.

Mr. Canada asked if they have spoken with the conservation commission.

Mr. Morill answered that they have spoken to the conservation commission when they first started the project. They discussed the construction of a gravel wetland next to a wetland to protect it.

Mr. Canada made a motion to close the public hearing and Mr. Roseen seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mr. Austin explained the potential conditions that were brought up in Planning Board discussions. Inlet protections, slope easements at the connecting road and cistern location verification. The Homeowner's Association documents should make it clear that public has access to the trails. A note should be added on the water well phasing, 40% void notes, pre-filtered screens, and gravel parking location for 4 spots is all condition precedent.

Mr. Roseen wants to know when there would be a required amendment and where it is defined.

Mr. Austin explained that it is up to the planning board when an amendment needs to be made.

Mr. Roseen made a motion for the approval of the Subdivision, Site Plan and Conditional Use Permits with the following conditions:

Conditions precedent:

1. Applicant shall obtain all necessary State permits, including but not limited to:
 - a. AOT Alteration of Terrain
 - b. NHDES State Subdivision
 - c. NHDOT Driveway permit
2. Applicant shall coordinate with Stratham DPW on location and installation of 4 gravel parking stalls designed to provide public trail-user parking

3. Applicant shall verify cistern location in cul-de-sac appropriately located to not obstruct through-traffic upon roadway extension; DPW and Fire to verify.
4. Applicant shall include fill slope easements at western terminus of Treat Farm Road to enable future construction of roadway.
5. Applicant shall create a potable water well phasing plan will be added to plan set, particularly for those lots where well located at rear of the lot in a manner that lot fill would make well location inaccessible for drilling;
6. Applicant to include “40% voids” for crushed stone language in gravel wetland detail.

Conditions Subsequent:

1. Full compliance with Subdivision and Site Plan Regulations unless otherwise stipulated in the approval.

Applicant shall submit Homeowners Association language to the Town for review; language shall denote “public” access to trails.

Mr. Lavery seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

b. Skate Park. Town of Stratham Skate Park. Kerri Vivathana, of the Skate park Committee, has proposed the installation of a skate park east of the Municipal Center softball field located at 10 Bunker Hill Ave., Stratham, NH 03885

Mr. Austin explained that the Skate Park is not a full site plan review. It is a way for the Board to understand what the project is proposing.

Mr. Roseen made a motion to accept the application as complete and Mr. Lavery seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Kerri Vivathana, of the Skate Park Committee, explained why the Municipal Center is a good location for the Skate Park. Ms. Vivathana introduced Christian Smith, an engineer from Beils Associates and he is there to explain the project.

Mr. Smith explained the Skate Park project. He discussed the storm water infrastructure that would be added to the Skate Park.

Mr. Austin reminds the Board that the outcome is not to say that the Skate Park will be located at the proposed site or that it is moving forward. The point is to confirm that this location has been evaluated for a location without having impact to town property or adjoining properties.

Mr. Lavery asked if there was consideration for parking. His concern is with the softball field filling the Municipal Center parking area and the parallel parking along Market Street.

226 Mr. Smith answered that he did not look at the parking and defers that back to the
227 Committee.

228 Seth Hickey, the Parks and Recreation director, commented on the parking question. As of
229 last week the softball program has been reduced in size from a fifth through eighth grade
230 program to a Kindergarten to 2nd grade program.

231 Bob Valeri, a resident from 3 Market Street, stated when he had moved to Stratham he did
232 not expect an edifice to be built across the street. He does not want to be looking out his front
233 door and see a Skate Park because he thinks it is unsightly. Parking is a major concern
234 because when there is a football game going on, parking overflows down to Bittersweet. He
235 moved to Stratham because it is a residential and rural town and he did not expect to see
236 something like a Skate Park here. He is also concerned about the noises that a Skate Park will
237 cause. Especially in the summer with open windows. He is concerned with the people yelling
238 at the Skate Park. He stated that there will be a lot of disturbances to the neighborhood. After
239 football games, there are a lot of things left behind, trash, pieces of uniforms, left on the grass
240 or on the fence. They are cleaned up, but he believes that a Skate Park would require even
241 more maintenance. He is worried about teens using the Skate Park for illegal activities
242 because it is in the corner where it gets dark at night. Mr. Valeri stated that he believes it has
243 quite an effect on property values on Market Street and Bittersweet Lane. He wants it to be
244 located in a different location in Stratham that will not affect residence.

