



**Stratham Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
July 19, 2017
Municipal Center, Selectmen's Meeting Room
10 Bunker Hill Avenue
Time: 7:00 PM**

Members Present: Bob Baskerville, Chairman
 Jameson Paine, Vice Chairman
 Mike Houghton, Selectmen's Representative
 David Canada, Member
 Nancy Ober, Alternate

Members Absent: Tom House, Secretary

Staff Present: Tavis Austin, Town Planner

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The Chairman took roll call.

2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. June 21, 2017

Mr. Paine made a motion to approve the meeting minutes for June, 21, 2017. Motion seconded by Mr. Houghton. Motion carried unanimously.

As Mr. House wasn't present, Mr. Baskerville asked Ms. Ober to be a full voting member. Ms. Ober agreed.

3. Special Guest Presentation: Theresa Walker of Rockingham Planning Commission

Ms. Walker updated the Board on a project concerning Coastal Adaption for the Master Plan and climate change for the Town of Stratham. It will result in 2 different deliverables; a draft Master Plan and some public outreach to those groups affected by the sea rise in Great Bay. Ms. Walker said there had been some difficulty in identifying contacts for Condo Associations and asked that if the Board knows of any to let Mr. Austin know so she can meet with affected Associations. She will be back around October time to share the draft of the Master Plan.

4. Public Hearing—

- a. Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit Applications** for the revision of an existing site plan and proposed building addition with associated parking, utilities, and drainage located at 58

Portsmouth Avenue, Stratham, NH 03885, Map 9 Lot 15 submitted by Scott Laffey, ICL Autos, 382 Newbury Street, Danvers, MA 01923.

Mr. Jonathan Ring, Jones and Beach, took the floor. He explained they wish to expand the existing Audi dealership from 14,000 S.F. to approximately 21,500 S.F.

Mr. Baskerville asked staff if this application is considered complete. Mr. Austin said not only is this application coming to the Planning Board as complete, it has already had a full vetting by the Technical Review Committee (TRC) on June 20, 2017.

Mr. Paine made a motion to accept the application as complete. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Mark Regent, Architect for the project said the existing building is a mixture of aluminum panels and synthetic stucco known as EIFS. A 25' addition is proposed on the front, the existing canopy will be removed on the side, and they will add an additional area to the back. What is now the showroom will become a sales area, offices and customer amenities. A new showroom will be added to remain Audi compliant. Due to the Gateway regulations, they will never be technically compliant, but this proposal has been accepted by the TRC. The canopy being removed will become a fully enclosed service drive for 6 cars, 2 lanes of 3 and there will be a high speed automatic door at each lane. The rear addition is strictly additional service bays. The existing service bays are not Audi compliant as they don't have enough clearance for a SUV. An enclosed area for detail and washing will also be created. They will end up with one additional bay over Audi's requirements.

The proposal is to get rid of all the aluminum panels and EIFS and make the building totally compliant with the Gateway regulations. The bulk of the solid portions of the building will be hardy planked. Mr. Baskerville asked if the hardy plank would be in a clapboard style. Mr. Regent confirmed it would be.

Mr. Baskerville observed that the TRC were satisfied with the architectural style. Mr. Austin commented that at the TRC meeting there was some discussion about what the garage doors would look like and a concern about how visible the aluminum would be and the glass.

Mr. Paine asked if there had been consideration given to breaking up the roof line. Mr. Regent said he personally prefers the current design as it meets the current changes better. Mr. Baskerville observed there is an existing second floor and asked if there would be one above the new show room. Mr. Regent said there would be a high ceiling higher than the second floor instead.

Mr. Eric Buck, Landscape Architect talked through the changes to the landscape which incorporates street trees, ornamental grasses, deciduous shrubs, perennial ground cover and evergreen material around the entire property. Mr. Baskerville asked if this all referred to new added vegetation. Mr. Buck confirmed it would be all new added vegetation.

Mr. Paine referred to a parking space to the south east and asked if that would remove any of the tall cedars. Mr. Buck said they would be maintained. Mr. Baskerville asked what was happening behind the building. Mr. Buck said they are putting in a buffer. Mr. Austin added that the rear planting is a TRC recommendation.

