

**TOWN OF EXETER  
PLANNING BOARD  
NOWAK ROOM  
10 FRONT STREET  
MARCH 27, 2025  
APPROVED MINUTES  
7:00 PM**

**I. PRELIMINARIES:**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT BY ROLL CALL:** Chair Langdon Plumer, Vice-Chair Aaron Brown, Gwen English, Jen Martel, Nancy Belanger Select Board Representative, Alternate Marty Kennedy, and Alternate Dean Hubbard

**STAFF PRESENT:** Town Planner Dave Sharples

**II. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Plumer called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and introduced the members. Alternates, Marty Kennedy and Dean Hubbard were activated.

**III. NEW BUSINESS:**

1. Continued public hearing on the application of StoneArch Development for site plan review of a proposal for the redevelopment of the property located at 112 Front Street. The proposal includes the demolition of the existing buildings and new construction of seventeen (17) townhouse style condominium units and associated site improvements. The subject property is located in the C-1, Central Area Commercial zoning district and identified as Tax Map Parcel #73-14. PB Case #24-17.

Chair Plumer referenced a request for a continuance from the applicant to the Board's April 10, 2025 meeting.

***Vice-Chair Brown motioned to continue Planning Board Case #24-17 to the Board's April 10, 2025 meeting at 7 PM at Town Offices in the Nowak Room. Ms. English seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 7-0-0.***

2. Continued public hearing on the application of Green & Company for site plan review and Wetlands Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a proposed Mixed-Use Neighborhood Development (MUND) project consisting of a townhouse development (off Haven Lane) with thirty-two (32) three-bedroom units, a four-story mixed-use building on Portsmouth Avenue having 4,418 S.F. commercial use on the first floor and thirty-six (36) one-bedroom units above, and one separate duplex structure with three-bedroom units on Haven Lane, along with associated site improvements. The subject property is located at 76 Portsmouth Avenue, in the C-2, Highway Commercial zoning district, Tax Map Parcel #65-118. PB Case #24-8.

Chair Plumer read the Public Hearing Notice out loud.

43 Alternate, Marty Kennedy, recused himself from this application and left the meeting table to sit with  
44 the public.

45  
46 Mr. Sharples summarized that the application was proposed to the Board on December 19, 2024. A site  
47 walk was held on January 9, 2025. The applicant returned to the Board on January 23, 2025. The  
48 applicant appeared at the Conservation Commission's January 14, 2025 and February 11, 2025 meeting.  
49 The Commission voted that they had no objection to the wetland Conditional Use Permit (CUP)  
50 application with two conditions of approval. Mr. Sharples referenced a memo from the Commission  
51 dated February 12, 2025.

52  
53 Mr. Sharples noted that a second Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting was conducted on  
54 February 27, 2025 and comment letters from Underwood Engineers (UEI) and TRC were provided to the  
55 Board.

56  
57 Mr. Sharples noted that the applicant submitted revised plans and supporting documents dated March  
58 19, 2025 to the Planning Board. The TRC issued another comment letter on March 5, 2025 and  
59 Underwood Engineers (UEI) provided comments in their March 4 letter. There are two waivers being  
60 requested as outlined in the waiver request letter from Jones & Beach dated January 13, 2025.

61  
62 Mr. Sharples indicated that at the prior Planning Board meeting, several items were discussed that  
63 included traffic, sidewalk access, construction hours, hydrant location, one access point vs two access  
64 points.

65  
66 Mr. Sharples noted that regarding traffic, the Planning Board agreed to forego a full traffic impact  
67 analysis and instead impose an exaction as agreed by the applicant to offset some of the cost to  
68 coordinate the three (3) traffic signals on Portsmouth Ave between High St and Alumni Drive. He spoke  
69 with Electric Light who does our signal work and they estimated that connecting the three signals  
70 (equipment and labor), preparing a timing plan, and implementing said plan would be approximately \$7-  
71 10K per signal. To this end, the applicant has agreed to provide the town with \$20,000 toward this effort  
72 and Mr. Sharples noted that he believes this is more than fair.