245 Jay Nesvold, a resident from 7 Bittersweet Lane, had heard that Stevens Park was not
246 possible because of a drainage issue and wondered if that were true.

247 Mr. Austin answered stating it was a drainage and parking.

248 Mr. Nesvold asked if Stratham Hill Park was considered.

249 Mr. Austin answered that it was considered, but then there was a lot of non-support surfaced.
250 Such as why is everything going in Stratham Hill Park, there's no park left, everything's
251 related to different uses, everything is being jammed into the park.

252 Mr. Nesvold had heard that there was a lot of money spent to put the field in as is.

253 Eric Lonsinger, a resident from 5 Market Street, asked about lighting at the park.

254 Mr. Austin answered that all that has been submitted is the terrain with no lighting on the
255 plan.

256 Mr. Lonsinger moved in about a year and a half ago, he liked the area with the open space, he
257 is concerned because there are already issues with parking, litter, cleanup, and traffic.
258 Especially since the access points to the Park are along Market Street. It is currently noisy
259 during the daylight and if the Skate Park is open, then he is worried it will be noisy at night as
260 well.

261 Brandon Peck, a resident from 13 Bittersweet Lane, agreed with what his neighbors have
262 expressed about Market Street being heavily congested during any sporting event that occurs
263 on the fields. He is worried that it will become worse if there was a Skate Park there. It is a
264 residential neighborhood and he is concerned with all the added traffic through the
265 neighborhood that has children 5 and under playing in the streets frequently. He is also

266 concerned about the location taking up the field space that get used all the time. He stated that
267 there are multiple Skate Parks in surrounding communities, Newmarket, Hampton and Rye,
268 and that a lot of them have been deserted. They erode and concrete cracks, nobody is using
269 them so nobody wants to pay to keep them up. Mr. Peck does not think that it is a good spot
270 for a Skate Park. He thinks Stratham Hill Park or some other location would be better.

271 Chris Ritchie, a resident from 21 Bittersweet Lane, had a question for Mr. Hickey about the
272 recreational sports that take place on the field and whether they provide any revenue for the
273 town.

274 Mr. Hickey answered that the town receives \$1000 for flag football to rent the field. The
275 \$1000 will be reinvested into the field so it can recover from the flag football usage.

276 Mr. Roseen discussed with Mr. Austin doing a Pros and Cons list with regard to the Skate
277 Park with every location. It has been brought to the Board multiple times already and every
278 location has had Pros and Cons to having it there.

279 Mr. Austin stated that the Board is deciding whether the Skate Park could be put in the field.
280 The Skate Park Committee was asked to look at Town Property and where a Skate Park could
281 go. The Committee is looking for the Planning Board to say it can functionally be used as a
282 site in accordance with the site plan regulations and then they can go to the Select Board to
283 get their approval.

284 Mr. Canada said that the question tonight is can it, not will it.

285 Mr. Roseen said that he wants to help the Committee avoid the pinball that this has become.

286 Mr. Lavery asked how deep of an excavation is the Skate Park and the bowls, the reason for
287 him asking was when the town expanded the Municipal Center parking lot there were several
288 feet of large boulders and rocks that came out of the expansion and all the boulders were
289 placed where the Skate Park is supposed to go.

290 Mr. Smith explained the dimensions of the bowl and that the deepest is 22 feet. The
291 excavation in total is estimated at 6 – 7 feet.

292 Michael Tallone, a member of the Skate Park Committee, addressed some residential
293 concerns. The site was specifically chosen to be away from the residential side of things.
294 They designed it so the entrance would be from the west side away from Market Street and
295 toward the Municipal Center. The committee thought that the location was good because of
296 the proximity to the Stratham Police Station and the Library for after school programs.

297 Ms. Vivathana addressed why they thought having a Police Station nearby was important
298 because that was a concern from town citizens during town vote.