Mr. Ring talked through the site plan portion of the plan. He said there would be a small amount of site work including removing a small amount of pavement, relocation of the dumpsters to the rear, consolidating vehicle parking and putting in some holding tanks in the rear. There will be

3 detention basins to handle storm water. The leach field is capable of coping with the extra addition. Sidewalk will be added along Portsmouth Avenue on the property, not a right of way, which will go around the corner. Existing light poles will remain, but with LED fixtures. Mr. Paine asked if any of the lights were spot lights that point downwards. Mr. Scott Laffey said most of them face down at an angle, but none of them spot out onto the road. Mr. Baskerville asked about the wall packs. Mr. Laffey said you can't see further than about 12' off of the building. Mr. Baskerville asked if the new LEDs would be on the building too and if they would be downward facing. Mr. Laffey said they would be.

Mr. Ring said they had 2 waivers; one for Section 3.8.8 Table b.5 Footnote 1 which relates to the new light boxes on the back on the poles and the spacing of the light boxes and the other is from Section 3.8.8 Table b.5 and Table c.6 relative to 40' spacing of the trees and the landscaping.

Mr. Austin said the TRC generally accepted the 40' spacing, but there was talk about which side of the street the trees should be located on along Portsmouth Avenue. The applicant doesn't want pedestrians caught between the trees and cars. The goal was to place the sidewalk as close as possible to the right of way without being in it which gives the applicant control of the sidewalk. The trees need to be set back to avoid the overhead power lines. The TRC did say in order to be Gateway compliant the lights should be placed along the interior drive. He understands the TRC, but also understands the applicant's hesitation to put utilities out there that have to be fed by private utilities until the Town figures out how it would accept that responsibility at some future time, if ever. Mr. Austin has no issues with the waivers but informed the Board that one of the notes that was added relates to the sidewalk that the driveway where it intersects Portsmouth Avenue, the original plan submittal actually showed the crosswalk crossing to the Portsmouth side and included the ADA dustpan at that corner. TRC suggested that a note be added that it not be constructed until there was a receiving sidewalk on the Porsche side of that intersection. He continued that the TRC wanted to know how the property owner intended to comply with the Gateway regulating plan that was approved in 2009. On sheet PR1 they have indicated a potential alignment that would connect the driveway currently between Porsche and Audi with a futuristic Market Street extension. When Toyota was approved a right of way was required on that site plan that extends down the driveway between the 2 buildings and extends over towards the south and extends functionally along the full southern boundary of the property in anticipation of a future Gateway road. In April the TRC made a motion to support the Market Street extension location to be between what is now the approved cell tower location and the storage buildings. The applicant was unable to get their powers to agree to even a paper street shown in that location. It doesn't seem appropriate to him from a planning perspective to install lights on that driveway at this time.

Mr. Austin suggested the lighting waiver be specific to this application as opposed to waiving the lighting requirement.

Mr. Baskerville opened the meeting up to the public.

Mr. Kirk Scamman, Frying Pan Lane talked about the proposed Gateway road on the Market Street side. The road has been designed to go right through the drainage systems of the Makris storm water proposal which seems ludicrous to him. He said when he attended the meeting for the Gateway project in April he suggested that before the cell tower was set, this road would be a major issue. He asked if a Gateway road would fit in between the cell tower and the storage buildings as his understanding is the minimum width has to be 70'. Mr. Scamman said he would like a note on the plan that he as an abutter is strongly opposed to how this is laid out. Mr.

Houghton and Baskerville said there is a disclaimer on the plan that mentions there are a lot of future variables.

Mr. Baskerville said this plan (PR1) is there for information and asked if it was binding in any way. Mr. Austin said it wasn't binding and wouldn't be recorded, it was put together at the request of the TRC to ensure that the project proposed at 58 Portsmouth Avenue was not going to propose a future conflict with the Gateway roads as presented on the non-binding, non-road Master Plan regulating plan that was adopted by the Town in 2009.

Mr. Austin talked about the width and said the minimum road width which the regulating plan calls a street is 51' and the maximum is 55'. He believes there is currently 53' between the cell tower lease pad area and the front face of the street so it would fit.

