

**City of Rochester Planning Board**  
Monday, July 10, 2023  
City Hall Council Chambers  
31 Wakefield Street, Rochester, NH 03867  
*(These minutes were approved on August 7, 2023)*

**Members Present**

Mark Collopy, *Chair*  
Robert May, *Vice Chair*  
Alan Dews  
Matthew Richardson  
Dave Walker  
Michael McQuade  
Peter Bruckner  
Don Hamann  
Keith Fitts

**Members Absent**

James Hayden, *excused*

**Alternate Members Present**

Alexander de Geofroy  
Michael McQuade  
Rick Healey

Staff: Shanna B. Saunders, *Director of Planning & Development*  
Ryan O'Connor, *Senior Planner*

(These are the legal minutes of the meeting and are in the format of an overview of the meeting. A recording of the meeting will be on file in the City Clerk's office for reference purposes. They may be copied for a fee.)

---

**I. Call to Order**

Chair, Mark Collopy called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

---

**II. Roll Call**

Senior Planner, Ryan O'Connor conducted roll call.

**III. Seating of Alternates**

Mr. Collopy asked Michael McQuade to vote in place of James Hayden.

**IV. Communications from the Chair**

Mr. Collopy noted that there was a large amount of people present and explained the Public Comment and Public Hearing timing for those present to speak.

---

## V. Approval of Minutes for

### A. June 19, 2023

*A motion was made by Mr. Walker to approve June 19, 2023, meeting minutes and seconded by Mr. Hamann. The motion carried unanimously.*

---

## VI. Opening Discussion/Comments

### A. Public Comment

Mr. Collopy opened Public Comment.

Tim and Amy O'Connell, 104 England Road, stated that they live in the England Road subdivision where 7 homes have been completed and 3 are currently under construction and 7 lots remain unsold at this time for development.

Mr. O'Connell stated his concerns with the infrastructure, stormwater management, erosion control, overall drainage, and easements of this subdivision. Mr. O'Connell asked how the issues would be addressed. Mr. O'Connell read an excerpt from the Rochester Modification Guidelines and Requirements. Mr. O'Connell requested that the changes brought on by the developer of the England Road Subdivision be brought before the Planning Board for further review and comment by the members, the public, and abutters.

Mr. Collopy asked if there were any comments from the Planning Department for the stated public comment pertaining to the England Road Subdivision. Ms. Saunders responded that she would investigate this concern because she was not aware of the details the applicant is referring to.

### B. Discussion of general planning issues

There were no general planning issues to discuss.

---

## VII. New Applications

- A. [Waterstone Property Group/Scott Haley, 68 & 76 Farmington Road](#) (by Jones & Beach Engineers Inc./ Erik Poulin) Preliminary Design Review Site Plan for mixed-use development project consisting of residential, entertainment spaces, restaurants, and retail. Case# 216 – 9&10 – GRD – 23 **Public Hearing**

Ms. Saunders stated that this is a conceptual/preliminary review only and the packet did not include technical review comments for this project and that a print of the comments were placed at each Board members seat prior to the meeting being called to order.

Mr. Josh Levy from Waterstone Properties Group introduced himself and Wayne Morrill from Jones and Beach Engineering and Jenn Murphy- Aubin from Waterstone Properties Group. Mr. Levy thanked staff, the Board, and the Community of Rochester for their support of the Ridge Marketplace. Mr. Levy gave an overview of shops and services that have recently moved into the Ridge Marketplace.

Ms. Murphy-Aubin provided a brief overview of events within the Ridge Marketplace. She stated that free events have been provided by the Ridge to promote a community within the City.

Mr. Levy provided an overview of data pertaining to the Ridge Marketplace Phase 1 and the businesses and revenues of the currently used part of the Ridge Marketplace. Mr. Levy stated that this submission is an opportunity for the Waterstone Properties Group to give input from the Planning Board and the community regarding their upcoming submission for Phase 2.

