



**Stratham Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
March 5, 2014  
Municipal Center, Selectmen's Meeting Room  
10 Bunker Hill Avenue  
Time: 7:00 PM**

---

Members Present: Mike Houghton, Chairman  
Bob Baskerville, Vice Chairman  
Bruno Federico, Selectmen's Representative  
Jameson Paine, Member  
Mary Jane Werner, Alternate  
Steve Doyle, Alternate  
Christopher Merrick, Alternate

Members Absent: Tom House, Member

Staff Present: Lincoln Daley, Town Planner

---

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call.**

The Chairman took roll call. The Chairman asked Mr. Merrick to be a voting member in the absence of Mr. House. Mr. Merrick agreed.

**2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes.**

a. January 15, 2014

Mr. Paine made a motion to approve the minutes from January 15, 2014. Motion seconded by Mr. Federico. Motion carried unanimously.

**3. Public Hearing(s).**

a. **Lindt & Sprungli (USA), Inc., One Fine Chocolate Place, Stratham, NH 03885, Tax Map 3 Lot 1.** Site Plan Review Application to construct a 108,261 square foot building addition, 110 space parking lot, and associated site improvements including the relocation of driveways and utilities, and grading work.

Mr. Brad Mezquita from Tighe and Bond, on behalf of Lindt said all the issues in the staff memo had now been addressed and reflected on the plan. They had been before

1 the Zoning Board of Appeals on January 21, 2014 and all the waivers had been  
2 approved. Further, the applicant has met with abutters regarding the noise issues. The  
3 company hired a noise consultant to identify and mitigate noise from the site. Mr.  
4 Mezquita stated that they believe the noise comes from a dust collector. Mr. Mezquita  
5 said they had met also with the residents on Rollins Farm Drive to talk about the gated  
6 gravel emergency access road to the rear of the property. He repeated a previous request  
7 that they would like a condition to be added to the approval that states the road has to  
8 be constructed before a certificate of occupancy can be issued.

9 Mr. Houghton asked when something would be received from the noise engineer. He  
10 was told by Mr. Greg Merrill, Facilities Manager for Lindt that they didn't have a firm  
11 date yet for that.

12 Mr. Merrick asked for a reminder of the ZBA variances. Mr. Mezquita gave a brief  
13 summary.

14 Mr. Paine asked if any wetlands had been identified as part of the new gravel emergency  
15 access road. Mr. Mezquita responded that they will need to delineate the wetland areas  
16 as part of the road design.

17 Mr. Houghton asked if there were any comments from the Fire Department concerning  
18 fire protection and the fire pond. Mr. Daley said the Fire Department is still reviewing  
19 the plans. Mr. Daley asked how calculations are determined for loading when it comes  
20 to fire protection. The applicant responded that said they had collected some data from  
21 the engineer who had done some work to the fire pond at a previous time. A Fire  
22 Protection engineer has also been employed who produced a statement that says the  
23 volume of water in the pond is more than adequate to serve this new addition. Mr.  
24 Daley said there is anticipated growth on the site so would the pond be able to provide  
25 fire suppression for that too. The applicant responded in the affirmative.

26 Mr. Merrick addressed the issue of odor saying Lindt said in a previous meeting they  
27 would provide some documentation to the Town proving they are more than meeting  
28 federal guidelines when it comes to odor and emissions. Mr. Daley said the Town has  
29 received a report which supports the applicant's previous statements.

30 The Chairman opened the discussion up to the public.

31 Mr. Graham from the Rollins Hill Farm Development talked about the connector road.  
32 He explained that several meetings had taken place and they had in theory agreed to 2  
33 changes involving the location and nature of that connection which Mr. Graham  
34 highlighted on a plan. Mr. Graham said they agreed informally, but would like a more  
35 formal agreement in place.