73  
74 Mr. Sharples noted sidewalk access was discussed. It appeared that there was a concern that the lease  
75 in the front of the parcel could prohibit pedestrian access on the proposed sidewalk that runs from the  
76 Haven Lane side of the development to Portsmouth Ave. He noted he will be prepared with a condition  
77 of approval if needed to address this matter.

78  
79 Mr. Sharples noted that construction hours were also discussed by an abutter, and it was requested that  
80 the Planning Board restrict the construction hours to beyond the Town's current ordinance. Mr.  
81 Sharples told the board that he would reach out to the applicant to see if they would voluntarily restrict  
82 the hours. They have agreed to restrict the hours from 7am to 7pm daily and only inside work on  
83 Sundays.

84  
85 Mr. Sharples noted regarding the hydrant location, the Fire Department reviewed the latest location  
86 shown on the plans and found that location acceptable.

Mr. Sharples noted that he also spoke to the Fire Department about the two access points on Haven Lane and they prefer this configuration over the one access point and turnaround.

Paige Libbey of Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc. noted that the applicant and Attorney Bosen were present. Minor modifications were made to the plans to address UEI comments concerning utilities.

She noted that the applicant made changes to break up two of the buildings into four units and three units. Any buildings with four or more units had horizontal jogs added to break up the façade. She noted changes to parking for buildings 2, 3 and 11 with the road widened for a better turn radius from garages without backing into the travel lane. She provided a handout showing the proposed changes. She noted changes to architectural elevations for buildings 8, 1 and 11 which will have the height decreased from 35' to 30.'

Ms. Libbey noted that the town's 3<sup>rd</sup> party review engineer, Jason Plourde, of VHB addressed traffic at the last meeting and recommended that it would be more beneficial to make a contribution to address those issues rather than do a traffic study.

Ms. Libbey noted that the Board requested architectural renderings at the last meeting, and she posted photos from above showing access to Portsmouth Ave, from Haven Lane in from the western entrance by building 11, a zoomed in version which included building 11 and a portion of building 1 with a slightly different roof line at 30' height instead of 35.' She posted photos of the view facing building 1 which is pulled forward. She posted photos of the eastern entrance of Haven Lane with buildings 7 and 6 in the distance. She showed where the green space will be near the mail house. She posted photos facing building 3 and building 10 and a view down the sidewalk away from Portsmouth Avenue, a photo between buildings perpendicular to Haven Lane, a view of buildings 8 and 9, from Portsmouth Avenue facing the side, and buildings 4 and 5. She posted the view from Haven Lane with the 8' fence, building 1 fence at the perimeter of the property line entrance of Haven Lane, the rear property of the three abutters showing fence and where it ends close to the wetland buffer.

Chair Plumer asked about 11 Bonnie Drive and whether the wide areas of trees will remain. Ms. Libbey referenced sheet L1 of the Landscaping Plan.

Ms. Martel asked about the fence and Ms. Libbey noted it would be white, vinyl, stockade and that she would add the detail to the plan set.

Ms. Martel asked about the balconies facing into the development and Ms. Libbey noted that was because otherwise the view would be the Thirsty Moose property where 5 and 6 have balconies facing the woodland.

Ms. English noted there was a lot of pavement and asked about putting a living island in the middle. Ms. Libbey noted it would obstruct a car's view backing in and out, and angled parking was not a solution that would work behind the garages. She noted the spaces would not be striped but open. Mr. Sharples noted the pavement is porous and Ms. English expressed concerns with heat.

Chair Plumer asked about the gray hashed area by building 11 and Ms. Libbey noted there is an open area between the buildings, also building 3. She noted adding another island may make plowing difficult, but she can look into that.

Ms. English asked if Building 11 could be outside the buffer. Ms. Libbey noted they would lose parking because of the curve in the road.

Chair Plumer asked about two-way traffic through the middle. Vice-Chair Brown noted it is a driveway not a road so safety for cars to move is a bigger priority than an island. The pavement is already porous and he noted he liked the layout. He noted flexibility makes sense for construction hours on holidays.