Mr. Morrill presented the proposed project of the Phase 2 of the Ridge Marketplace. Mr. Morrill shows plans of the proposed project to the Planning Board. Mr. Morrill explained the various types of businesses that will be added to The Ridge in Phase 2. Mr. Morrill also presented and explained the proposed plans for residential spaces in The Ridge Phase 2. Mr. Morrill stated that the residential apartments are proposed to have 216 units. Mr. Morrill explained the plans for traffic and access throughout the proposed phase and through the proposed residential area.

Mr. Levy stated that sustainability features are being included in the process of finalizing plans for the submission of the project. Mr. Levy stated Waterstone Properties Group has sought out input from the State, City, and Trail Groups to find a way to tie into the Riverwalk trail in Rochester.

Mr. Collopy opened the Public Hearing.

Janet Warfield, 30 Shiloh Drive, stated her concerns with increases in traffic. Ms. Warfield stated that leaving and entering the residential park is already hard with current traffic conditions and is concerned that conditions will worsen with the proposed construction.

Susan Rice, 159 Ten Rod Road, stated she is a business owner in downtown Rochester. Ms. Rice stated that she has numerous concerns about this proposed project. Ms. Rice stated that she sent multiple pictures to the Planning Department showing alterations of the property. Ms. Rice stated that she drove into the property on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July last year and saw a large amount of equipment on the premises. Ms. Rice stated that she has noticed, from Route 11 that equipment has been moving throughout the property. Ms., Rice stated that she feels that the developers are hiding equipment behind large piles of earth. Ms. Rice stated that she feels that this project should be forwarded to and reviewed by the Strafford County Regional Planning Commission due to its large impact on Rochester, as well as, surrounding cities. Ms. Rice stated her concerns with increased traffic as the proposed project moves forward. Ms. Rice stated that she felt that Rochester should remain a "hub of activity" and continue to build, but that plans should include impacts to the current population that lives and works within the City of Rochester. Ms. Rice stated that she was concerned that the proposed project was within the aquifer area and felt that further, detailed review should be considered for this project. Ms. Rice stated explained a porous asphalt that has been used in other locations and asked if this could be something used at this location to help with drainage. Ms. Rice recommended the Planning Board use a third-party review company of their choosing to investigate impact to land and traffic. Ms. Rice stated her concerns with water and sewage capacity. Ms. Rice asked if abutters have been notified, in person, of the proposed trail for this project and recommended that city representatives notify these abutters personally. Ms. Rice asked what privacy and security additions would be made for the abutters of this development and stated that some abutters have animals that could be impacted by the increased noise from this development. Ms. Rice stated that the Zoning Ordinance calls for Open Space and that she feels that there is not enough Open Space in the current proposed plan. Ms. Rice reiterated and gave examples of her traffic impact concerns. Ms. Rice stated her opinions of the architectural layout and stated that the City of Rochester has its own character and that she does not support the plan of buildings that resemble the architecture of other cities. Ms. Rice stated requirements for Charitable Gaming in the Zoning

Ordinance, such as bus stops and electric vehicle charging stations and asked if these requirements would also apply to developments live this proposed project.

Andrew Samonas stated that he is not a resident of Rochester but is a member of the City of Portsmouth's Planning Board and holds a master's degree in real estate development and urban design from the University of Miami. Mr. Samonas stated that he has been following the Ridge project and has an interest in the development of the Ridge. Mr. Samonas stated that, in his experience, the developer has been very accommodating to concerns of the Boards and of the general public. Mr. Samonas stated that he feels that the Waterstone Properties Group stands out, positively, amongst other development companies and that this project could be a great asset to the City of Rochester. Mr. Samonas stated that he supports the development.

Marsha Miller, 7 Harding Street, stated that she grew up on the Seacoast thanked the Planning Board and public for their part in the positive transformation of Rochester. Ms. Miller stated that she is grateful and feels that Rochester has become a great city to come to. Ms. Miller stated that she is a volunteer for the share fund and the people of the City of Rochester donate substantially to the share fund. Ms. Miller stated the Waterstone Properties Group was the first to donate and get the program up and running with a donation of \$1,500.00. Ms. Miller thanked the Waterstone Property Group for their charity.