36 Mr. Daley said the design would need to come before the Fire Department for their  
37 review also.

38 Mr. Baskerville made a motion to close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Mr.  
39 Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

40 Mr. Daley addressed the applicant. He asked if, as part of the report, there is any way  
41 indicated to mitigate the noise further or is it just to identify the noises that are  
42 emanating from this facility. Mr. Merrill said their approach is to be a good neighbor

1 and identify offending noises and mitigate them as much as they can.

2 Mr. Baskerville made a motion to approve the site plan for expansion dated November  
3 22, 2013 last revised February 5, 2014 with the following conditions:

- 4 1. The applicant shall submit a copy of the approved sewer discharge permit to the  
5 Town Planning department.
- 6 2. The applicant shall donate a minimum of 12 trees of a 3” caliper of the Planning  
7 Board’s choice for the benefit of the community.
- 8 3. The applicant’s licensed engineer shall submit fire suppression design plans,  
9 demand requirements, designing components, and engineering specifications for  
10 review and approval by the Town.
- 11 4. The applicant shall design and construct an emergency access road as generally  
12 depicted on sheet 4 of the referenced plan to the abutting property line of Tax Map  
13 3 Lot 24 for the purpose of providing a secondary emergency access from Rollins  
14 Farm Road to Marin Way, final design and location of the emergency access road  
15 shall be mutually agreed upon by Lindt and Rollins Hill Development or the current  
16 owner of that tax map and the Town. Said emergency access road shall be  
17 constructed prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the new building  
18 addition and it shall be maintained and snow plowed by the applicant. It shall be  
19 maintained on the Lindt property by Lindt, and Rollins Hill Farm by either the Town  
20 or by the Rollins Hill development corporation.
- 21 5. The applicant shall submit a sound mitigation study within 90 days with any  
22 required repairs finished before the certificate of occupancy, any future sound issues  
23 are to be repaired in good time. The Planning Board leaves itself the option to have  
24 Lindt return to the Planning Board if future sound issues arise.

25 Motion seconded by Mr. Merrick. Motion carried unanimously.

- 26 b. **Sarannie, LLC and ST Holding Company, LLC, 37 Portsmouth Avenue, Stratham,  
27 NH 03885 for the property located at 37 & 39 Portsmouth Avenue, Stratham, NH  
28 Tax Map 9, Lots 2 & 3. Site Plan Review Application and Conditional Use Permit  
29 pursuant to Section 3.8 of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance to construct a 7,125  
30 square foot auto dealership building expansion, parking lot and roadway  
31 improvements, and related lighting, landscaping, drainage enhancements.**

32  
33 Mr. Bruce Scamman introduced himself, Jim Gove, Gove Environmental Services, and  
34 Mr. David Yanofsky, applicant and property owner. He began the presentation by  
35 providing an overview of 6 topics to be discussed with the Board. The first was a  
36 temporary site plan approval extension of 3 months, the second to get the project under  
37 jurisdiction, third to talk about the meeting that was had with the Gateway Technical  
38 Review Committee (GTRC), fourth a brief overview of the site plan, fifthly the wetland  
39 issues on the site, and finally the conditional use permits that will be needed.

40  
41 After a brief discussion, Mr. Baskerville made a motion to extend the temporary site plan  
42 approval to June 6, 2014. Motion seconded by Mr. Merrick. Motion carried  
43 unanimously.

44  
45 After a brief discussion, Mr. Baskerville made a motion that the Planning Board accept

1 the plans as complete and accept jurisdiction. Motion seconded by Mr. Merrick. Motion  
2 carried unanimously.