Ms. English questioned TRC and UEi notes with regard to a comment about NH DOT. Ms. Libbey noted the area was urban compact and Paul Vlasich was fine with the way it was drawn. Mr. Sharples addressed the driveway flare radius and the improved layout.

Ms. English questioned #55 – guardrail removal and Ms. Libbey noted the guardrail is still there in front of parking spaces, snow will be removed at the building on Portsmouth Avenue.

Ms. English asked about concerns with patches of porous pavement and depth to high water table. Ms. Libbey noted the patches are gone and the sections will be regulated with signage. She noted the areas with the islands are difficult to clean but described the process with the access door.

Ms. English asked about planting trees near porous pavement (#67) and Ms. Libbey noted the trees were moved not eliminated and showed the area.

Ms. English asked about the guidelines not met referenced on page 7. Ms. Libbey noted a narrative was provided. Mr. Sharples noted it was his comment concerning the front building on Portsmouth Ave concerning windows and the windows were changed ,and he had no further comments.

Ms. English asked about the sidewalk (page 8) and Ms. Libbey noted the flare was questioned to connect the sidewalk and was removed entirely. Mr. Sharples asked how that would work with “phase 1.” Ms. Libbey noted it will go straight to Portsmouth Avenue in Phase 2.

Ms. Belanger asked about #9 on page 8 of the Jones & Beach letter dated March 19, 2025 and Ms. Libbey indicated it is shown on sheet C-1, the property juts out which comes from when Portsmouth Avenue was widened, but not in front of this property, and they are talking with DOT to clean that up.

Ms. Martel asked about the waiver for grading within 5’ of property lines and Ms. Libbey referenced sheet C-3 where the sidewalk runs along the property line, to install buffering and make sure the drainage swale works, to maintain connectivity to wetland, the fence, plantings along the buffer. The Right of Way is only 40’ wide so 24’ with road, curbing, grading, excavation it will get close. There will be silt fencing and construction fencing to protect abutting land.

Ms. Martel asked if the sidewalk fence on Haven Lane could be pulled back and Ms. Libbey noted it was pretty tight with the grade and culvert.

Chair Plumer asked about the flow of the culvert and Ms. Libbey depicted the flow path, same as today.

Ms. Martel asked about the sidewalk and Ms. Libbey showed the sidewalk with Portsmouth Avenue wider in line with MUND (Mixed Used Neighborhood Development).

Chair Plumer asked about parking in front of stores and Ms. Libbey noted there will be no parking in front of stores and showed the areas of parking. Ms. Martel asked about resident parking in back and Ms. Libbey noted it would not be limited only to residents.

Ms. Martel asked about trash, utilities, elevator and stores. Ms. Libbey showed the loading area and noted there would be private trash removal.

Ms. English asked about curbing and signage for plowing. Ms. Libbey depicted the areas where the guardrail, curbing and retaining wall are on the plan. Ms. Libbey discussed underground detention, the filtration treatment and runoff treatment for the front sidewalk.

Ms. English asked about the culvert between building 5 and the parking area which she referred to as a ditch. She noted she was nervous about a severe rain event being 10' away. Ms. Libbey referenced the 48" culvert perpendicular to the stream and the culvert being replaced at the backside of the Thirsty Moose property and how the two culverts will be tied into the structure to allow additional outlet with the usual parallel flow with the stream, future erosion prevention and culverts are sized to prevent erosion during a 50-year storm.

Chair Plumer asked about the washed out gully and Ms. Libbey noted a wetland permit would be filed with the state for the southwest most end filled in for construction of sidewalk and drainage. The area will be cleaned up and restored where erosion was happening. She noted the elevation of the building and that the pipe would be well overtopped before it could ever flood that building.

Ms. English asked if there were enough snow storage and Ms. Libbey noted areas designated and plans to truck excess off site.