Jerry Gregoire, 61 Estes Road, thanked the Planning Board for their services to the City of Rochester and thanked the developer of the proposed project for their presentation. Mr. Gregoire stated his support in the increased number of jobs and residences that this development would produce. Mr. Gregoire stated his concerns with the traffic on Route 11 with the increase of traffic resulting from the proposed development. Mr. Gregoire stated that he felt Route 11 should be upgraded to safely withstand the traffic increase and that the developer should pay for the upgrades and not the taxpayers.

Beth Wiggins, 6 Coleman Street, gave a brief history of her family living in the City of Rochester. Ms. Wiggins stated that she liked the design of the proposed project, but she also would like to see implementation of designs that portray more of the City of Rochester. Ms. Wiggins stated her concerns with traffic increase on Route 11 with the proposed project. Ms. Wiggins stated her support for the trail and also stated that she was concerned about the design of the proposed parking area for the development with regards to the elderly persons of the community. Ms. Wiggins asked if the parking and development would be wheelchair accessibility. Ms. Wiggins stated that she was a retired schoolteacher in the City of Rochester and now is a real estate agent. Ms. Wiggins gave examples of positive impacts and improvements of the City of Rochester and listed benefits of the addition to the Ridge Marketplace Phase 2. Ms. Wiggins stated her concerns with the lack of affordability for housing in the City of Rochester.

Tom Kaczynski, 112 Whitehall Road, stated that he does not support private-public partnerships. Mr. Kaczynski stated that he felt that TIF, Tax Increment Financing, is horrible for taxpayers. Mr. Kaczynski stated that he felt that the TIF status should have been changed with the change of the residential allowance for this project and that taxpayers do not realize that they are the ones paying for the startup of this project. Mr. Kaczynski stated his concern of impacts to local schools with the construction of the residential apartments. Mr. Kaczynski stated that the City of Rochester is submitting \$7.9 million for the infrastructure of this project. Mr. Kaczynski stated that taxpayers are paying for infrastructure of this project, as was done in Phase 1 of The Ridge Marketplace. Mr. Kaczynski asked how this proposed project will affect the wastewater treatment plant within the City of Rochester.

Ms. Saunders stated that an emailed letter was received by the Planning Department regarding the proposed project. Ms. Saunders stated that the letter has been placed in each of the Planning Board members' meeting packet for their review.

Mr. Walker asked how many parking spots are residential. Mr. Levy replied that the plans call for 1½ parking spots per unit, 216 units equal about 324 parking spaces. Mr. Walker stated that families typically have 2 cars and that the parking required for that statistic would be 432 spaces. Mr. Levy stated that they have used the average of 1½ cars per units and factored in the Coast bus stop that will be in the residential area.

Mr. Walker stated that he did not see plans for the loop road and asked if all traffic was expected to come in and out of Crane Drive from Route 11. Mr. Levy stated that the plan calls for a connecting road between The Ridge Phase 1 and Phase 2. Mr. Walker stated his concerns regarding traffic for the residents of the apartments that are proposed in the plan. Mr. Levy stated that the future plans call for a loop road through other parcels, but this current plan only has the entry/exit from Crane Drive. Mr. Walker stated that a loop road would be a key feature for the development. Mr. Levy showed the plan that called for a road that runs straight to and from the residential area. Mr. Walker stated that he felt that the road was not enough, and that the roundabout would not be able to handle the traffic flow. Mr. Levy explained the research behind the plans of the traffic.

Mr. Walker stated that, other than his concerns with the traffic level increase, he supports this project and feels that it will have a positive impact to the City of Rochester.

Mr. Bruckner stated that he felt there was very little open space in the residential area. Mr. Bruckner asked what size units would be in the residential buildings. Mr. Levy stated that the building would be composed of mostly studio, 1-bedroom and 2 – bedroom units with a few 3-bedroom units. Mr. Levy gave a brief overview of the research behind the type of units that are included in the plans and stated that the research showed very little children in these environments.

Mr. Bruckner asked if there was an estimation of how many children would be present in this type of residential complex. Mr. Levy responded that there was not a number placed, but that other, similar residential complexes had very few children.

Mr. Bruckner stated his concerns for there not being enough green space in the plans for the residential areas. Mr. Bruckner stated that he would like to see more green space in the plans. Mr. Levy stated that the developer will take that thought into consideration for green space in the residential area.