3  
4 Mr. Scamman talked about the meeting the applicant had had with the Gateway Technical  
5 Review Committee (“GTRC”) in January 2014. He explained that at the corner of River  
6 Road and Portsmouth Avenue, there used to be a Mobil gas station and adjacent to that  
7 was a Subaru Dealership. They are working on a site plan to combine those 2 lots in the  
8 Gateway District. This project has a road in the back which would be the first of the  
9 Gateway roads built in Town. Mr. Scamman shared comments from the GTRC. He said  
10 they liked the building, and they were excited about the Gateway road. In phase 2, they  
11 were looking to connect the road with an S curve connecting into the Autofair property,  
12 which was met with different reactions from the Committee. Some felt it should stay as  
13 it is in Phase 1, others thought using Stop signs for calming measures would be better.  
14 Mr. Scamman said the GTRC very much liked the landscaping plan; there is less interior  
15 landscaping, but lots of it around the property. There will be a little pocket park in the  
16 rear of the lot also. Mr. Daley added that not all the members were in agreement about  
17 the elevations and architectural design. He thought the Board should consider, as part of  
18 the review process, working with the applicant to revise their elevations to meet the intent  
19 of the design standards within the Gateway District.

20  
21 Mr. Daley mentioned that as part of Phase 2, Mr. Scamman had talked about having a  
22 shared driveway with Sullivan’s Tires, an idea the GTRC really liked. Mr. Scamman  
23 discussed the 2 phases and stressed there are 2 options for the road which are dependent  
24 upon what Market Basket decides. Mr. Houghton asked Mr. Scamman if there would be  
25 a reason not to talk to Sullivan’s Tires about merging their driveways prior to Phase 2.  
26 Mr. Scamman said it is his understanding that they are not too excited about entering into  
27 discussions at this point. Mr. Daley said the reason Subaru was before the Board is  
28 because the GTRC identified that Subaru are not in compliance with Section 3.8 so the  
29 applicant will need to apply for a conditional use permit. There are 7 items for the Board  
30 to consider.

31  
32 Mr. Daley ran through the items: Section 3.8.8.b; involves the central zone design  
33 standards in roadways. This project exceeds the maximum block area of 30,000 square  
34 feet. From the same section the maximum footprint allowed for a building is 15,000  
35 square feet, this project is about 15,525 square feet. Again from Section 3.8.8.b central  
36 zone design standards: the maximum front setback is 15 feet, but the location of the  
37 building exceeds that setback. Mr. Daley continued that New England traditional street  
38 lighting is required on all sidewalks. The lighting proposed for River Road and along  
39 Portsmouth Avenue doesn’t meet this requirement. He said parking area design  
40 standards, with the exception of the small vegetated island in the interior portion of the  
41 property, no interior landscaping or island medians are being proposed. Mr. Daley  
42 referred to public space and open space standards. He said the applicant will need to  
43 clarify if the proposed development dedicates the minimum of 15% of the total  
44 development area to open space and public space. Lastly Section 3.8.9.vi. which involves  
45 architectural and site design standards. Portions of the building extend beyond the 50 –  
46 75 feet limitation without any breakage to the façade of the building itself. Mr. Daley

1 said the GTRC recommended connecting the access roads between Sullivan Tires and  
2 Subaru, to ensure the proposed architectural elevations meet the intent and requirements  
3 of Section 3.8.7., Building and Site Design Standards and Section 3.8.9., Architectural  
4 and Site Design Standards. Mr. Daley said the proposed Gateway road includes many of  
5 the elements of the Gateway which are required as part of the Ordinance, however there  
6 are certain elements that deviate slightly from those requirements which the Planning  
7 Board should consider as part of the review process.  
8

9 Mr. Scamman continued by discussing the lighting for the Gateway Road. He said 25  
10 feet is required on center and the same for trees which means only 12.5 feet between a  
11 lighting pole and a tree. The trees will grow into the light bulbs. He said maybe lighting  
12 could be alternated on each side of the road.  
13