Mr. Paine made a motion to grant a waiver for this specific project, as proposed, to not include any additional light posts on the property due to the fact that it includes 3 relatively minor additions to an existing structure with an existing area of pavement. Motion seconded by Mr. Canada. Motion carried unanimously.

After discussion the Board decided the second waiver wasn't warranted.

Mr. Paine made a motion to close the public hearing for the Audi of Stratham application. Motion seconded by Mr. Houghton. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Paine made a motion to approve the conditional use permit and site plan applications for the Audi of Stratham proposal, 58 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 9 Lot 15 which incorporates the revision of an existing site plan and proposed building addition with associated parking, utilities, drainage, and sidewalks as well as insuring the accessible curb pan and cross walk across the common driveway of dealerships between the existing Audi and Porsche dealerships be noted, so as to require its development at a future date when the establishment of sidewalk on the north side of the crossing occurs and to confirm that the construction of sidewalks on Portsmouth Avenue and interior drive road be constructed at 5' wide with the mentioned 10'. Mr. Baskerville suggested adding that the Planning Board accepts the spacing of the street trees as shown on the site plan. Mr. Paine agreed with the suggestion and continued that the landscape plan be amended to illustrate snow storage areas which are consistent with the design plan. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

- b. 2-Lot Minor Subdivision Application** to create one (1) new building lot at 9 Elton Ave, Stratham, NH 03885, Map 2 Lot 18 submitted by Joseph Nichols, Beals Associates, PLLC, 70 Portsmouth Ave., Stratham, NH 03885.

Mr. Paine made a motion to approve the formal subdivision application for the French property as complete. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Nichols talked through the application which is for a pork chop lot subdivision. The existing property has a frontage of 268' and the pork chop lot will have a frontage of 62'.

The new lot will be 2.83 acres and located west of the existing property. The existing lot is partly in Stratham and partly in Exeter, but the pork chop lot will be solely in Stratham. He met with Mr. Austin who confirmed all conditions for a pork chop lot had been met.

Mr. Baskerville said at the end of Elton Avenue there is a 50' right of way. Mr. Nichols explained it is an easement for a future 50' right of way should the parcel, which is currently conservation land be accessed. Mr. Austin said that conservation land has 2,000 plus feet of frontage on Stratham Heights Road.

Mr. Baskerville referred to Section 4.4.2.e of the subdivision regulations and wondered if that would impact the setback of the house. Mr. Austin said he spoke to the Town Administrator to understand the intent of this regulation and whether it was to always obligate a pork chop lot to establish a home behind an existing home. The Town Administrator said it was not. Mr. Austin feels confident that this application meets the intent of the regulations. He informed the Board also that if they grant approval that a condition should be added quoting the statement at the end of Section 4.4.2.f.

Mr. Baskerville opened the floor up to the public.

Mr. O' Neil, 8 Elton Avenue, and direct abutter said that he is in favor of this plan. He did ask if there could be consideration for locating the driveway on the opposite side as his house is reasonably close to the lot line.

Mr. Austin suggested a discussion between the applicant, the neighbor and Highway Agent to coordinate where the driveway could go. The applicant said he would be fine with that.

Mr. Paine said that on the plan there is a 6" perforated plastic pipe visible and he asked what that was for. Mr. Nichols said there is some wetland on the lot so he believes it for drainage.

Mr. Paine made a motion to close the public hearing for the subject property. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Paine made a motion to approve the proposed 2 lot minor pork chop subdivision application to create one new lot at the French property located at 9 Elton Avenue, Tax Map 2, Lot 18 with the condition that the applicant is compliant with the Town of Stratham subdivision regulations and a note is added to the plan and deed that either of the lots can be further subdivided into a pork chop lot. Mr. Austin added that it is not a note to the plan, but that the deeds be prepared to reflect that. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

- c. **6-Lot Subdivision Application** to create five (5) new building lots at 8 Whittaker Drive, Stratham NH 03885, Map 19 Lot 68 submitted by Jonathan S. Ring, PE, Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc., PO Box 219, Stratham, NH 03885.