Mr. Bruckner stated that he feels that the proposed location would benefit from solar power.

Mr. Healey stated that there are five garages on only one page of the plans. Mr. Levy stated that some of the area is for covered parking. Mr. Healey stated that there is not architectural diagrams or pictures of these structures in the renderings that the Planning Board currently has. Mr. Levy stated that the issue would be looked into and reviewed by the design teams.

Mr. Levy stated that the Waterstone Properties Group and the developer will look more into increasing the Open Space areas to try and increase the size of those spaces.

Mr. Levy stated that the entire site will be ADA accessible.

Mr. Collopy reiterated some comments from the public. Mr. Collopy stated that he supports the color tones of the buildings but is concerned of the longevity of the architecture in the current plans. Mr. Collopy stated that he is concerned if the architecture will need updating in the future as trends change. Mr. Levy stated that he and the design and engineer teams will speak on any concerns and make changes where necessary.

Mr. Levy stated that there is not going to be a casino or gaming facility and that when entertainment is stated, it is meant as a movie theatre. Mr. Levy stated that from his review the City of Rochester would benefit greatly from a movie theatre. Mr. Levy stated that a movie theatre is the number one recommended amenity for the area.

Mr. Levy explained efforts that have been made to bring more entertainment options to the City of Rochester such as restaurants, a bowling alley, and a fitness center.

Mr. Collopy asked for further explanation on the pedestrian traffic plans. Mr. Levy stated that there will be a sidewalk that runs through to the Ridge Phase 1 and there is a plan in progress for a possible trail throughout the marketplace. Mr. Morrill gave a brief explanation of pedestrian traffic plans including trails and bus stops. Mr. Morrill stated that there would be extensive paths available for customers and for the residents of the apartment complex.

Mr. Collopy asked for a brief explanation on the concerns of Route 11 traffic. Mr. Morrill stated that the engineers have been working diligently with the City staff to provide a traffic analysis that took current and potential traffic patterns into consideration all the way into Farmington. Mr. Morrill stated that the engineering team is very willing to work with the City to hear and adjust any specific needs.

Mr. Morrill stated that with regards to the Alteration of Terrain Permit, it came close to expiring but was extended for five years. Mr. Morrill stated that an updated permit will be provided to the Planning Department.

Mr. Morrill responded to the concern of the parking garage units by stating that the plans for this parking came into the plans later and were completely shown. Mr. Morrill stated that residents of the apartments will have the option to rent these covered parking spaces when signing up for leases.

Mr. Morrill responded to the concern of lacking Open Space within the residential area. Mr. Morrill stated that there are various amenities that are in the plans for residents of the proposed apartment complex. Mr. Morrill also explained that there is a planned location for a dog park near the residential area.

Mr. Morrill stated that considerable effort has been taken to alleviate traffic concerns and gave example of the spaces that would be accessible to buses and driving companies, such as Uber.

Mr. Morrill explained concerns from the Fire Department with regards to exiting the residential area in the event of a fire. Mr. Morrill stated that an emergency access was added to the plans to help move people to a safe location as quickly as possible in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Morrill stated that the engineers will work with the developers to be sure that there are green areas throughout the residential space, especially near the proposed dog park.

Mr. Morrill stated that similar designs will be used in Phase 2 as were used in Phase 1.

Mr. Morrill stated that there plans for there to be a kiosk for bikes in the back space of the proposed residential area.

Mr. Morrill explained the collaboration with the Department of Public Works with regards to the future of the roundabout possibly needing to be converted into a two-lane roundabout. Mr. Morrill explained that enough space has been left in the plans to make that upgrade a possibility if needed in the future.

Mr. Dews asked what the chances were of removing the parking garages and increasing the height of the buildings and moving the covered parking under the buildings, rather than creating separate areas for them. Mr. Dews stated that this change could lead to more available green space. Mr. Morrill stated that the idea would be passed on the developer for review.

Mr. Dews asked if details for water pipes could be added to the plans. Mr. Morrill stated that the current submission is for the design and that future plan submittals will include utility plans.