Ms. Martel noted landscape island plantings would die if the islands were used for snow storage. Ms. Libbey noted they could look for better locations.

Ms. English recommended having as much vegetation as possible and recommended moving the snow storage so that the plantings won't be damaged. Vice-Chair Brown asked to review snow storage for "phase 1." Ms. Libbey noted the entranceway, parking area at the edge of the building, sidewalk, islands and along the mail house pull off, and the location where the town pushes snow off Haven Lane. Vice-Chair Brown noted that between building 6 and 7 would be ideal. Ms. Belanger noted concerns with treatment of melting snow. Ms. Libbey noted the area could be graded to flow away from wetlands and to porous pavement.

Chair Plumer asked if the long strip between Buildings 6 and 7 had a retaining wall and Ms. Libbey indicated yes.

Ms. English asked to identify plantings on the landscape plan especially the northern border exit into Haven Lane on the left side of the road. She asked if the 7-8 plantings were tall enough to provide screening. Ms. Libbey noted there were arborvitae, grasses and taller trees. She noted the label on the plan. Ms. Martel noted there was a symbol on the plan.

Ms. English asked about HVAC in "Phase 2." Ms. Libbey noted it would be on the roof but not visible. "Phase 1" would be internal.

Ms. English asked about bike racks and Ms. Libbey noted she needed to add those as part of "phase 2."

Ms. English asked about the proposed trail and whether there was a significant grade. Ms. Libbey noted it would loop and follow the contours. There would also be a couple of steps so it would not be as steep.

Ms. English asked about removal of invasives, and Ms. Libbey noted that would require permitting with the wetland bureau and so it is not proposed.

Ms. English asked about recreation areas and Ms. Libbey noted it meets regulations, the green space around the units and trail as well. Ms. Martel recommended taking out the area by "phase 2."

Ms. Martel asked about the drainage plans in "phases 1 and 2." Ms. Libbey reviewed the grading plan, porous pavement area, infiltration, and jellyfish system. She noted the front was trickier and would have underground detention.

Ms. Martel asked about roof runoff for "phase 1." Ms. Libbey noted filtration drip edges behind buildings including a filter course and stone reservoir. She described the filtration system.

Ms. Martel noted the proposed snow storage area recommended by Vice-Chair Brown would not be treated and drain to the wetland.

Ms. Belanger asked about #58 on page 2 of the Jones & Beach letter dated March 19, 2025. Ms. Libbey noted the road was widened in sections setback to gage, with the second floor cantilevered. She noted that adding would interfere with plowing.

Ms. Belanger asked about #65-66 on page 4 and 5 and whether they were still waiting on DPW. Ms. Libbey noted she spoke to Paul Vlasich yesterday and he wants to meet to finalize the layout.

Vice-Chair Brown asked about electric vehicle charging stations and Ms. Libbey noted the conduit note on the plans as part of "phase 2." Mr. Sharples noted that in "phase 1" residents have garages.

Vice-Chair Brown asked about the pedestrian access in “phase 1 and phase 2.” Ms. Libbey noted from Haven Lane to Portsmouth Avenue the neighborhood could walk through. Ms. Libbey noted she did not envision the public going behind the units. Ms. Libbey noted it is clear where the sidewalk and parking are.

Ms. English asked about landscaping behind 11 Bonnie Drive and whether it would be adequately shielded. She noted she would like to see that beefed up. Ms. Libbey noted there would be a few more trees in the section. The Board provided Ms. Libbey with a letter dated March 23<sup>rd</sup> from the abutter. Ms. Libbey noted they would not disturb the wetland by cutting trees and putting in a fence. Ms. Martel agreed that shrubs can’t be planted in the woods and wetland and noted the best screening would be on 11 Bonnie Drive. Ms. Belanger encouraged the applicant and abutter to have conversations.

Craig Boudreau of 11 Bonnie Drive noted he was concerned with flooding and lighting. He noted he wouldn’t want to walk through people’s back yards. He noted his preference was natural screening and a fence. He noted the buffer proposed was unrealistic and wants it to go up to the unit. Ms. Libbey noted where the fence is proposed to end and not wanting additional wetland impact. She noted they were happy to reach out and work with the abutter.

