



1  
2  
3  
4  
5 **Stratham Planning Board**  
6 **Meeting Minutes**  
7 **April 2, 2014**  
8 **Municipal Center, Selectmen's Meeting Room**  
9 **10 Bunker Hill Avenue**  
10 **Time: 7:00 PM**  
11

---

12  
13 **Members Present:**     Planning Board  
14                             Mike Houghton, Chairman  
15                             Bob Baskerville, Vice Chairman  
16                             Bruno Federico, Selectmen's Representative  
17                             Jameson Paine, Member  
18                             Steve Doyle, Alternate  
19                             Christopher Merrick, Alternate  
20

21                             Zoning Board of Adjustment  
22                             Arol Charbonneau  
23                             Chris Brett  
24                             Chris Cavarretta  
25                             Jim Elliott  
26                             Garrett Dolan  
27                             Kirk Scamman  
28

29 **Members Absent:**     Tom House, Member  
30                             Mary Jane Warner, Alternate  
31

32 **Staff Present:**         Lincoln Daley, Town Planner  
33  
34

---

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

36         The Planning Board Chairman took roll call and asked Mr. Doyle to be a full voting  
37         member. Mr. Doyle agreed.  
38

39 **2. Review/Approval of Planning Board Meeting Minutes.**

40         a. February 6, 2014

41         b. March 5, 2014

42                 Mr. Paine made a motion to approve the February 6, 2014 minutes. Motion seconded  
43                 by Mr. Doyle. Motion carried unanimously.

1 Mr. Baskerville made a motion to approve the March 5, 2014 Planning Board minutes.  
2 Motion seconded by Mr. Federico. Motion carried unanimously.

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

4 a. **Joint Meeting of the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Adjustment.**

5 **Varsity Wireless, LLC, One New Hampshire Avenue, Portsmouth, NH 03801 for**  
6 **the property located at 313 Portsmouth Avenue, Stratham, NH Tax Map 22, Lot**  
7 **29.** Site Plan Review Application and Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Section 19.7  
8 and a Special Exception Permit application pursuant to Section 19.4.2 of the Stratham  
9 Zoning Ordinance to replace an existing 165' tall lattice telecommunications tower with  
10 a 170' tall monopole telecommunications tower, associated antennas and cabling, and  
11 the installation of ground based telecommunications equipment and associated fencing.

12 Mr. Fran Parisi, attorney representing the applicant introduced himself along with the  
13 principal of Varsity Wireless, Chris Davis and Brian O' Landy, Real Estate specialist  
14 and Keith Ballasentie who is a radio frequency expert.

15 Mr. Parisi started by thanking the 2 Boards for holding a joint meeting and gave the  
16 background to Varsity Wireless. He said more people have cell phones than land lines  
17 nowadays and data traffic is heavier than voice traffic. They expect that usage to  
18 increase. He said all this extra usage requires more cell sites and as technology  
19 improves, cell towers need to be located closer to one another.

20 Currently the wireless signal along the Route 33 from the Stratham/Greenland border to  
21 down town Stratham is poor. Varsity wants to improve that coverage. The tower  
22 currently located at 313 Portsmouth Avenue is old and used for different purposes than  
23 what Varsity needs and it is not structurally strong enough for a modern  
24 telecommunications company. Varsity Wireless are proposing to replace the existing  
25 165' tower with one that is 170' tall. It will be a monopole tower which means it is  
26 self-supporting, and all the cabling connects to the infra-structure at the bottom. There  
27 will be platforms at varying heights on the tower for different telecommunication  
28 companies to use. Mr. Parisi said this type of structure is attractive because it facilitates  
29 co location and accommodates rapidly evolving technologies. Most of the activity they  
30 are proposing will be behind the building, although 30' of buffer will be exposed to the  
31 street, but they are happy to use landscaping to shield that. The entire facility will be  
32 surrounded by a chain link fence for security purposes. The compound will be 40'  
33 wide and 100' long to make it accommodating for the various telecommunication  
34 companies. There will be pads inside that compound which will locate  
35 telecommunication equipment.

36 Mr. Parisi said they have designed the facility to accommodate up to at least 4 different  
37 telecommunication companies and they will be replacing a small whip antenna about 4'  
38 in height for a company called Enertrac. They attach wireless sensors to propane tanks  
39 so they can monitor how much propane is inside a tank.

40 Mr. Parisi continued the height of the tower doesn't have any impact on the  
41 surrounding area in proximity to the air base. Mr. Parisi said this structure has no  
42 impact on aero navigation and won't require any lighting as it's below the required  
43 threshold for that. Mr. Parisi said because telecommunication structures are licensed by

1 the Federal Communications Commission, they are subject to a very extensive  
2 environmental screening policy which requires Varsity to do an extensive analysis to  
3 make sure there is no impact on any environmental resources. Mr. Parisi confirmed it  
4 was determined that there would be no environmental impact.