Mr. Dews stated that he noticed that there were cars backed up onto the Spaulding Turnpike from the Route 11 exit and stated that there may need to be changes to stoplight timing or traffic patterns to alleviate this issue in the future. Mr. Morrill responded that part of the traffic analysis will include review of the traffic coming from both sides of the exit. Mr. Morrill stated that the traffic will be fixed, and significant changes will be made to better traffic issues.

Mr. May stated that he recommended solar panels be placed throughout the project to generate a renewable energy source for the area. Mr. May also stated his support for electric vehicle charging areas.

Mr. May recommended that the developer look into pervious pavement to help with drainage of the space.

Mr. May stated that he supports the proposed bus stop(s) withing the development and feels that they would be a good addition.

Mr. May stated to the Planning Board that he feels that the development will create a positive impact for the City of Rochester and other nearby cities. Mr. May recommended that the proposed development be a project of regional impact.

Mr. Morrill stated his support for the idea of porous pavement. Mr. Morrill stated that there must be good material under the pavement to make the pavement porous and that the engineers and developers will look into possible ways to add this feature despite the complications of soil type for the property.

Mr. deGeofroy stated his support for solar panel placement throughout the development, as well as electric charging stations.

Mr. Bruckner asked if the architectural models could include views from all sides so that the Planning Board can seen a more complete plan of what may be built from all sides, such as a three-dimensional plan. Mr. Morrill stated that more in-depth plans will be added in the official submission of the project.

Mr. Fitts thanked presented for the presentation of the proposed project and stated that he felt that proposed plans and that the completed part of the Ridge seem very tight and does not give much room for people with bigger vehicles. Mr. Morrill stated that all roads are sized as required per the regulations. Mr. Morrill stated that the proposed plans would call for larger parking spaces to allow for parking of larger vehicles and delivering tractor trailers.

Mr. Morrill explained the design of the traffic ways through the parking areas in residential and commercial spaces.

Mr. Collopy recommended that the developer gain the input of the Arts and Culture Commission when planning murals and signage for the development. Mr. Morrill stated that the trails that are to be installed will have art throughout the pathways.

Mr. de Geofroy recommended that there be art throughout the development.

Mr. Sullivan, Deputy Finance Director for the City of Rochester, reviewed the development agreement between the City of Rochester and the development of The Ridge. Mr. Sullivan stated that the City of Rochester presented to the Planning Board that the connection at Marketplace Blvd would be a City project and that the City would be widening Route 11. Mr. Sullivan stated that the design did not call for the loop road after further review and was not engineered at this time. Mr., Sullivan stated that if there were to be a loop road for the residential area of the Ridge Phase 2, that there would need to be an additional review and that the loop road would involve properties that are not owned by Waterstone Properties Group. Mr. Sullivan stated that a loop road would require possible easements and an increase in funding. Mr. Sullivan stated that if further traffic study is required that Peter Nourse, Director of the Department of Public Works, and the traffic engineer from HDA to present to the Planning Board.

Mr. Collopy asked Ms. Saunders to review the process of the Regional Development designation. Ms. Saunders stated that whether a project gets deemed a Project of Regional Development under the statute is a decision that the City's Planning Board would make. Ms. Saunders stated that when a formal proposal is submitted, that the Board can decide if this project shows regional impact. Ms. Saunders stated that Strafford Regional Planning and surrounding towns would be notified as abutters and if they have recommendations, comments, or concerns that they can work with the Strafford Regional Planning Commission to bring those comments and concerns to the City of Rochester's Planning Board. Ms. Saunders summarized by saying that involving the Regional Planning Commission is a way to extend the number of abutters to the Strafford Regional Planning Commission so they could hear from those abutters and the City of Rochester would be able to review comments and concerns from surrounding communities.

Mr. Fitts asked when the Planning Board would hear of next steps taken. Ms. Saunders responded that the applicant will submit a formal application within the next few months for review.

Mr. Collopy asked if involving the Strafford Regional Planning Commission should be done. Ms. Saunders stated that once this large project is formally submitted, it will be reviewed by the Technical Review Group and after necessary changes have been made the formal project application will be presented to the Planning Board.