299 Mr. Ritchie asked why having a Police Station was a concern.

300 Mr. Austin reminded everyone of the purpose of the public hearing, not to approve the
301 project, they are deciding if the location is possible.

302 Ms. Vivathana spoke of why Police was a concern. Some residents believe a Skate Park
303 brings in bad behavior, so having a Police Station nearby would bring comfort to those
304 residents.

305 Mr. Roseen commented that Chief Scippa, who is now retired, was comfortable with the
306 location with the ease of visibility from the Police Station to the Park.

307 Mr. Tallone explained that they looked at parking in other communities and felt the
308 Municipal lot would have plenty of room for people to park.

309 Mr. Baskerville asked if they had any information on parking due to the change of use.

310 Mr. Hickey said the field is currently used for flag football, other than that usage, there is a
311 walking path that will not be impacted. There is an anticipated decline in usage. They predict
312 a decrease in amount of parking due to the decline in programs.

313 Mr. Austin explained that the Municipal Center has enough parking according to regulations.

314 Mr. Peck is requesting to the Board that they look into what sports are being omitted. He also
315 believes they are eliminating the possibility of future use of the field if they put in a Skate
316 Park.

317 Mr. Canada reminds the public and Board what the point of the meeting is, and it is to decide
318 if the Skate Park can be built at the Municipal Center Field.

319 Mr. Austin stated that it is Staff's recommendation that the presentation submitted is in
320 compliance with the site plan regulations.

321 Mr. Roseen asked what the action in front of the Board this evening is.

322 Mr. Austin said he would recommend a motion to accept the site plan materials as
323 satisfaction of the applicable site plan review regulations for installation of a recreational
324 element on town owned property.

325 Mr. Roseen asked what the next steps would be if they accept.

326 David Moore, the town administrator for Stratham, stated his understanding of the process is
327 that it has been a citizen led effort to advocate for a Skateboard Park for the community. The
328 next steps are in the hands of the Committee as an advocacy group. In the past, as a group,
329 they have sought the support of the Select Board in sponsoring an article for the towns
330 warrant at Town Meeting. In the past the Select Board declined this request due to the lack of
331 information they had at the time. As a result the citizen group went to the Town Meeting with
332 a petition, they had signatures and appeared on the Town Warrant. The question went before
333 the Town Meeting where funding was denied by vote. The question where it goes from here
334 is in the hands of the advocacy group sponsoring the project. Whether they go back to the
335 Select Board or go straight to the Town Meeting via a petition. Any other process associated
336 with getting the necessary approval would be up to the advocates.

337 A resident from Bittersweet Lane wanted to clarify that the park is mostly at grade.

338 Mr. Smith shows the 3D images of the Skate Park.

339 The resident asked if noise was a concern for the Board.

340 Mr. Tallone answered that the sound study they had will be no louder than it is now.

341 Mr. Lonsinger asked if there would be rails.

Mr. Tallone said there would be.

Mr. Lonsinger said there would be metal on metal which would create a loud noise.

Mr. House made a motion to close the public hearing and Mr. Lavery seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mr. Baskerville expressed concerns with parking.

Mr. Canada made a motion to accept the submitted Site Plan materials as satisfaction of the applicable Site Plan Review regulations for installation of a recreational element on Town owned property. Mr. Lavery seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

5. Public Meeting:

a. Rollins Hill Farm. Discussion of two requested changes to approved project.

Mr. Austin explained that the applicant requested time on future agenda.

The Board discussed with Mr. Austin what the two requested changes are.

b. Staff Updates.

Mr. Austin informed the Board that their Master Plan copies can be picked up on the way out.

Mr. Canada informed the Board that the Heritage Commission intends to have a meeting with the Board about starting a committee to have possible rezoning on Route 33.

6. Adjournment

Mr. Canada made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:02 PM and Mr. Lavery seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Note(s):

1. Materials related to the above meeting are available for review at the Municipal Center during normal business hours. For more information, contact the Stratham Planning Office at 603-772-7391.
2. The Planning Board reserves the right to take items out of order and to discuss and/or vote on items that are not listed on the agenda.