5 An analysis was done also by radio frequency consultants to determine the need for this  
6 tower at this location. He shared the analysis with the Board and pointed out the weak  
7 coverage for the Route 33. Sprint and Verizon don't have any great coverage along the  
8 northern part of Stratham going toward Great Bay so this facility is to accommodate  
9 them primarily. AT & T and T-Mobile have a site on Long Hill which was recently  
10 modified, but it wasn't designed for multiple carriers and multiple technologies. Mr.  
11 Parisi explained that they are also required to look for alternative sites to build new  
12 structures. They did look at several locations including the old community college, but  
13 the antenna wouldn't be situated high enough and the owners were not interested in a  
14 new structure being located there.

15 Mr. Parisi said the only thing they don't meet is a by law that states they be 125% of  
16 the height of the tower set back from any residential structures. The tower is more than  
17 100% but less than the required 125% away from a residential structure. They are  
18 asking for a waiver from that requirement. They provided an affidavit from a structural  
19 engineer explaining the integrity of these new tower types. He added that by putting all  
20 the cabling inside, it actually holds the tower together. The tower tapers and gets  
21 weaker as it gets nearer the top which is for safety purposes. It is designed to collapse  
22 within itself so it wouldn't topple over in an extreme weather event.

23 Mr. Parisi said a hardship is created by the topography of the surrounding land. He said  
24 there is no effect on surrounding communities or noxious odors. The fact that they are  
25 using an existing facility means any extra impact is minimized on the surrounding area.

26 Mr. Parisi referred to the Telecommunications Act of 1996, a law developed by  
27 Congress to help facilitate the development of wireless infrastructure. In that law it  
28 states that planning and zoning boards have authority to act within their legal right,  
29 however, they cannot deny applications where the denial would effectively be a  
30 prohibition of telecommunication services. Denials have to be based on substantial  
31 evidence. Congress doesn't want to see discrimination against a carrier.

32 Mr. Federico made a motion to accept the application as complete. Motion seconded  
33 by Mr. Doyle. Motion carried unanimously.

34 Mr. Houghton suggested the ZBA address the special exception request first, although  
35 he was sure many of the issues would pertain to the Planning Board also.

36 Mr. Kirk Scamman made a motion to accept the special exception application as  
37 complete. Motion seconded by Mr. Dolan. Motion carried unanimously.

38 Mr. Charbonneau asked Mr. Cavarretta to be a full voting member. Mr. Cavarretta  
39 agreed.

40 Mr. Hughes, Stratham resident, said he appreciated the presentation given tonight. He  
41 was there tonight because of safety concerns and would like to know more about how  
42 the tower collapses, the foundation and what the life expectancy of this structure is. He

1 added that he welcomes the extra coverage as it is terrible at the moment. He asked if  
2 there was any detriment to health that he needed to know about.

3 Mr. Parisi said with respect to the foundation, they haven't done an analysis on that yet,  
4 but once they get a permit, geo technical engineers come in to do soil borings and  
5 design a foundation appropriate for the location. Towers are heavily regulated by the  
6 government and engineering community and there are very strict guidelines in place.  
7 Even during Hurricane Katrina, a tower didn't fall down. He then addressed radio  
8 frequency ranges and said there are regulations in place to prevent interference to any  
9 electrical services such as televisions. As for health issues, Mr. Parisi said there are  
10 Federal regulations concerning emissions and that this tower is well within those  
11 guidelines and the tower has a very low power transmission. He added that numerous  
12 studies have been done on this subject and they are considered safe enough to locate  
13 near hospitals and schools.

14 Ms. Becky Mitchell, resident said she noticed in Mr. Parisi's presentation that he didn't  
15 talk about visual impact to the area. She asked for clarification on the visuals. Mr.  
16 Parisi agreed it would be more noticeable from Portsmouth Avenue, but to less  
17 locations overall when compared to the previous one. Ms. Mitchell just wanted people  
18 to be aware there will be some visual impact especially when antennas are added. Ms.  
19 Mitchell then asked about the study that was done to assess the environmental impacts  
20 especially relating to historical elements. She asked what sources were consulted or  
21 authorities used to come to the conclusions they reached. Mr. Parisi answered that they  
22 used an environmental consultant and there is a very long check list they have to go  
23 through when doing these assessments. One of those is analyzing all the historical  
24 structures within a certain radius of the structure. In addition to that they contact the  
25 State Historic Preservation Officer who often times contacts the local Historic  
26 Preservation Officer. Ms. Mitchell said she is the Chairperson of the Heritage  
27 Commission for the Town of Stratham and was not contacted so she would like to see a  
28 letter from the Division of Historical Resources stating that they had looked into this  
29 project. Mr. Parisi said they could provide a copy of that letter.