Mr. Austin said he believed the application to be complete.

Mr. Paine made a motion to accept the application for a 6-Lot subdivision as complete. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ring, Jones and Beach said they had been before the Board twice already with preliminary designs and this plan tonight is the one submitted at the original preliminary in November 2016 which is the design for a hammerhead inside a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Ring said test pits have been done and the soils tested. The wetlands have been flagged. The zone is R/A and all lots meet the dimensional requirements. Each lot has a well and a septic system.

There are 2 waiver requests relating to the road; one for a 22' width and the other is for the hammerhead.

There is a detention basin in the right of way for the cul-de-sac area and driveways have been shown. There is a reduction in storm water flow as a result of the detention basin. They have infiltration drains also around each house. Mr. Ring continued they are showing drip edge details which shows that the roof run off is going to fall into a stone trench and infiltrate into the ground water and they have a minimum 1000' rain garden.

Mr. Ring said they have listened to the abutters Mr. and Mrs. Brocklebank who currently have 2 driveways, one of which comes off of High Street and the other crosses the Sullivans' property plus there is an underground pipe from their house that extends onto the Sullivan property by about 20'. They are going to remove one of the driveways and loam and seed it back to grass and give them a new driveway between 2 existing trees and a light pole and secondly they are cutting back the pipe by about 50' to put it on their property and install some rip rap which will allow the drainage to have a bit of a splash pad before it goes into the roadside swale and heads down the road into the detention basin.

Mr. Ring said they had one more waiver request for lot size soil calculations.

Since the last meeting they had received a letter from West Environmental concerning 5 Hillcrest Drive which is an abutting property belonging to Mr. and Mrs. Graves. Mr. West, Wetland Scientist observed several wetlands which were not noted on the plan dated 4-19-17.

Mr. Chris Albert, Jones and Beach said there were some concerns raised about wildlife at the previous meeting. It is true that there is some wildlife in the vicinity of the wetland areas and they anticipate that they will need an EPA Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan. If you disturb more than an acre of soil, an EPA SWPPP is required. It is small enough not to need an AOT permit. They have contacted the NH Natural Heritage Bureau and he said they have a memo from them dated August 31, 2016 which is valid for a year so that will need to be renewed. They did say that they did not think this project would cause an impact.

Mr. Baskerville said the regulations cater for a hammerhead, but not a circular way for a hammerhead. Mr. Austin felt advising the applicant to get a waiver would be appropriate. Mr. Baskerville said the wording should be changed on the plan.

Mr. Ring said the intent was to keep the drainage structures and facilities within the right of way as opposed to an easement.

The Board discussed department head comments. Mr. Lavery, Highway Agent has several concerns with the road design as it is of no benefit to the Town. Snow storage in particular is an issue, no driveway details are shown, and there's no 50' right of way incorporated between Whittaker and Hillcrest Drive. Maintenance costs will be high too. Mr. Lavery requests that the Board does not accept this road. It is also the recommendation from staff that the other design of a through road is a better option.

Mr. Austin read Section 4.4.3. Streets Platting of Streets of the subdivision regulations. He said he does not support the proposed cul-de-sac or a hammerhead within a cul-de-sac with no information supporting the continuance of the previously approved plans being impractical. The applicant has referred to topographical limitations, but the Board has not seen that demonstrated.

Mr. Baskerville said that it looks like the existing septic for the existing house will need to be reconstructed. Mr. Ring said it would be.

Mr. Ring said they do show a typical driveway detail on the plan which shows a drainage pipe that would go underneath the driveways for Lots 2, 3, and 4. That shows the slope and drainage swale also.

Mr. Austin referred to Mr. Ring's comment that each lot would have a rain garden, but the detail doesn't say that nor does the site plan suggest that would be required. Storm water control is referenced, but it doesn't say what or how so that needs to be addressed. Mr. Ring agreed that would be a good idea. Mr. Paine asked if each individual owner would be responsible for the rain garden or an association. Mr. Ring said they would be maintained by individual homeowners. He said the calculations do not show the use of the rain gardens to reduce the flow of water although it does show the infiltration trenches around the houses. Mr. Austin observed that even without the rain gardens, the plans exceed the minimum requirements for the drainage, however, if the Board feels rain gardens are critical, maintenance thereof should be included in the deeds.