Susan Taylor of 30 Haven Lane noted it is wet behind the Thirsty Moose property and behind the Auto Parts store and there are cones and yellow tape at this point.

Vice-Chair Brown asked why it couldn’t be one-way. Ms. Libbey asked which way they would want it to go and noted it would be difficult to enforce. She noted she cannot reduce the parking aisle width.

Ms. Belanger asked about phases and when the approval expires. She asked about the lease being extended. Chair Plumer noted it could be continued when ready to build “phase 2.” Vice-Chair Brown noted it was recommended that drainage and access should be done now. Attorney Bosen discussed vesting under the regulations and concerns if MUND were to go away. He discussed the terminology of phasing and how the applicant did not propose phasing, and the lack of a definition. He noted it could be referred to as one project. Ms. Libbey noted it was not referred to until TRC discussed water and access. Attorney Bosen discussed active and substantial building. Mr. Sharples noted it could be vested five years and hope for an extension. There is four more years on the lease with the auto parts store and the tenant’s option to extend for five more. Mr. Green noted they could know 30 days before it renews, or the lessee could leave early. Mr. Sharples noted the building permit is good for a year to 18 months. Mr. Sharples noted the Board follows Section 13.8 of the site plan regulations. Mr. Sharples noted the Board has the authority to waive 13.8.4 but if they waived it, it would not be defined.

The Board recessed briefly to continue Case #25-1 to their next meeting due to being late in the evening and not likely to be finished by 10 PM which is when no new business is conducted.

The hearing resumed at 9:24 PM.

Ms. English asked about the lighting plan and expressed concerns that bulbs not hang down past the shade as she has seen in other properties. Ms. Libbey referenced L-3 and noted there will be a couple of decorative street lights and lights at the rear of the parking lot, rear of building and front in “phase 2.”

Ms. Libbey addressed the waiver for grading within 5’ of the property line for buffering and fencing. She noted the restoration plan. Mr. Sharples noted the access is exempt from the provision.

***Vice-Chair Brown motioned after reviewing the criteria for granting waivers, to approve the request of Green and Company for a waiver from Section 9.3.6.7 of the site plan review and subdivision regulations regarding grading within 5’ of the property line for Planning Board Case #24-8. Mr. Hubbard seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Ms. Belanger voted aye, Ms. English voted aye, Vice-Chair Brown voted aye, Chair Plumer voted aye, Mr. Hubbard voted aye and Ms. Martel voted aye. The motion passed 6-0-0.***

Ms. Libbey addressed the waiver for the standard specifications for construction – Section E(II)(D)(1) Curb Radius Intersections (DPW construction standards). She noted the ROW is 40’ wide and she outlined the turning template used by the Fire Department. She noted a wider radius could not be fit. Chair Plumer noted it is unique to the situation.

Ms. Belanger asked if it would be affected if sidewalks were put in. Ms. Libbey noted that would reduce the road width and then they would have the radius at that point.

Vice-Chair Brown agreed it was a unique situation.

***Vice-Chair Brown motioned after reviewing the criteria for granting waivers, to approve the request of Green and Company for a waiver of Section E(II)(D)(1) – Curb Radius Intersections (DPW construction standards) for Planning Board Case #24-8. Ms. Belanger seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, Ms. Martel voted aye, Mr. Hubbard voted aye, Chair Plumer voted aye, Vice-Chair Brown voted aye, Ms. English voted aye, and Ms. Belanger voted aye. The motion passed 6-0-0.***

Ms. Libbey read the responses to the wetlands Conditional Use Permit (CUP) into the record. She noted it was a permitted use in the zone for MUND in C-2. She noted there were alternate designs submitted and revised and referenced wetlands D and C crossing which are limited value. She noted 7.7% of the limited use buffer and plaques to be placed along the tree line. She noted the language to be contained in the condominium documents. She referenced the function and value report from the wetland scientist who concluded the impact was not detrimental to the wetland as all have been degraded, flood flow is not compromised, and the erosion of the existing channel was noted. Wetland C and D are manmade with little to no value. She noted the design was altered to maintain connectivity. She noted the NH DES Alteration of Terrain application (AoT), wastewater and EPA general permits, and that flooding would not increase to neighboring property. She addressed mitigation elsewhere on the site and noted the existing vegetated area to be permanently conserved as greenspace. She discussed restoration proposal to all areas not permanently impacted.