30 Mr. Federico asked Mr. Parisi to describe the structure in more detail. Mr. Parisi said  
31 the affidavit from the engineer states that the base of the tower is about 6' in diameter  
32 and tapers to about 3' at the top. The tower comes in 30' sections stacked up on top of  
33 one another. Mr. Baskerville asked what the color of the metal for the antenna was.  
34 Mr. Parisi said it's a galvanized steel, but they are happy to paint it if needs be although  
35 it causes problems.

36 Peter Grey, resident, said from a practical stand point, drivers are going close to 50mph  
37 as they drive past that site and the current tower is probably less visually appealing than  
38 the new one that is being proposed. He doesn't see people paying much attention to it  
39 when they drive by there.

40 Mr. Doyle said he feels the application should read 185' not 170' for the height of the  
41 tower because it should include the antenna in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance  
42 Section 19.3.5. Mr. Paine asked if the 4 potential lease pads were intended to hold  
43 equipment. Mr. Parisi said they were utility sheds. Mr. Paine asked would they hold  
44 something like a generator that would have gasoline. Mr. Parisi said generators usually

1 get built inside a shed with the propane already inside the shed. He added that  
2 nowadays generators tend to be more self-contained. Mr. Paine asked about the  
3 fencing and if there would be access issues during winter time with snow. Mr. Parisi  
4 said there shouldn't be any problems with that.

5 Mr. Baskerville referred to the 125% set back. He asked where the nearest house was  
6 and how far away they would be from it. Mr. Parisi said it's about 200'. Mr.  
7 Baskerville explained that the report from the Town Planner said they were about 160'  
8 away so less than 100%. Mr. Baskerville said that as the applicant doesn't meet the  
9 125% criteria and the foundation hasn't been designed yet, he wondered if they could  
10 design the foundation to be 225% of the 185' tower. Mr. Parisi said they could do that.  
11 Another way would be to design it like a 200' tower, but not put the last 30' on it. Mr.  
12 Baskerville requested a copy of the calculations before the building permit is issued.  
13 Mr. Parisi said it could be put as a condition of the approval.

14 Mr. Merrick asked if the radio frequency affidavit was prepared by a professional  
15 engineer. Mr. Parisi said it was. Mr. Merrick said he would like to see all affidavits on  
16 formal letterhead and stamped. Mr. Daley said all the supporting documentation should  
17 be stamped as part of the resubmittal process.

18 Mr. Scamman said one of his concerns is the noise that will be generated from a  
19 generator should there be a power outage. He is concerned for residents in the area.  
20 Mr. Parisi said the generators themselves can go inside buildings and are done in such a  
21 way that there's ventilation and room for baffling to be put in there too. He said they  
22 could use a stockade fence and put baffling around that also. Mr. O' Landy suggested  
23 this be added as a condition also. Mr. Merrick asked if when a company leases a pad if  
24 they build their own structures and put their own generators in. Mr. O' Landy said they  
25 do. Mr. Merrick suggested that as part of the lease agreement they could require  
26 critical grade mufflers or silencers.

27 A resident said that they should establish a decibel limit within a certain amount of feet.  
28 That way it could be tested and if they are over the limit the Town has some recourse.  
29 Mr. Merrick asked if each lessee really needed their own generator and if it was  
30 possible to have just one. Mr. Parisi said they could look at that.

31 Mr. Paine referred to the existing business on the site. He talked about the fact that a  
32 fence is being proposed that goes off the back end of the property and comes back  
33 around. He asked if there was any consideration for fire access to ensure larger fire  
34 trucks can access the larger property or get in through the back side of the property.  
35 Mr. Parisi showed where he was putting fencing in the back which he said shouldn't  
36 impede traffic. There will be ample space for public safety. Mr. Paine said he supports  
37 a stockade fence in particular for the residents out the back side of the property.

38 Mr. Daley asked if the Board would support any type of landscaping to negate the  
39 visual impact. Mr. Merrick asked who would maintain it. Mr. Davis said maintaining  
40 landscaping is part of their contract. Mr. O' Landy said there are 2 large arborvitaes  
41 out there which they are happy to maintain or relocate. They are happy also to preserve  
42 the existing landscaping and supplement it as necessary.

1 Mr. Houghton asked the applicant to talk about the flow of traffic in and out of the site.  
2 Mr. O' Landy said that once the facility is built there will be no traffic. Mr. Houghton  
3 asked how much of the 4,000 square feet would be used for pads. Mr. O' Landy said  
4 only some of that fenced in area would be used and the rest would be grassed. Mr.  
5 Houghton asked if any analysis had been done on the impact of drainage and run off as  
6 impervious surface was being added. The applicant said they hadn't done any  
7 calculations for that. Mr. Houghton said they would need that information.