Mr. Paine asked Mr. Ring if he felt he could construct a drainage basin in the standard hammerhead right of way structure. Mr. Ring said not in accordance with the regulations because it's 160' long and approximately 60' wide so it would not fit. Mr. Ring explained how the drainage would work. He said he can super elevate the grading so the rain goes into the center. Mr. Paine said he feels the applicant needs to demonstrate hard ship and an inability for this design over connecting the 2 right of ways and having a through road. Mr. Ring explained how much extra work would be involved for the drainage if they went ahead with a through road.

Mr. Baskerville referred to Mr. Laverty's comments about driveways. They looked at sheet P1 for driveways and the individual lots. Mr. Ring reminded the Board they don't know where houses are going to go. The Board looked at the individual lots. Mr. Ring explained where culverts and extra drainage would be needed. Mr. Baskerville and Paine requested the details be added for the next plan. Mr. Baskerville said he had an issue with the driveway on Lot 3 as there is large driveway radius being shown but the driveway starts as a shared driveway with Lot 2 and it circles around the detention basin before it gets to the Lot 3 in the right of way. Mr. Ring said they could split the driveway and have 2 separate ones or they could do a loop road 14 or 16' wide and put the pond inside, but it is more infrastructure for Mr. Laverty to maintain which is why they show the hammerhead. Mr. Baskerville said he doesn't like the driveway layouts. He doesn't mind hammerheads or cul-de-sacs, but not a large right of way with a hammerhead.

Mr. Austin said there wouldn't be enough frontage for the lots if just the hammerhead was designed.

Mr. Baskerville iterated his preference for the through design and said the Planning Board could deny this plan based on Section 4.4.3.

Mr. Austin said if the applicant or Planning Board suggest the applicant or any combination of that suggest the one way loop under Addendum A Figure B Typical Detailed Paved Turnaround, the center of the loop cul-de-sac as identified in the Addendum is landscaped.

Mr. Austin read that if topographical conditions make such continuance or conformity impractical, the Board may permit dead end streets.

Mr. Baskerville opened the floor up to the public.

Mr. Graves, Hillcrest Drive said he would like to know why they can't extend a cul-de-sac or traverse across the topography to alleviate all the drainage issues. He understands the difficulty for the Highway Department, but it seems perfectly sensible to come off of Whittaker and traverse the topography. It would help the Fire Department response time and environmentally and physically it makes sense. Mr. Graves then addressed wetlands and said 4 different professionals have been out there and he can't believe that the wetland markers haven't been changed. He was there with Mr. Mark West from West Environmental and within spitting distance of the property line, they were standing in water and surrounded by wetland vegetation, trees and shrubs and the soils indicated that also. They continued down the property line and found more. The Board has a letter from Mr. West backing up what Mr. Graves is saying namely that the wetland delineation is not correct. He suggested Beach and Jones put in a marker so the elevation change can be seen from his driveway and the hardship it will create for him and the drainage issue that will be on the property line as it is all wetlands.

Mr. Baskerville said his concern for the wetlands is knowing what an impact it has on the plans so if they do a site walk with the conversation commission, they will have the commission's opinion first and then they will decide whether or not to get another wetlands scientist if there appear to be conflicting delineations. Mr. Austin said he isn't sure the Conservation Commission should be the arbiter between the parties. Mr. Baskerville said he is interested in their advice.

Mr. Austin responded to Mr. Graves' first question and said that the Board doesn't get to choose what an applicant turns in for plans.

Mr. Graves said he has heard that no way could a cul-de-sac be extended. Mr. Austin said earlier on in the process the applicant indicated to him that they did not want to modify their front yard.

Mr. Austin said one of the other options for the road was to extend Whittaker to approximately the location of the cul-de-sac illustrated in this plan and another was to extend Whittaker and connect back out to High Street so there would be at least one circular pattern. That second one was not proposed by Jones and Beach or the applicant, it was just discussed in a meeting.