Ms. Martel indicated that snow storage was not addressed adequately enough for the impact marked temporary to the buffer which is more likely permanent and noted she was uncomfortable voting to approve the CUP when she has not seen how it will be addressed.

Ms. Libbey indicated the proposal for grading to porous pavement and where stormwater would be treated. She noted road salt can't be used for maintenance. They will use only one (non-salt) treatment on paver areas.

Ms. Martel indicated the stairs by the kiosk would make the proposal challenging, they were not going to get a berm there. Attorney Bosen recommended it be a condition of approval to not use salt or chloride products. Ms. Martel indicated salt or not, there would be other solvents, such as motor oil. Ms. Libbey noted the slope was not huge, only 6" and UEI could review on their end.

Vice-Chair Brown asked if it was not permitted to truck off snow from the property. Mr. Sharples noted it was not required in the regulations. Vice-Chair Brown noted the islands were not practical with vegetation. Ms. Libbey indicated the grades could be changed to make it work and snow could be trucked off in a bad winter. Vice-Chair Brown agreed grading should work and the town engineer was more qualified. Mr. Green noted the grading was not a significant change. Vice-Chair Brown indicated he was comfortable making it a condition of approval. Chair Plumer agreed. Ms. English noted she was concerned with it. Vice-Chair Brown indicated he was less comfortable with the Board making a redesign than the town engineer. Chair Plumer agreed. Ms. Libbey noted the change was in line with others that could come up waiting for state approvals.

Ms. Martel noted there was more parking than needed and more asphalt. Ms. English agreed with Ms. Martel. She noted she believed it was too much of a buffer impact for this site.

Mr. Sharples read the Conservation Commission's proposed conditions concerning upgrade of the 18" culvert as discussed; and the deed restriction be executed to permanently protect the passive recreation trail.

Ms. Libbey noted the wetland in the protected greenspace was a higher value and the application went through extensive process with Conservation, and they felt comfortable after hearing the testimony from Gove Environmental with the conditions Mr. Sharples outlined.

Ms. Libbey noted that the condition could read that UEI review and insure that all stormwater flows to be treated. Mr. Sharples added and be reviewed by the town engineer or designee, or a design that achieves that. Vice-Chair Brown recommended giving the flexibility.

Mr. Sharples read the proposed conditions.

***Vice-Chair Brown motioned after reviewing the criteria for a wetlands Conditional Use Permit to approve the request of Green and Company with the conditions read by Town Planner Dave Sharples. Ms. Belanger seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Ms. Belanger voted aye, Ms. English***

***voted nay, Vice-Chair Brown voted aye, Chair Plumer voted aye, Mr. Hubbard voted aye and Ms. Martel voted nay. The motion passed 4-2-0.***

The Board discussed phasing and approval time. Vice-Chair Brown noted they would likely finish the first portion in three years and sell as quickly as they are built in this market leaving a potential gap in time for the front portion of the project. The applicant is concerned about zoning changes and don't want to lose their approval. The front of the project is what the public desired with rezoning. Attorney Bosen noted there could be a waiver so that the residential units can be completed, utilities and walking path.