8 Mr. Scamman asked if by adding this to the site, it will keep the current business that is  
9 on the site in compliance or will a whole site plan application be required for the entire  
10 site. Mr. Scamman said the 4,000 square feet could possibly kick them out of being in  
11 compliance and alter the approval they are currently operating under. Mr. Parisi said he  
12 would look at it, but he doesn't think this will affect it as they are not taking away any  
13 current parking spaces. Mr. Daley said his understanding is that the variance that was  
14 granted was for the stone business. Mr. Parisi said his understanding was that a  
15 variance was granted to allow a commercial business in a residential zone. Mr. Parisi  
16 stated they are not doing anything to change what is there, the current business is still  
17 operating within the parameters of the variance that was granted. Mr. Daley said he  
18 would look into Mr. Scamman's concern.

19 Mr. Dolan asked if there were conditions attached to the variance that was granted for  
20 the landscape operations. Mr. Daley said there weren't any applicable to this current  
21 application, however there was a condition that allowed an additional business  
22 comparable to the one there now. A landscaping business did move in for a while. Mr.  
23 Scamman commented that he saw no similarity between telecommunications and a  
24 stone business. Mr. Daley said the tower was already existing. Mr. Scamman said he'd  
25 feel more comfortable if the Code Enforcement Officer took a look at this situation.

26 Mr. Daley asked if it was possible to minimize the 4,000 square feet area by combining  
27 structures. Mr. Parisi said it wasn't possible because of several different companies  
28 using the site; they don't like to share for security and competition purposes.

29 Mr. Merrick and Mr. Houghton said they would both prefer a single generator for all  
30 the carriers on the pad site. The applicant said they need to look at it first.

31 Mr. Houghton asked the ZBA members if they were ready to discuss the special  
32 exception application. Mr. Baskerville reminded the ZBA that the Planning Board are  
33 able to add conditions to the approval and shared the conditions he had noted.

34 Mr. Charbonneau asked the ZBA members if they wanted to add or change anything to  
35 Mr. Baskerville's suggested list of conditions. Mr. Scamman said his main concern lay  
36 with the current business no longer being in compliance with the granted variance and  
37 asked if that should be a condition.

38 Mr. Dolan made a motion to close the public session for Case # 599 Varsity Wireless  
39 Special Exception application to Section 19.4.2. Motion seconded by Mr. Brett.  
40 Motion carried unanimously.

41 The Board went through the criteria for a Special Exception in accordance with Section  
42 17.8.2 and Section 19.4.2 of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance.

43 The Board agreed the applicant met the criteria of Section 19.4.2.

1 Mr. Scamman referred to Section 17.8.iii and said he felt the Planning Board were  
2 going to take care of the issue of noise associated with generators.

3 Mr. Charbonneau referred to Section 17.8.vi. about storm water runoff but said as that  
4 was going to be included as a condition by the Planning Board, it wasn't an issue.

5 Mr. Scamman asked Mr. Baskerville to repeat the conditions he had stated earlier. Mr.  
6 Baskerville said he had added 2 more and modified some of the earlier ones as follows:

- 7 1. The foundation and connection to the foundation be designed for a 231' tall  
8 monopole, the tower is to be designed for the 170' monopole height, stamped  
9 calculations to be submitted to the Town before building permit is issued.
- 10 2. The fence is to be an 8' high stockade fence.
- 11 3. Drainage needs to be analyzed to not increase the flow in a 10 year storm event, a  
12 leaching catch basin or alternative is to be added if needed.
- 13 4. The existing landscaping is to be preserved and supplemented as agreed to with  
14 consultation with Town staff.
- 15 5. No more than one generator will be on the site with a critical grade muffler; sound  
16 is to be considered if abutters notice an appreciable increase in noise, mufflers as  
17 needed are to be added. The site must meet all sound decibel codes and regulations.
- 18 6. The Town Code Enforcement Officer review the existing use that it is still in  
19 compliance with its variance.
- 20 7. The affidavits are to be resubmitted on letter head, stamped and signed.

21 Mr. Dolan made a motion that the ZBA accept the application for a Special Exception  
22 based on the 7 conditions stipulated by the Planning Board for this application. Motion  
23 seconded by Mr. Brett. Motion carried unanimously.

24 Mr. Charbonneau made the applicant aware that there is a 30 day appeal period.

25 Mr. Dolan made a motion to close the April 2, 2014 Zoning Board meeting, jointly held  
26 with the Planning Board at 8:48 pm. Motion seconded by Mr. Elliott. Motion carried  
27 unanimously.

28 Mr. Paine asked about the antennas and if they would be aligned or situated in different  
29 directions. Mr. Parisi explained it is the telecommunication companies that dictate the  
30 antennas, although the platforms themselves tend to be uniform. Mr. Daley said that on  
31 the plan it shows 3 carriers at the 165' height and the 4<sup>th</sup> carrier is at the 170' height.  
32 He asked what is driving the 4 carriers and would it be possible to locate all 4 carriers  
33 at the 165' height. Mr. Parisi said it is to do with by-laws and co-location and that the  
34 top is more valuable. Mr. Daley asked if Varsity anticipates having extra whip  
35 antennas lower than 140'. Mr. Parisi said typically not. When they design these  
36 facilities they design them with ports so the cabling comes up through the middle and  
37 goes out to the different ports. Mr. Houghton said he would like these provisions  
38 stated in the documents. Mr. Parisi suggested including a condition that they won't put  
39 more than 4 platforms on unless they come back before the Planning Board. Mr.  
40 Houghton added no lower than 140'. He continued to say that right now they don't  
41 have any design information on these antennas such as how big the platforms will be.