Mr. Hamann stated that if the project is presented to the Strafford Regional Planning Commission that there would be 30 days given for the Commission and surrounding cities to respond with their concerns. Ms. Saunders stated that timeframes can be extended as much as possible as long as the applicant agreed.

Mr. Collopy stated that the Planning Board meeting would take a five-minute break.

**B. Kozbro LLC, 9 Academy Street (Northam Survey) Amendment to Approved Site Plan. Amendment to add additional dwelling units. Case# 125 – 198 – R2 – 23 *Public Hearing ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION\****

Krystian Kozlowski gave an overview of the amendment to the approved project. Mr. Kozlowski stated that the project was previously approved on July 11, 2022. Mr. Kozlowski stated that the original plan called for a total of 9 dwelling units and that the current amendment called for a total of 10 dwelling units. Mr. Kozlowski stated that this amendment reduces the area of disturbance and improves site utility routing. Mr. Kozlowski briefly explained the changes in façade and landscape



of the project. Mr. Kozlowski stated that Stormwater review was completed by the developer using Hydrocad and the results indicated that the site has sufficient capacity for infiltration of post-development flows. Mr. Kozlowski stated that the project will be phased and explained what each of the five phases will include moving forward.

Ms. Saunders stated that there was a typo regarding the number of units in the project description that was given to the Planning Board and stated that the amendment called for ten total units.

Ms. Saunders reviewed the Staff Recommendation with the Planning Board and stated that the Planning Department recommends that the Planning Board views the application as complete to proceed with consideration.

*A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to accept the application as complete. The motion carried unanimously.*

Ms. Saunders stated that staff recommends approval of the amendment with the standard conditions for precedent conditions including state plain coordinates, inspections, drainage maintenance agreement, and final drawings. Ms. Saunders stated that there were comments from the Fire Department regarding the current and proposed fire suppression system. Ms. Saunders further listed the required Plan Modifications under Precedent Conditions.

Mr. Dews asked for clarification on why the plans did not include water shut offs outside the building. Mr. Kozlowski stated that there have been communications with the Department of Public Works to make changes. Mr. Dews stated that he felt it was important to have the water shut offs so that both buildings can be controlled for water intake. Mr. Kozlowski stated that there will be additional shutoffs and further explained how the additional shut-offs will be placed.

Mr. Dews asked who owned the fence along the property line. Mr. Kozlowski stated that the owner of the site that faces 15 Academy Street owns the fence. Mr. Dews stated that the fence was built facing the wrong way and should be fixed. Ms. Saunders stated that the Planning Department would connect with the Building and Licensing Department to see if this would be a Code Enforcement issue.

Mr. May asked if the parking spaces were staying a part of the property or if they were being removed. Mr. Kozlowski stated that the parking spaces would be staying.

Mr. May asked if the lot-line was changing or staying the same. Mr. Kozlowski stated that there were no requested changes to the lot.

*A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to approve the Amendment to an Approved Site Plan as presented with the conditions as stated by Staff and added by Mr. Dews. The motion carried unanimously.*

C. **RBV Realty, LLC/Rebecca Matthews, 46 Stillings Court** (by Berry Survey)  
Condominium Subdivision. Case# 117 – 19-1 – NMU – 23 **Public Hearing**  
**ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION\***

Ms. Mathews asked if both 46 and 48 Stillings Court could be presented together. Ms. Saunders explained to the Planning Board that both Condominium Subdivision Applications mimicked another and that it would be beneficial for both applications to be presented at once.

Mr. Collopy stated that the applications for both Condominium Conversion/Creation at 46 Stillings Court and at 48 Stillings Court would be presented at once.

Ms. Mathews gave an overview of the proposed Condominium Conversion/Creation at both locations. Ms. Mathews stated that both of the buildings have their own meters and that they both follow driveway maintenance agreements.

Mr. O'Connor stated that both projects can be reviewed together, but that each application will require a vote for approval separately.

Mr. O'Connor stated the staff recommends that both projects be accepted as complete and that they are not a project of regional impact.