Ms. Belanger asked if it were typical to approve a project for that many years and Chair Plumer referenced Riverwoods. Vice-Chair Brown noted it was very typical, right now the market is very fluid. Mr. Sharples noted there is one that has been approved for five years. Ms. Belanger noted phasing came up at TRC. Mr. Sharples noted in order to identify what to do first. Chair Plumer noted that granting an extension was no big problem. Mr. Sharples advised that if the approval time is waived it would be in perpetuity unless otherwise stated. Vice-Chair Brown recommended 15 years. Ms. Libbey noted they would also need to extend their state approvals. Mr. Green noted this was designed under MUND and that may change, the Board may change. He noted they intend to move rapidly, 15 years would be wonderful, 11-12 ok, one year would not work. Ms. English noted Portsmouth Ave could change, stormwater regs could change. Attorney Bosen recommended focusing on the here and now and not being speculative. Mr. Green noted they could do 12. Mr. Sharples read the proposed condition: "this approval shall be valid for a period of 12 years from today's date."

Vice-Chair Brown asked what would happen if they didn't do anything. He would like to see improved screening for 11 Bonnie Drive. Mr. Green recommended discussing that with the homeowner on site.

Ms. Green noted they could add a row of trees behind the building. The fence was shown on the plan to the point of wetlands buffer and then the row of trees could continue behind the building. Mr. Boudreau noted a 10' fence would be better, he noted he wanted a fence.

Mr. Sharples read the proposed condition: "to construct a living fence a minimum of 8' height which shall be shown on the plans the length of building 1 between building 1 and 11 Bonne Drive."

Mr. Green noted they could extend the fence shown on the plan by 20' and have a living fence to the end of the building shown on plan. Mr. Sharples added the language "as discussed at the meeting."

***Vice-Chair Brown motioned to approve the request of Green and Company, Planning Board Case #24-8 for multi-family site plan with the conditions read by the Town Planner. Mr. Hubbard seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Ms. Martel voted nay, Mr. Hubbard voted aye, Chair Plumer voted aye, Vice-Chair Brown voted aye, Ms. English voted nay and Ms. Belanger voted nay. The motion failed 3-3-0.***

Mr. Sharples read the standard conditions and additional conditions of approval:

1. An electronic as built plan with details acceptable to the Town shall be provided prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. This plan must be in a dwg or dxf file format and in NAD 1983 State Plane New Hampshire FIPS 2800 feet coordinates;
2. A preconstruction meeting shall be arranged by the applicant and his contractor with the Town engineer prior to any site work commencing. The following must be submitted for review and approval prior to the preconstruction meeting:
  - i. the SWPPP (storm water pollution prevention plan), if applicable, be submitted to and reviewed for approval by DPW prior to the preconstruction meeting; and
  - ii. A project schedule and construction cost estimate.
3. Third party construction inspection fees shall be paid prior to scheduling the preconstruction meeting.
4. The annual operations and stormwater maintenance report in the stormwater management operation and maintenance manual (revised March 15, 2025) shall be completed and submitted to the Town engineer annually on or before January 31<sup>st</sup>. This requirement shall be an ongoing condition of approval and included in the condominium documents.
5. All comments in the UEI review letter dated 3/26/25 shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Town Planner and Town Engineer, or their designee, prior to signing the final plans.
6. All condominium documents including declaration and by laws shall be submitted to the Town Planner for review and approval prior to signing the final plans. The documents submitted to the Town shall include language regarding the maintenance requirements of the pervious pavers and stormwater practices shown on the plans and other applicable conditions of this approval. The condominium documents shall be reviewed by the town's attorney, at the applicant's expense.
7. All applicable state permit approval numbers shall be noted on the final plans.
8. All applicable fees to be paid including, but not limited to sewer/water connection fees, impact fees and inspection fees (including third party inspection fees) prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
9. All landscaping shown on plans shall be maintained and any dead or dying vegetation shall be replaced, no later than the following growing season. as long as the site plan remains valid.
10. All outdoor lighting (including security lights) shall be down lit and shielded so no direct light is visible from adjacent properties and/or right of ways.
11. The applicant shall submit the land use and stormwater management information about the project using the PTAPP online municipal tracking tool. The PTAPP submittal must be accepted by DPW prior to the preconstruction meeting.