1 Mr. Parisi said that was dictated by the carriers, but typically they are a 12' triangle.  
2 Mr. Davis said they can be flush mounted or they extend out. Mr. Daley suggested  
3 Varsity provide a typical design and then each carrier can come before the Planning  
4 Board with any differences from that typical design. Mr. Parisi said it would be highly  
5 unlikely that dishes would be used.

6 Mr. Paine asked for confirmation that 3 of the antennas would be on 3 sides of the pole.  
7 He asked if it would be a problem to request they don't place any on the street side to  
8 help minimize the visual intrusion. Mr. Parisi said it is designed for 360 degree  
9 coverage in all directions. Typically the antennas are placed on 3 bases like a triangle  
10 and they can be angled, it would be impossible to limit it. Mr. Merrick asked if there  
11 would be any lighting. Mr. Parisi said there won't be any permanent lighting. Mr.  
12 Daley said as part of the site plan approval, lighting is addressed. Mr. Merrick asked if  
13 a stockade fence would be good enough for their security purposes. Mr. Parisi  
14 explained that the towers are designed so the first 20' are non-climbable.

15 Mr. Baskerville said he had added more conditions; there will be a maximum of 4  
16 platforms on the tower, the lowest one to be no lower than 140', carrier designs are to  
17 be similar to a typical design which will be submitted and no antenna dishes are to be  
18 installed without Planning Board approval.

19 Mr. Houghton suggested the applicant continue to work with staff to address items  
20 raised tonight. One item Mr. Houghton mentioned was the fact that they had applied  
21 for a 170' tower when in fact the total height with the whip antenna would be 185'.  
22 Mr. Parisi asked if the Board couldn't approve a 170' tower permitting a whip antenna  
23 not to exceed 15' above that.

24 Mr. Houghton suggested Varsity continue their application to the next Planning Board  
25 meeting. Mr. Baskerville added they should show the nearest house on the plan also.

26 Ms. Foss, resident asked if having the antennas all around would help the coverage of  
27 Stratham Hill Park. Mr. Parisi confirmed that Ms. Foss was correct.

28 Mr. Daley said the Board has the authority and purview to enlist help from outside  
29 consultants for analysis purposes. He asked if the Board was satisfied with the  
30 information that had been provided with this application. Mr. Houghton said he would  
31 like to see something concerning the drainage and storm water runoff.

32 Mr. Baskerville made a motion to continue the hearing to April 16, 2014. Motion  
33 seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

34 b. **Sarannie, LLC and ST Holding Company, LLC, 37 Portsmouth Avenue,**  
35 **Stratham, NH 03885 for the property located at 37 & 39 Portsmouth Avenue,**  
36 **Stratham, NH Tax Map 9, Lots 2 & 3.** Site Plan Review Application and Conditional  
37 Use Permit pursuant to Section 3.8 of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance to construct a  
38 7,125 square foot auto dealership building expansion, parking lot and roadway  
39 improvements, and related lighting, landscaping, drainage enhancements.

40 Mr. Bruce Scamman, Emmanuel Engineering introduced himself as representing the  
41 applicant. He explained that Exeter Subaru are expanding onto the adjacent site and  
42 they are also working with the Town to build the first Gateway road to the rear of the  
43 property. Tonight's meeting is to talk about landscaping and architecture.



1 Mr. Scamman started by saying he had submitted 2 sketches concerning turnaround  
2 areas, one for a car carrier and the other for a fire truck. He added that as they were  
3 unable to get the specifications for the fire truck the Town uses they used specifications  
4 for a standard fire truck from on line.

5 Mr. Scamman then introduced Mr. Jeff Hyland, landscaping architect for the project.  
6 Mr. Hyland said since the last meeting, a few minor changes had been made to the plan.  
7 The sidewalk in front of the building has changed, and some of the screening has been  
8 fine-tuned because of concerns for the abutting home. The plant materials are all of a  
9 native variety and are salt tolerant and hardy. The bio retention areas will have a  
10 variety of native plants that are particularly good at soaking up and cleaning storm  
11 water. Up on the Gateway road, they are proposing a bio retention tree way so all of  
12 the water from that road will run into that bio retention area. Access points are shown  
13 on the plan also. Mr. Hyland said there will be a pocket park with a couple of benches  
14 and a small stone dust path. He said they had taken a lot of care to see how this site  
15 would look approaching from both River Road and Portsmouth Avenue and have  
16 deliberately targeted corners with lots of plantings.