14 Mr. Scamman then explained that the project is an expansion of an existing car dealership.  
15 They will be adding approximately 7,100 square feet to the side of that building which  
16 includes an area underneath an overhang for delivery of cars. The actual footprint of the  
17 walls is 15,000 square feet, but the overhang adds an extra 525 feet to that. He did not  
18 realize that all roof overhangs had to be included in the overall size so that alters the total  
19 to 7,610 square feet. Mr. Scamman said they need some direction from the Board as to  
20 which footprint they want Subaru to go by with the regulations because the regulations  
21 are not specific if the measurement is wall to wall or to include roof overhangs. Mr.  
22 Scamman said that this project will remove 2 driveways, one of which near the entrance  
23 of River Road off Portsmouth Avenue resulting in a safer environment. The new  
24 proposed Gateway Road is further back from Portsmouth Avenue and creates more  
25 queuing space for vehicles. There will be porous pavement in the front and side of the  
26 lot. In the rear they could not do it all the way through because of the leach field. A  
27 space has been created though to capture water in a bio retention area. Pavement will be  
28 removed on one side of the lot for a new driveway and with less parking. They will be  
29 creating a new 8 feet wide multi-use sidewalk on one side and on the other side there will  
30 be a grass panel. He explained that the sidewalk is a little larger, but they felt at 6 feet it  
31 would be too narrow for both pedestrians and cyclists to use it.  
32

33 Mr. Scamman then reminded the Board of the gas transmission line that crosses the  
34 Gateway Road and through the property. He explained that there are a lot of regulations  
35 associated with a federal gas transmission line. On the landscape plan there are no trees  
36 in that area because their roots play havoc with the gas line itself. Lastly, they are going  
37 to remove some steps and make the area more handicap friendly.  
38

39 Mr. Baskerville asked about delivery trucks and if there was room for them to drive  
40 around the building. Mr. Scamman said the building is not designed for that. He  
41 reminded the Board of the parking lot at 6 Frying Pan Lane which is for Subaru deliveries.  
42 He showed a temporary area on the plan that would give a tractor trailer room to come  
43 onto the property, back up, and exit the property. On Phase 2, they moved a driveway  
44 which creates a throughway that tractor trailer traffic can use. Mr. Baskerville asked  
45 about the Fire Department getting around the building. Mr. Scamman showed on the plan  
46 that they had intentionally left no parking on one of the corners to create a wider turn.

1 They have not done design work on that yet.

2  
3 Mr. Scamman turned to the subject of wetlands and gave an overview of the meeting held  
4 yesterday with the Chairperson of the Conservation Commission, the Chairman of the  
5 Selectmen, the Highway Agent, the Town Administrator, Mr. Daley and Subaru's design  
6 team to discuss the connector road and wetland permitting. He showed the impacted  
7 wetland area on the plan totaling approximately 33,535 square feet in size. They did an  
8 exhibit for the DES permit showing if the Town built the road going through that area  
9 connecting to the back of the lot, it would encompass the entire wetlands. After the  
10 discussion yesterday, the Town offered to pay the mitigation fees for crossing the  
11 wetlands for Market Basket who is supposed to build the road in accordance with their  
12 2008 approval. Mr. Canada, Chairman of the Selectmen said at the meeting that he would  
13 like a letter from the Planning Board saying they want the road.

14  
15 Mr. Scamman invited Mr. Gove to talk about the specifics concerning the wetlands. Mr.  
16 Gove stated they had flagged the wetlands which is an area that has been modified  
17 significantly, but still had the characteristics of a wetland. He said the wetlands drain  
18 from the north to the south and collects from the uplands, goes through a culvert and  
19 becomes a wetland after that. The wetland continues off site to a pond on Sullivan's  
20 Tires property and that continues to drain to the south toward Market Basket. Mr. Gove  
21 said if he talks about the impacts associated with this particular site, of 33,535 square  
22 feet, the filing fee will be \$6,706 because it's more than 10,000 square feet, there has to  
23 be compensatory mitigation.