12. Use of the proposed sidewalk from the residential units to Portsmouth Avenue shall be unrestricted for use by the residents of this project. The intent of this condition is to insure that any lease of the front portion of the lot will not impede pedestrian access to the sidewalk.

13. No building shall be closer than 20' from the side property lines and this shall be reflected on the final plans.

14. As agreed by the applicant, the applicant shall provide a \$20,000 contribution to be used toward the improvement of vehicular traffic flow from the site to Portsmouth Ave which includes as a minimum the signalized intersection at Green Hill Road and Portsmouth Ave. This contribution shall be made when submitting for a building permit.

15. As agreed by the applicant, all construction hours shall be limited to 7 AM to 7 PM daily with only inside construction on Sundays.

16. On the final plans bike racks shall be added to phase 2 to the satisfaction of the Town Planner.

17. A constructed and living fence a minimum of 8' in height shall be shown on the final plans between the length of building 1 and 11 Bonnie Drive, as discussed at the meeting.

18. *This approval shall be valid for a period for 12 years from today's date. (revised to 10 years from today's date).*

19. The proposed pedestrian trail shall be reviewed by the Conservation and Sustainability Planner prior to signing the final plans.

Ms. Belanger asked about the ROW along Portsmouth Avenue being transferred. Mr. Sharples will do more research on why the state didn't take it and whether the Town would want it.

Ms. Belanger noted her issue was the length of years of approval, she noted she would be fine with ten years. Mr. Sharples noted with the building permit it will likely go to 12 anyway.

Ms. Martel noted she had a hard time approving the CUP and is not comfortable with so much impact from pavement in wetlands buffers. She noted the spirit of the MUND to have limited parking and four per unit. Ms. English agreed.

Ms. Libbey asked about the as built plans for phase 1 and phase 2 and whether they would be separate, and Mr. Sharples indicated yes.

***Ms. Belanger motioned to approve the request of Green and Company, Planning Board Case #24-8 for a multi-family site plan with the conditions read by Town Planner Dave Sharples, with said site plan approval valid for a period of ten years from today's date. Mr. Hubbard seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Ms. Belanger voted aye, Ms. English voted nay, Vice-Chair Brown voted aye, Chair Plumer voted aye, Mr. Hubbard voted aye and Ms. Martel voted nay. The motion passed 4-2-0.***

Ms. English asked about stop signs and Ms. Belanger noted she brought that up at the Select Board meeting. Mr. Sharples noted he would follow up.

3. The application of StoneArch Development for a multi-family site plan review for the proposed construction of a six (6) unit townhouse style residential condominium development along with associated parking and site improvements. The subject property is located at 57 Portsmouth Avenue, in the C-2, Highway Commercial zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #73-14. PB Case #25-1.

The Board scheduled a site walk at the proposed site, for April 10, 2025 at 8 AM.

***Vice-Chair Brown motioned to continue Planning Board Case #25-1 to the Board's April 10, 2025 meeting at 7 PM at the Exeter Town Offices in the Nowak Room. Ms. Belanger seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 6-0-0.***

#### **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

March 13, 2025

February 27, 2025

***Ms. Belanger motioned to table approval of the February 27, 2025 and March 13, 2025 meeting minutes. Ms. English seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 6-0-0.***

#### **V. OTHER BUSINESS**

- Master Plan Discussion

Mr. Sharples noted that he was on the agenda for the Select Board's meeting Monday night to present the Bike & Pedestrian Master Plan. There would be one meeting rather than two.

- Field Modifications

- Bond and/or Letter of Credit Reductions and Release

#### **VI. TOWN PLANNER'S ITEMS**

#### **VII. CHAIRPERSON'S ITEMS**

#### **VIII. PB REPRESENTATIVE'S REPORT ON "OTHER COMMITTEE ACTIVITY"**

560 **IX. ADJOURN**

561 Chair Plumer adjourned the meeting at 11:20

562 PM.

563 Respectfully submitted.

564 Daniel Hoijer,

565 Recording Secretary (Via Exeter TV)