17 Mr. Daley asked Mr. Hyland about interior landscaping. Mr. Hyland said they tried to  
18 strike a balance so the quantity of trees is there, but they have been moved to the sides  
19 instead of the configuration stated in the Gateway regulations. Mr. Hyland said they  
20 are struggling also with the architecture, large overhangs aren't very conducive to  
21 landscaping and because of the close proximity of the existing building and property  
22 line they were unable to put landscaping on that side of the building. They have put a  
23 few shrubs under the overhang, but it's tough for plantings to survive under there. Mr.  
24 Hyland said he does believe that the landscaping he is suggesting will soften the view  
25 of the building as you drive down Portsmouth Avenue. On the back side of the  
26 building, the main concern was the topographic change. When coming down River  
27 Road, the building lies pretty tall so they have used small plantings, but a lot of them so  
28 it creates a visual buffer. He said the overall effect as you are viewing the site from the  
29 outside perimeter, will have the same effect as having plantings on the inside.

30 Mr. Daley said he appreciates the focal points on the corners, but the lower left hand  
31 corner of the property is a concern. When you're on the Route 108 you see the building  
32 itself. He wondered if any mitigation measures had been considered. Mr. Hyland said  
33 the challenge there was the proximity to the property line. It comes down to a very  
34 small strip, so they around with putting trees in there, but the space didn't seem  
35 appropriate, and there is also the next phase to take into consideration. They didn't  
36 want to plant trees if they have to be taken down in the future. Mr. Daley said part of  
37 the Phase 2 discussion was sharing a driveway with Sullivan's Tires and maybe having  
38 a combined landscaping plan for that corner. Mr. Daley asked if there was no  
39 opportunity for some plantings for the right hand side of the building. Mr. Hyland said  
40 the overhang, access points, and overall site configuration makes it difficult. However,  
41 he said they could look again if the Board so wished.

42 Mr. Daley referred to the fact that they like to designate certain parking areas for  
43 employees, customers or service and wondered if there was a way to use landscaping to  
44 delineate those parking areas. Mr. Houghton asked what the total number of parking  
45 spaces would be. Mr. Scamman explained he didn't have the numbers with him. Mr.

1 Federico asked about snow storage. Mr. Scamman showed the areas for snow storage  
2 on the plan. Mr. Paine asked about the vegetation in those areas. Mr. Hyland said that  
3 had been taken into consideration and the trees were hardy enough to withstand snow.  
4 Snow can be pushed into the rain garden too. Mr. Daley reminded them that they  
5 couldn't push snow into a Town right of way. Mr. Baskerville asked where the vents  
6 from the septic system would be and if they would be covered with landscaping. Mr.  
7 Scamman said in commercial buildings the vents tend to go out through the roof of the  
8 building. Mr. Baskerville asked if they would be colored to match the building. Mr.  
9 Scamman said he always recommended they should be black because they blend well.

10 Mr. Daley wanted to know about the owner/maintenance of the pocket park including  
11 the part of the roadway leading to the pocket park. He referred to future water and  
12 sewer lines and easements to allow them to be laid, his concern being that some of the  
13 landscaping could be torn up to do that. Mr. Scamman asked if the water line would be  
14 put in the State right of way. Mr. Scamman said that wouldn't affect any landscaping  
15 as it's all on the property. He mentioned also that they would like to push the sidewalk  
16 away from the State right of way to make it safer for pedestrians. Mr. Daley said that  
17 the D.O.T. is pushing the Town to take over sidewalks along the Route 108 so the  
18 Town may take over the maintenance of sidewalks in the Gateway district. Mr. Paine  
19 asked if the landscaping plan had taken lighting locations into consideration. Mr.  
20 Hyland said it does but they are still working on it.

21 Ms. Mitchell said noticed that when driving south west on Portsmouth Avenue,  
22 approaching River Road, you find you are coming from a high elevation and she has  
23 noticed how you can really see those car inventory fields when you're coming from that  
24 direction. She wondered what the height of the trees would be. Mr. Hyland said  
25 absolutely which is why they have targeted the corners of the property and located the  
26 trees in specific areas.

27 Mr. Scamman referred to their lighting plan and said it takes into consideration the  
28 Gateway Road. They have not put any lighting on the Phase 2 path down River Road  
29 nor the front sidewalk. As represented at the earlier meeting, there appeared to be a  
30 discrepancy of people who wanted it and didn't want it. He said they were hoping for  
31 more direction from the Board. Mr. Houghton said regulations require lighting in those  
32 areas. Mr. Houghton asked how much open space there was. Mr. Hyland said roughly  
33 16%. Mr. Hyland addressed light spacing and the Gateway regulation that requires 25'  
34 spacing between lights. He feels that puts too much lighting on the ground. He said if  
35 they do a combination light fixture that lights the sidewalk as well as the parking lot,  
36 they wouldn't want to do a 25' spacing. Mr. Daley asked how high the lights would be.  
37 Mr. Hyland said total light fixtures would probably be 18'. Mr. Daley asked if they  
38 were placed 16 – 18' apart would that in his opinion be adequate lighting. Mr. Hyland  
39 said he believed so with today's LED lighting plus they could use different types of  
40 arrays to avoid light spilling. Mr. Baskerville asked if they were going to install the  
41 lights out the back now or would that happen later. Mr. Scamman said his  
42 understanding is that they are building the road, but there will be sections without lights  
43 where the gas line is located.