Mrs. Brockelbank, 110 High Street said Mr. Ring says this plan came about due to all the abutters' objections, but he failed to mention their objections that this plan will impact the drainage on their property. She pointed out also that the plan states 112 High Street, but there is no 112 High Street. Mrs. Brockelbank referred to the Master Plan which was put together by people with no bias and adopted by the Town. This Master Plan serves as a guidance tool for the Planning Board and the residents trust in that document and the Board's ability to use it. It limits the number of dead end streets in the Town and also discounts the previously approved right of ways for a connecting point of the Sullivans' land which were intended for a through road if the Sullivans were going to choose to develop their property. In addition the plan has a negative impact on the Stratham tax base due to extra maintenance costs and makes it an unsafe environment for future residents of this proposed road and those travelling on High Street as the proposed intersection is visually impaired. It also makes it more difficult for the Fire Department to reach residences in an emergency. She continued that during the last 8 months they have been presented with multiple variations of the Sullivans' plan. They have made it very clear their preference is to ignore the through way despite there being a plan that shows it can be done.

Mr. Robert Hillery, 5 Whittaker Drive said he is not against development just bad development. He suggested that if they look at this a little differently most of tonight's discussion will become mute. He referred to Section 4.4.1.b of the subdivision regulations which says lots shall not be

irregularly shaped or have elongations just to provide necessary square footage. He referred to Lots 1 and 5 which both have long tongues which are in excess of 25% of the total square footage. He thinks if there were less lots it would solve a lot of tonight's issues. He is strongly opposed to this plan as submitted because it's putting too much into a small space.

Mr. Richard Sweat, Vineyards wished to echo Mr. Austin's comments about dead end streets; they are not encouraged by the Town. In Section 4.3.3 it refers to the fact that if restricted by topography the Board may permit dead end streets. He can't believe such conditions exist and doesn't think dead end streets are good for the Town in general. He thinks interconnecting streets provide more walking and biking and more recreational opportunities. A sense of community is promoted, and more efficient road maintenance. He agreed also with the irregular lot sizing. He thinks the plan should conform to what was approved in 1987 which has the 2 road stubs and to the subdivision regulations.

Mr. John Gray, 32 Vineyard Drive said his concern is safety with school buses so he would like to see less traffic on High Street where the school buses go. He thinks interconnected roads provide more safety. He suggests using the existing cul-de-sac on Willowbrook Avenue as suggested by Mr. Graves if the through option doesn't go ahead.

Mr. Darrin Brockelbank, 110 High Street addressed Mr. Ring and said he was doing his client a disservice by continuing this plan. He agrees that there are too many lots and agrees with all the issues raised by others tonight. He opposes this current plan.

Mr. Scott Longwell, 1 Whittaker Drive said he feels there needs to be a waiver for the irregular lot size and agrees a lot of issues would go away with fewer lots.

Mr. Peter Horton, 103 Tidewater Farm road said he has spoken with the Brockelbanks and this proposal doesn't make sense from a safety or economic sense. Access isn't good and then taxes will increase to cope with the road maintenance. He thinks it is a good idea that a site walk occurs for the Board to see this on the ground.

Mr. Roy Byrnes, 2 Hillcrest Drive said when the Board does a site walk, he suggests they pay attention to his home concerning the road situation. Mr. Baskerville asked Mr. Byrnes if he was opposed to the Hillcrest connection. Mr. Barnes confirmed that he was.

Mr. Austin reminded everybody that when Board members do the site walk it is to review the plan before them tonight and not to look at any other suggestions.

Mr. Baskerville shared the process for a site walk to the public.

Ms. Brockelbank offered for people to park in her driveway for the site walk. She said if people do park on Whittaker, she would like people to walk High Street so people can see the visibility issues. Ms. Brockelbank requested that when this is next on the agenda that it is one of the first 2 agenda items because of the late hour. Mr. Austin said that typically continued public hearings tend to be first on the agenda.

Concerning the site walk, Mr. Austin said he thinks it would be helpful if the proposed right of way was delineated as well as the rights of way from Whittaker and Hillcrest.