24  
25 Mr. Gove continued by explaining the other compensatory mitigation alternatives  
26 available. The first option is to create and construct new wetland areas. This would  
27 require the creation of wetland area using a ratio of 1.5 to 1 resulting in a 50,000 square  
28 foot wetland area. The second option involves a direct payment to the Aquatic Resource  
29 and Mitigation Fund ("ARM"). This would require a payment into the Aquatic Resource  
30 and Mitigation fund of approximately \$145,854. The final options would be to dedicate  
31 and preserve offsite wetland areas. This essentially involves an area of both wetlands and  
32 uplands that are preserved at a particular ratio. Mr. Gove said there are a couple of  
33 potential preservation sites. He explained that from a standpoint of what is being  
34 preserved, it is called preservation of the upland buffer. A wetland is picked that has a  
35 more valuable resource than the impacted wetlands and a buffer is created around it and  
36 protecting that along with the resource itself. Typically, half the area needs to be uplands.  
37 The Town, conceptually would be the agent for the actual application because the owner  
38 has to be allowed to give the authority to the agent to file the application. Mr. Gove said  
39 there is a parcel at the end of River Road that could be utilized, it is a larger parcel than  
40 needed at about 29 acres. However, there are other parcels that may be available for  
41 preservation. He says that would be the most cost efficient way for the Town to provide  
42 compensatory mitigation.

43  
44 Mr. Merrick sought confirmation that the Town would be paying for the mitigation fees.  
45 Mr. Scamman said that his client would build the road, but the deal with Market Basket  
46 was that the Town would be responsible for all fees associated with the wetlands permit.

1 Mr. Scamman addressed the proposed sewer line saying they were proposing water,  
2 sewer, gas, and underground utilities be put in as part of the new Gateway road. However,  
3 the road would have to be wider than the standard required width.  
4

5 Mr. Merrick asked if the Town would be paying for the construction of the road also. Mr.  
6 Daley said that up for discussion before the Board of Selectmen is the payment of the  
7 application fee, costs associated with high ranking consultants to prepare the application,  
8 and any survey costs associated with the property used for mitigation. Mr. Yanofsky  
9 stated that the Jewett Construction company has quoted roughly three quarters of a  
10 million dollars to construct the road.  
11

12 Mr. Merrick asked if Market Basket were willing to continue the road to the same design  
13 as Subaru's. Mr. Daley replied that at this moment it is an unknown.  
14

15 Mr. Baskerville asked Mr. Gove if they were going to apply for the wetlands permit  
16 piecemeal as different sections of the road were built. Mr. Gove said this particular plan  
17 can at least give the Wetlands Bureau an indication as to what the potential future phase  
18 2 impacts would be. With regards to the compensatory mitigation, the fact that there is  
19 already a parcel that could be used for Phases 1 and 2, helps getting the Wetlands Bureau  
20 to understand that phase 2 will be done at some time, and a parcel of land has already  
21 been set aside for that.  
22

23 Mr. Baskerville asked how thick they expected their total cross section to be. Mr.  
24 Scamman replied it was around 230 - 236 inches. Mr. Baskerville commented that they  
25 probably need 6 feet either side of the septic system for depth below pavement down to  
26 the bottom of the seasonal water table. He asked if they were putting 3 feet of water  
27 either side when they need 6 feet. He asked if that would affect the long term water table  
28 below the septic system. Mr. Scamman said they took the setbacks as required by the  
29 DES which is 35 feet. The bottom of the field will be below 2 feet.  
30

31 Mr. Paine referred to the western piece of the parcel where the porous pavement is located  
32 and said he thought last time they met, Mr. Scamman had identified the elevation as being  
33 too high. Mr. Scamman said they had made changes because now they are proposing the  
34 pocket park and that would require the area to be filled in. Mr. Paine asked if there was  
35 anything to collect water draining off from the north. Mr. Scamman said the site will be  
36 developed on the other side and the water will be treated there before it gets to this area.  
37 Mr. Doyle asked what percentage of the Gateway road is represented on Subaru's plan.  
38 Mr. Scamman said it was probably about 40%.  
39

40 Ms. Werner asked how many parking spaces were being proposed. Mr. Scamman said  
41 around 300 spaces. Mr. Daley asked if that was in addition to the 98 spaces on Frying  
42 Pan Lane. Mr. Scamman responded in the affirmative. Mr. Scamman said they are  
43 proposing 53 spaces for service and customers and all the rest are delineated areas for  
44 parking. He indicated where those spaces were on the plan.  
45

46 Mr. Houghton asked how the plan would change if the Gateway Road was not

1 constructed. Mr. Scamman replied there would be several options, but all of them would  
2 not be developing the land where the proposed road is going to be located.