44 Mr. Scamman said they would like feedback on what the Planning Board's preferred  
45 option is for the road in Phase 2. Mr. Baskerville said it made sense to him to put lights

1 on the sidewalk where the commercial use is, but not at the rear of the property where  
2 there currently is none. Mr. Daley asked about landscaping on the far side. The Board  
3 said that should go in now. The Board suggested an “S” curve versus stop signs.

4 Mr. Daley confirmed with the Board that they were happy with no lights on the rear  
5 sidewalk. The Board said the applicant should lay the conduit for the lights, but they  
6 don’t have to put up the lights. The Board confirmed also that the applicant should go  
7 ahead and do the landscaping.

8 Mr. Paine referred back to the car carrier turnaround and the approved parking storage  
9 lot on Frying Pan Lane which was approved last year. His understand was that car  
10 carriers would deliver cars over there. Mr. Paine wanted to know if this was going to  
11 make the approval for that parking lot outdated. Mr. Scamman replied that they felt it  
12 was important it was designed as a stand-alone car dealership in the event that Subaru  
13 move to a different lot. He added that there are other trucks that come to the site that  
14 aren’t necessarily car carriers so this is to show the Town that there is a safe turnaround  
15 area should it be used. In Phase 2 the driveway along the side of the building becomes  
16 a straight connection which makes it even easier for a tractor trailer to go through the  
17 site. Mr. Yanofsky, owner of Subaru said the parking lot is leased from Mr. Kirk  
18 Scamman and there’s no guarantee he won’t find a better use for it in the future. Mr.  
19 Scamman talked about the driveway saying it is configured in a way that it can be  
20 manipulated. It was moved a little as one abutter is not happy about the corner of their  
21 property being used for it.

22 Scott Vlasak from Bruce Hamilton Architects talked about the changes to the elevations  
23 since the previous meeting. He talked about the difficulty of building something that  
24 meets both Subaru’s approval and the Gateway regulations. They are trying to keep all  
25 the New England features that are currently on the existing building such as pitched  
26 roofs which they are putting around the entire building. He talked about the visuals  
27 from the road and said they have added a couple of gables to the sight line. The  
28 existing tower will remain, but will be refinished in a slate material. They are breaking  
29 up the roof line with small gable dormers and trying to break up the façade in a way  
30 that complements the New England character. The overhang will be enhanced by  
31 bringing columns down to the ground. Beyond the service entrance, they are crafting a  
32 3’ over hang which will wrap all around the west rear elevations and continue on the  
33 north elevation. The west elevation will be more screened by landscaping than the  
34 other sides. There will be some columns on the north elevation also which mirror the  
35 south elevation. Finally as you come around to the front of the building there is a  
36 cupola with a weather vane. They are also residing the building with a horizontal lap  
37 siding in a hardy white type material.

38 Mr. Houghton asked what the color palette would be. Mr. Vlasak said some sort of  
39 gray and most of the trims will be white. Mr. Baskerville asked what the almond shape  
40 was at the top of the sign tower. Mr. Vlasak said that was a Subaru element which is a  
41 pre formed metal roof edge. Mr. Federico asked if the mechanicals would be on the  
42 roof. Mr. Vlasak said they haven’t finishing designing the addition for mechanicals just  
43 yet, but the intent would be to locate them as far as possible from the center so they are  
44 not visible from the outside. Mr. Daley asked about existing mechanicals. Mr. Vlasak  
45 showed them on the plan and said the intent is to screen them as much as possible. Mr.

1 Houghton asked if they were redoing the entire roof. He was told the existing roof  
2 would remain. Mr. Daley asked about the view from River Road. Mr. Vlasak said he  
3 hadn't looked at the building from there although River Road and Portsmouth Avenue  
4 is lower than the Subaru site which helps. Mr. Houghton asked if the location of the  
5 mechanicals was on the plan. Mr. Vlasak said they will probably do that when they  
6 prepare their building permit drawings as that is when the mechanical engineers will do  
7 their design and identify where those units should go. Mr. Daley asked if notification  
8 could be provided to the Board once the location for the mechanicals is known. Mr.  
9 Baskerville asked if there could be a condition that they shouldn't be visible.

10 Mr. Daley asked if there were any flat roofs as part of the architectural design. Mr.  
11 Vlasak said yes and showed them. He added that they are going to add a parapet in  
12 accordance with the regulations. Mr. Houghton said they hadn't seen a lighting plan.  
13 Mr. Daley confirmed it had been submitted and will be discussed at the next meeting.