Mr. Ring talked about the 2 lots with the tail shapes which result partially from the current configuration of the property. Before the Sullivans attained this property, they owned the house lot at the bottom of Whittaker Drive. The original owners of this lot subdivided the property when it was 1 acre zoning and 150' frontage and the 50' strip was left to become a road to come in and

then to have a subdivision in the future. He said it is true about needing 2 acres and he has to do something with that land. He could give an extra wide right of way to the Town, but the Town doesn't want all that land. They did talk with the Brockelbanks during earlier discussions about reconfiguring it, but nothing came of it.

Mr. Ring appreciates everybody's comments tonight and he has taken notes.

Mr. Hillery wanting to clarify his comment earlier about the tails on a couple of the lots. He said it isn't the shape, but that they are needed to have 2 acres. Mr. Ring said even if it was 3 acres, the tail would still exist.

Mr. Baskerville asked Mr. Ring if they were ready to have this plan submitted to Civilworks for review.

Mr. Baskerville asked if it was acceptable for Board members who couldn't make a site walk to walk the property at a time convenient to them. Mr. Ring said that would not be a problem. Mr. Graves gave permission for members to walk on the right of way on his property, but warned them the conditions weren't ideal.

Mr. Paine made a motion to continue the hearing for the 6 Lot subdivision application at 8 Whittaker Drive until September 6, 2017. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Baskerville said there will be a site walk on July 26, 2017 at 6:00 pm. The meeting point will be at the end of Whittaker Drive.

Mr. Austin confirmed he would post a notice for the site walk.

5. Public Meeting—

- a. 2-Lot Condominium Subdivision**, represented by Joe Falzone, for 7 Emery Lane, Stratham, NH 03885, Tax Map 13 Lot 44. *Preliminary Consultation* for 2-Lot Condominium Subdivision.

Mr. Falzone explained that there are 2 buildings on this lot, one is a residence, and the other is his office. He would like to make this a condominium subdivision to allow 2 separate condominium form of deeds, one as a residence and the other as an office use. They both have separate driveways and parking, but share a well and septic.

Mr. Austin says he is receptive to this application because nothing really changes apart from the ability to sell the house separately from the office. Mr. Baskerville asked if a line would be drawn down the middle to address the issue of limited common land. Mr. Falzone said he would do something like that.

Mr. Paine asked if other structures would be added. Mr. Austin suggested that when this comes before the Board for formal approval that a condition be added to limit to what is there now.

Mr. Baskerville said he doesn't see or hear any objections for this plan.

6. Miscellaneous

- a. Member Comments**

Mr. Austin organized a meeting with Mr. Baskerville to meet with himself and Mr. Lavery on July 25, 2017 at 08:30 am. That would be to discuss rights of way, dead end roads, irregular lots and perhaps pork chop lots.

Mr. Austin referred to Theresa Walker's presentation and said even though the Planning Board didn't have a lot of comments as a group to Julie Labranche's work, that plan did go forward. A stem from that project is that more money became available and they came up with a project called Setting Sail which is a grant to look at what they do with the plan. \$6,100 was awarded for that and the outcome is a chapter for the Master Plan and some good outreach as stated by Theresa Walker.

Mr. Baskerville said he would like to meet with Mr. Austin to suggest some additions to tighten up the regulations on things like lot shapes. Mr. Canada said he thinks it is important that the whole Board participate and he feels very strongly about this topic and would like some input.

Mr. Baskerville said some of the roadway regulations such as cross sections are very weak.

Mr. Austin and Baskerville said the whole Board will have input and Mr. Houghton reminded Mr. Austin they were going to have a workshop.

The Board asked about Mr. Rob Roseen, the new incoming alternate. Mr. Austin explained he hasn't been sworn in yet, but he would send him an email reminding him.

Due to the lack of a quorum for the next Planning Board meeting, Mr. Paine made a motion to cancel the August 2, 2017 Planning Board meeting. Motion seconded by Mr. Canada. Motion carried unanimously.

7. Adjournment.

Mr. Paine made a motion to adjourn at 10:25 pm. Motion seconded by Mr. Canada. Motion carried unanimously.