3  
4 Mr. Paine asked if the applicant had any calculations for the impacts to the wetland buffer.  
5 Mr. Scamman said he hasn't looked at that yet. Mr. Paine said it would be useful  
6 information for the Conservation Commission chair.

7  
8 Mr. Houghton opened the floor to the public.

9  
10 Ms. Pat Elwell, Conservation Commission, referred to the trees along the gas line and  
11 said they may want to consider the trees they use to plant there as tree roots spread out to  
12 the equivalent of their height.

13  
14 Mr. Daley commented that the Planning Board needs to make a recommendation to staff  
15 to write a letter to the Board of Selectmen in support of the Gateway Road and for the  
16 Town to accept jurisdiction for the application process for the wetlands permit.

17  
18 Mr. Scamman then reminded the Board of the conditions they were seeking for the  
19 conditional use permit application as listed earlier by Mr. Daley on behalf of the GTRC.  
20 He said he was seeking advice also about the lighting on Portsmouth Avenue as it's a  
21 small section and whether they should wait until that area gets developed or should they  
22 go ahead and do it piece meal. Mr. Paine suggested developing an escrow account so  
23 when there are multiple properties they could do the lighting then. Mr. Daley said that  
24 could apply to sidewalks too. Mr. Daley said a conduit should be put in place to allow  
25 for the future development and the electrical connections should be put in place if nothing  
26 else. Mr. Scamman said they could put some light out there by lighting one side of their  
27 parking lot if the Board wants it. Mr. Daley confirmed with Ms. Werner that he  
28 remembered decorative lighting being more of a Gateway issue for the interior roadways,  
29 not so much for Portsmouth Avenue. Ms. Werner confirmed that was the case. Mr. Daley  
30 referred to the proposed stone dust path up River Road and he asked the Board if they  
31 were satisfied with that or would they prefer an asphalt sidewalk. Mr. Scamman said  
32 Mr. Hyland who designed the landscaping plan thought a stone dust path would be a  
33 better look for a rural environment. Mr. Houghton asked if they need to consider this  
34 now as it is part of Phase 2. Mr. Daley said both Phases 1 and 2 were part of the site plan  
35 before the Board.

36  
37 Mr. Paine said he felt there should be some lighting provided for safety reasons. Mr.  
38 Merrick said he liked the stone dust path. Mr. Baskerville said the stone dust path  
39 probably won't get plowed during winter so probably won't get used very much so  
40 lighting wouldn't necessarily be needed at the time of year. Mr. Daley said although the  
41 stone dust path might work at this particular location, the Board should consider  
42 sidewalks in their totality on River Road and reminded them that requesting a site walk  
43 can also be part of the site plan review process.

44  
45 Mr. Houghton, along with other members agreed that the aspects they found important,  
46 relative to the Gateway design standards were: roadways, architecture, landscaping.



1 Other elements such as setbacks, building footprint, and windows warrant some  
2 consideration given the existing structure, the existing business and nature of the  
3 application. Mr. Houghton would like to see more details about the architecture. Ms.  
4 Werner asked who would be responsible for the maintenance of the pocket park and  
5 would there be any lighting. Mr. Houghton said there should be lighting as a safety  
6 measure.

7  
8 Mr. Scamman asked if there was any further feedback about the lighting on the front  
9 sidewalk along Portsmouth Avenue. Mr. Houghton said he didn't think that was  
10 envisioned in the Gateway planning process. Mr. Federico said his preference would be  
11 to require decorative lighting along the street including the Portsmouth Avenue section.  
12 Mr. Baskerville confirmed that D.O.T. approval would be needed for decorative lights.  
13 Mr. Daley said that was correct.