14 Mr. Scamman pressed the Board further for their feedback on how they would like to  
15 see the proposed road connect to River Road. There was much discussion with the  
16 consensus being they should probably show the road as straight for the short term and  
17 move to the "S" curve design once Phase 2 comes into play. Mr. Scamman confirmed  
18 that his client wouldn't be responsible for obtaining the easement. The Board said they  
19 wouldn't expect a dealership to be responsible for the easement

20 Mr. Scamman summarized that they would be sticking with a straight road for Phase 1,  
21 running out perpendicular to River Road and in the future if there is any future  
22 development, then an "S" curve would go in at that point, paid for by future developers.  
23 There will be no conduit under the road but trees are required on the north side of the  
24 road.

25 Mr. Federico made a motion to continue the hearing until May 7, 2014. Motion  
26 seconded by Mr. Doyle. Motion carried unanimously

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

31 Mr. Houghton said the applicant was here on March 19, 2014 but the Board had  
32 requested the applicant come back to discuss a couple of items in more detail.

33 Mr. Ken Berry, Berry Surveying and Engineering introduced himself. He started by  
34 saying what wasn't shown on the original plans is the extension of a chimney that is  
35 going to be required. Referring to the plan, Mr. Berry said they are adding a dormer,  
36 and dropping the roof on one side by a foot and a half in the back. This will break the  
37 roof line up. Windows have been added to match the architecture on the front of the  
38 house. When you are driving up and down Portsmouth Avenue, it will look very three  
39 dimensional. Skylights have been added also with the same architectural style as the  
40 front of the building. Mr. Roy said he had broken up the roof plane too.

41 Mr. Berry said they took the landscaping information that Mr. Short had provided  
42 before and it has now been rendered on the site plan, and signed by Mr. Short. The

1 Board asked for detail for the level spreader so that has been added to the L plan and  
2 cross referenced on the site plan.

3 Mr. Berry talked about recording the plan at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds  
4 (RCCD) and said he took the overall site plan and stripped it of all the features that are  
5 not allowed to be recorded and enlarged the meets and bounds description. The plan  
6 reads like it's a boundary retracement showing the proposed addition to be put on the  
7 house. Mr. Berry said a paper copy has been provided to the Town Planner for his  
8 review. They will take it to the RCCD after that for them to check it is satisfactory for  
9 recording purposes.

10 Mr. Daley asked about test pits. Mr. Berry said they are getting ready to do that as his  
11 understanding was they can't get a building permit without that information. He added  
12 that a replacement leach field will be designed too.

13 Mr. Daley said he appreciated Mr. Short adding the landscaping to the site plan plus the  
14 extra maple trees that had been added to break up the northern side of the property.

15 Mr. Houghton asked about signage. Mr. Roy said they haven't gone to the ZBA yet.  
16 Ms. Mitchell asked when that would be. Mr. Roy didn't know yet, but Mr. Daley said  
17 when the design comes in, he would forward it to the Heritage Commission for them to  
18 see.

19 Mr. Baskerville asked when they were hoping to start building. Mr. Roy said the  
20 closing date was April 21, 2014 and so they'd like to start the following day and move  
21 in October 1, 2014.

22 Mr. Doyle made a motion to close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Mr. Payne.  
23 Motion carried unanimously.

24 Mr. Daley explained the motion just needed to state the applicant is approved with the  
25 conditions stated at the March 19, 2014 meeting.

26 Mr. Baskerville made a motion that the plans as submitted tonight meet all the  
27 conditions of the approval. Motion seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion carried  
28 unanimously.

29 Mr. Daley added there is a 30 day appeal period which began March 19, 2014.

30 **4. Miscellaneous.**

31 Mr. Daley asked the Board their opinion on a subdivision that Ms. Colleen Lake would like  
32 to do on her property; he explained it will fall under the new Town Center regulations  
33 which requires such things as sidewalks, lighting, and roadway construction. Mr.  
34 Houghton said he would interpret that as having to come before the Board with a new  
35 application. Mr. Baskerville and Federico agreed.

36 Mr. Federico talked about the lighting at the Nissan dealership. He said it came up at the  
37 Board of Selectmen meeting recently. He said there is no need for them to have all of their  
38 lights on all night long. Mr. Daley said Mr. Crews doesn't want the lighting reduced on  
39 site due to security issues. Mr. Paine asked about motion sensitive lighting instead. Mr.  
40 Federico insisted they didn't all have to be on.

1 Mr. Federico said the other issue was the electric sign at the Honda Barn. It used to have a  
2 black background with white lettering but now it has a red background with bright red  
3 letters. Mr. Daley said he didn't remember that being part of the conditions for the  
4 variance that was granted. Mr. Federico asked Mr. Daley to check it.

5 **5. Adjournment.**

6 Mr. Baskerville made a motion to adjourn at 10:40 pm. Motion seconded by Mr. Federico.  
7 Motion carried unanimously.