*A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to accept both applications as complete. The motion carried unanimously.*

*A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to approve both Condominium Subdivision Applications as presented with the conditions as stated by Staff. The motion carried unanimously.*

**D. [RBV Realty, LLC/Rebecca Matthews, 48 Stillings Court](#) (by Berry Survey)  
Condominium Subdivision. Case# 117 – 19-2 – NMU - 23 **Public Hearing**  
**ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION\*****

Application was presented in correlation with 46 Stillings Court Application.

*Application was accepted as complete and approved by the Planning Board in previous motion.*

**E. [Beth Wiggins, 6 Coleman Street](#) (by Norway Plains/ Joel Runnals) 2-Lot Subdivision.  
Case# 128 – 88 – A – 23 **Public Hearing** **ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION\*****

Joel Runnals with Norway Plains presented the 2-Lot subdivision application. Mr. Runnals explained the applicant has received a Variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment to re-subdivide the lot and create a non-conforming lot. Mr. Runnals explained how the frontage of each lot is measured and what changes are being made. Mr. Runnals stated that both lots have city water and sewer access.

Mr. O'Connor explained that a variance was obtained for frontage for the property and stated that staff recommends the application be considered complete and has no regional impact.

*A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Dews to accept the application as complete. The motion carried unanimously.*

Mr. O'Connor reviewed the precedent conditions listed and stated that staff recommends the application for approval.

Mr. May asked for clarification on driveway requirements for the new lot. Mr. O'Connor stated that there would be no issues with the new lot receiving permitting for a driveway.

*A motion was made by Mr. Dews and seconded by Mr. Healey to approve the 2-Lot Subdivision as presented with the conditions as stated by Staff. The motion carried unanimously.*

---

## VIII. Continued Applications

### A. [Johnny Lam, 24 Signal Street](#) (by Portsmouth Sign/Carrie Vaughn) Conditional Use Permit for second freestanding sign. Case #120-315-DC-23 **Public Hearing ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION\***

Carrie Vaughn from Portsmouth Sign Company gave an overview of the application. Ms. Vaughn stated that the sign has been approved for a Variance by the Zoning Board and is currently requesting approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a second freestanding sign.

Ms. Saunders reviewed the application and Conditional Use Permit criteria for the application and stated that staff recommends the application be approved by the Planning Board.

Mr. Walker asked if the Planning Board was reviewing and approving a Conditional Use Permit. Ms. Saunders responded yes.

Mr. Dews stated that the sign has already been installed and erected.

*A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to approve the Conditional Use Permit. The motion carried unanimously.*

### B. [42 Front Street, LLC, 42 Front Street](#) (by Norway Plains Assoc./Ashley Rowe) 2-Lot subdivision. Case# 102 – 41 – R2 – 23 **Continuance to August 7, 2023 Planning Board Meeting.**

Ms. Saunders stated that the Planning Board must vote to continue the application to the date specified, August 7, 2023.

Mr. Fitts asked if there have been previous extensions for this application. Ms. Saunders responded that this is the second extension request.

*A motion was made by Mr. Healey and seconded by Mr. May to continue the application to the August 7, 2023 Planning Board Meeting. The motion carried with 8 votes for and 2 against.*

---

## IX. Other Business

### A. Planning Update

Ms. Saunders explained the Natural Resources Community Event on July 17<sup>th</sup> and invited all Planning Board members to attend to hear input from the community.

Mr. O'Connor stated that he is leaving his position as the Senior Planner for the Planning Department and thanked Ms. Saunders for her mentorship and the Planning Board for all that they have done. Various Planning Board members thanked Mr. O'Connor for his time and stated that he will be missed.

## **B. Other**

Mr. May asked if there would be a Planning Board Workshop Meeting in July. Ms. Saunders responded that there would be no workshop meeting in July.

Mr. Collopy asked if there was an update on the landscape company on Milton Road. Ms. Saunders stated that the matter went to court and the applicant plead guilty and that they have a certain number of days to restore the site and remove the equipment.

---

## **X. Adjournment**

*A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. May to adjourn the meeting at 8:41pm. The motion carried unanimously.*

---

Respectfully submitted,

Jaclyn Millard,  
*Administrative Assistant II*

and

Shanna B. Saunders,  
*Director of Planning & Development*