14  
15 Ms. Debbie Foss asked who paid if the street lights were put in the D.O.T. right of way.  
16 Mr. Daley said the Town would and the Town would be responsible for maintenance of  
17 the sidewalk also.

18  
19 Mr. Federico made a motion to continue this application until April 2, 2014. Motion  
20 seconded by Mr. Baskerville. Motion carried unanimously.

21  
22 Mr. Houghton made a motion to request that the Board of Selectmen move forward with  
23 the wetlands permit, to support the construction of the Gateway Road. Motion seconded  
24 by Mr. Federico. Motion carried unanimously.

- 25  
26 c. **Kevin Roy Builders, Inc, 64 Portsmouth Avenue, Stratham, NH 03885 for**  
27 **the property located at 257 Portsmouth Avenue, Stratham, NH Tax Map 22,**  
28 **Lot 8.** Site Plan Review Application to construct a 2,273 square feet addition and  
29 building expansion with related landscaping and drainage improvements.

30 Mr. Kenneth Berry, surveyor from Berry Surveying and Engineering, started by  
31 giving an overview of the project including the impacts on the property, in  
32 particular to the wetlands at the rear of the property.

33 He stated that they are requesting waivers from specific section of the Site Plan  
34 Review Regulation cited in the information check list as per their letter dated  
35 January 28, 2014 and some additional waivers as a result of a First Review Letter  
36 and meeting with Mr. Daley. The waivers were briefly discussed, but tabled to  
37 allow board members to review said requests.

38 Mr. Houghton asked if anybody in the public had any questions before the Board  
39 started addressing the waivers.

40 Ms. Elwell asked if there would be a way to improve the site by making the current  
41 drains tie into the new drainage system the applicant is putting in. Mr. Berry said  
42 the new system is going to have to be tied into the existing foundation drains. Ms.  
43 Elwell said her thought was whatever is coming off the impervious surface into the

1 gutters, goes straight into the stone. She wondered if there was a way to break that  
2 up so they can flow into the drainage system. Mr. Berry said they could talk about  
3 adding some extra bio material to the top layer of stone.

4 Mr. Baskerville asked if a top coat will be added to the parking lot after the addition  
5 is built. He commented that about 500 square feet of roof area was being added  
6 above a little seasonal wet land and although he is not too concerned about the roof  
7 area, it might be a nice gesture, if at the end of the parking lot, that they dig out a  
8 ditch a couple of feet wide and deep, fill it with stone to stop some of the water that  
9 is sheet flowing off the back of the parking lot.

10 Mr. Houghton suggested continuing the application.

11 Mr. Baskerville made a motion to continue to March 19, 2014. Motion seconded  
12 by Mr. Merrick. Motion carried unanimously.

13 **4. Public Meeting(s).**

14 **a. Rollins Hill Development, LLC, 20 Rollins Farm Road, Stratham, NH 03885, Tax**  
15 **Map 3 Lot 24.** Preliminary discussion of a conceptual over 55, multi-lot subdivision  
16 development and roadway plan.

17 The discussion involving the conceptual subdivision development was incorporated into  
18 the Lindt & Sprungli (USA), Inc. Site Plan Review application. The primary topic  
19 discussed involved the proposed emergency access road connecting the two projects. The  
20 proposed emergency road would begin at the Lindt & Sprungli (USA) warehouse  
21 roadway network and continue north to the end of the property opposite the Rollins Farm  
22 Road cul-de-sac. Rollins Hill Development, LLC stated that they are in support of the  
23 connector road and continue to work with Lindt on the design and final location.

24 **5. Miscellaneous.**

25 There were no member or miscellaneous comments or reports.

26 **6. Adjournment.**

27 Mr. Baskerville made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:29 PM. Motion seconded by Mr.  
28 Merrick. Motion carried unanimously.

29  
30